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# Summary: at LPT in 2022/23, Disabled colleagues made up 7.8% of our workforce, and were…

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Metric 1** Fairly well-represented across non-clinical band groups. However, Disabled colleagues are still underrepresented at Bands 8A and 8B compared to the workforce overall.Under-represented at clinical Bands 8A and above.Underrepresented in medical roles. **This is an improvement on last year in terms of overall workforce, and a similar position for bands 8a and above.** | A picture containing text, screenshot, line, font  Description automatically generatedA picture containing text, screenshot, line, font  Description automatically generated |
| **Metric 2** Equally likely to be offered a role when shortlisted as non-disabled applicants. Non-disabled people were 0.97 times as likely as Disabled to people to be made an offer from shortlisting.**Recruitment data has been calculated differently to last year, so results between years cannot be directly compared.**  |
| **Metric 3** More likely to enter a formal capability process than non-disabled colleagues, but not significantly so.**This is an improvement on last year.** | **Figures redacted due to small numbers** |
| **Metric 4 (p.14)**More likely than non-disabled colleagues to suffer harassment, bullying or abuse from the public (28.4% Disabled, 18.8% not disabled)**This has worsened since last year.**More likely than non-disabled colleagues to suffer harassment, bullying or abuse from the managers (14.7% Disabled, 6.0% not disabled)**This has improved since last year.**More likely than non-disabled colleagues to suffer harassment, bullying or abuse from colleagues (22.5% Disabled, 10.6% not disabled)**This has worsened since last year.**Less likely to say they, or a colleague, reported their last incident of harassment, bullying or abuse (50.9% Disabled and 59.1% non-disabled).**This discrepancy has worsened since last year.** | **Abuse from the public:****Abuse from managers:****Abuse from colleagues:** |
| **Metric 5 (p.18)**Less likely to feel that career progression processes are fair (59.5% Disabled and 66.7% non-disabled)**This has improved slightly since last year.**  |  |
| **Metric 6 (p.19)**More likely than non-disabled colleagues to have felt pressure from their manager to come to work, despite not feeling well enough to perform their duties, (24.2% Disabled and 12.8% non-disabled)**This has worsened since last year.** |  |
| **Metric 7 (p.20)**Less likely than non-disabled colleagues to be satisfied with the extent to which the organisation valued their work (44.4% Disabled and 54.9% non-disabled).**This is an improvement on last year.**  |  |
| **Metric 8 (p.21)**79.2% of Disabled colleagues reported said adequate adjustments had been made to enable them to carry out their work.**This is similar to last year.**  |  |
| **Metric 9 (p.22)**Disabled colleagues scored lower than non-disabled colleagues on the engagement score (6.7 for Disabled colleagues and 7.1 for non-disabled colleagues). **This is the same as last year.**  |  |
| **Metric 10 (p.24)**Underrepresented among total and executive Board members (-2.2%, -7.8% compared to workforce), but overrepresented among voting Board members (+1.3%). **This is similar to last year.** |

# Full Analysis

# Introduction to the Workforce Disability Equality Standard

The Workforce Disability Equality Standard (WDES) includes ten metrics comparing experiences and outcomes for Disabled and non-disabled colleagues. This data is used to develop action plans for improvement.

All NHS Trusts were required to submit WDES data to NHS England and NHS Improvement, by May 31st 2023. An action plan must be agreed by the Trust Board and published on the Trust’s website by October 31st 2023.

**Note on data:**

The “four-fifths” rule is used to identify significant differences between groups. If the relative likelihood of an outcome for one group compared to another is less than 0.80 or higher than 1.25, then the difference can be considered significant.

Headcounts of 10 and below have been redacted from this report which will be published publicly.

**Note on terminology:**

For the Staff Survey, “Disabled” is defined to mean any physical or mental health conditions or illnesses lasting or expected to last for 12 months or more. Everyone responding “Yes” to “Do you have any physical or mental health conditions or illnesses lasting or expected to last for 12 months or more?” was deemed to be Disabled for the purposes of the Staff Survey analysis. The word “Disabled” was removed from this question in 2020, but results before and after this change are still comparable. The proportion of people reporting a long-term condition or illness via the Staff Survey is much higher than the proportion of people who are recorded as being Disabled on ESR, which is the figure used for the other WDES metrics.

# The WDES metrics

## Metric 1. Pay Bands

Percentage of Disabled colleagues in Agenda for Change pay bands, calculated separately for non-clinical and for clinical colleagues, medical subgroups and Very Senior Managers (including Executive Board members) compared with the percentage of colleagues in the overall workforce.

**Narrative for metric 1:**

* At March 2023, Disabled colleagues made up 7.8% of LPT’s substantive workforce of known disability status, an increase since last year (6.4%). Disability status was unknown for 15% of people (933/6227), down from 16.9% last year. This increase could be due to efforts to encourage people to share their disability status, as well as more people with disabilities being appointed into roles.
* Staff Survey results for 2022 show 27.9% of substantive colleagues at LPT declared a disability, a similar figure to 27.8% last year. Therefore, ESR likely underestimates the percentage of Disabled colleagues in the organisation. This may be due to the anonymity of the Staff Survey encouraging people to declare a disability; the wording of the Staff Survey question asking more generally about “any physical or mental health conditions or illnesses lasting or expected to last for 12 months or more”; or the fact that some people will develop disabilities over their working life and not necessarily update their ESR record. Efforts are ongoing in collaboration with our MAPLE (Mental and Physical Life Experience) Staff Support Network to encourage people to share their disability status on ESR.
* Non-clinical:
	+ For non-clinical colleagues, representation is fairly consistent throughout the bands, with increasing numbers of people sharing their disabilities at Bands 8a and up since last year (although small numbers make these figures liable to change year on year).
* Clinical:
	+ The proportion of Disabled colleagues is highest between Bands 1 and 4, and decreases at higher bands. 39.7% of Consultants have not shared their disability status, compared to just 6.7% of medical trainees, 14.9% of non-clinical staff, and 14.6% of clinical (non-medical) staff.
* The proportion of “Not Stated” or undisclosed disability data has decreased year-on-year from 45.0% at March 2012 to 21.8% at March 2019 and 15.0% at March 2023.

Table 1: Metric 1: The disability profile of substantive colleagues by pay band cluster

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Pay Band Cluster** | **Percent Disabled** **March 2021** | **Percent Disabled** **March 2022** | **Percent Disabled** **March 2023** | **Number** **Disabled March 2021** | **Number** **Disabled March 2022** | **Number** **Disabled March 2023** |
| Substantive Colleagues Overall | 5.9% | 6.4% | **7.8%** | 258 out of 4402 | 305 out of 4730 | **411 out of 5294** |
| Non clinical Cluster 1, Bands 4 and under | 7.2% | 7.6% | **9.8%** | 45 out of 626 | 49 out of 647 | **94 out of 964** |
| Non clinical Cluster 2, Band 5 - 7 | 7.8% | 9.2% | **9.6%** | 24 out of 306 | 30 out of 325 | **37 out of 387** |
| Non clinical Cluster 3, Bands 8a - 8b | R | R | R | R | R | R |
| Non clinical Cluster 4, Bands 8c - 9 and VSM | R | R | R | R | R | R |
| Clinical Cluster 1, Bands 4 and under | 5.4% | 5.9% | **7.8%** | 59 out of 1090 | 69 out of 1175 | **94 out of 1209** |
| Clinical Cluster 2, Band 5 - 7 | 5.8% | 6.3% | **7.1%** | 113 out of 1950 | 133 out of 2117 | **156 out of 2196** |
| Clinical Cluster 3, Bands 8a - 8b | R | R | **5.6%** | R | R | **12 out of 213** |
| Clinical Cluster 4, Bands 8c - 9 and VSM | R | R | R | R | R | R |
| Clinical Cluster 5, Medical Consultants | R | R | R | R | R | R |
| Clinical Cluster 6, Medical Career Grades | R | R | R | R | R | R |
| Clinical Cluster 7, Medical Trainee Grades | R | R | R | R | R | R |

Graph A: How the percentages of Disabled colleagues varies across pay bands for substantive colleagues, compared to the overall figure





## Metric 2. Recruitment

Relative likelihood of non-disabled colleagues compared to Disabled colleagues being offered a role from shortlisting across all posts.

**Narrative for metric 2:**

* In 2022/23 non-disabled people and Disabled people were equally likely to be offered roles from amongst those shortlisted (non-disabled people were 0.97 times as likely as Disabled people to be offered roles from shortlisting).
* In 2022/23, some adjustments have been made to the calculations due to the functionality of our new recruitment system, NHS Jobs 3:
	+ Data for the number of people **recruited** is not available for 2022/23 in NHS Jobs 3. Therefore, the number of people **made offers** is used here, in contrast with previous years. Internal candidates will appear in the number of shortlisted candidates, but as their offers are not currently recorded on NHS Jobs 3, they will not appear in the number of candidates offered roles. Therefore, the number of people offered roles is underestimated.
	+ Only vacancies which had reached the point of offer are included in the figures. Vacancies are earlier stages are excluded because outcomes were unknown for these applicants. Applicants who withdrew from the process prior to offers being made have also been excluded. This improves our data quality.
	+ Had 2021/22 data been calculated in the same way, this shows non-disabled candidates were still similarly likely to Disabled candidates to be made an offer, with non-disabled candidates 1.04 times more likely to be made offers.

Table 2: Metric 2: The relative likelihood of non-disabled people and Disabled people being appointed from amongst those shortlisted

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Recruitment** | **2019/20** | **2020/21** | **2021/22** | **2022/23\*** |
|  | **RECRUITED** | **MADE OFFERS** |
| Relative likelihood of appointment from shortlisting (non-disabled/Disabled) | 1.39 | 1.13 | 1.17 | **0.97** |
| % non-disabled people appointed from shortlisting | 11.2% | 10.8% | 13.2% | **35.9%** |
| % Disabled people appointed from shortlisting | 8.1% | 9.6% | 11.3% | **36.9%** |
| n. non-disabled people appointed from shortlisting | 504 out of 4493 | 550 out of 5079 | 766 out of 5786 | **1108 out of 3081** |
| n. Disabled people appointed from shortlisting | 30 out of 371 | 35 out of 364 | 55 out of 485 | **109 out of 295** |

\*It is not possible to make comparisons with previous years, as 2022/23 data has been calculated differently.

## Metric 3. Formal capability process

**Description of metric 3:**

* Relative likelihood of Disabled colleagues compared to non-disabled colleagues entering the formal capability process. This does not include ill-health processes.

**Narrative for metric 3:**

* Results for Metric 3 have not been published, as there were fewer than 10 performance management cases involving staff with a disability in 2021/22. This is in line with guidance from the National WDES team.

## Metric 4. Harassment, bullying or abuse

**Description of metric 4:**

* 4 a) Percentage of Disabled colleagues compared to non-disabled colleagues 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 colleagues compared to non-disabled colleagues 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:**

* **The public:** Disabled colleagues were more likely than non-disabled colleagues to suffer harassment, bullying or abuse from patients / service users, their relatives or other members of the public (28.4%, 229/807 Disabled colleagues and 18.8%, 391/2077 non-disabled colleagues); the position has worsened since last year but is better than 2019 and 2020. LPT’s results for this metric in 2021 were better than Trusts of the same type in the benchmark group (32.2% Disabled colleagues and 24.7% non-Disabled colleagues).
* **Managers:** Disabled colleagues were more likely than non-disabled colleagues to suffer harassment, bullying or abuse from managers (14.7%, 118/803 Disabled colleagues and 6.0%, 124/2066 non-disabled colleagues); however this is an improvement on last year and continues a downward trend. LPT’s results for this metric were worse than Trusts in the benchmark group for Disabled colleagues (12.3% Disabled colleagues and 7.0% non-Disabled colleagues).
* **Colleagues:** Disabled colleagues were more likely than non-disabled colleagues to suffer harassment, bullying or abuse from other colleagues (22.5%, 180/800 Disabled colleagues and 10.6%, 218/2063 non-disabled colleagues); this is worse than last year. LPT’s results for this metric were worse than Trusts in the benchmark group for Disabled colleagues (18.9% Disabled colleagues and 12.1% non-Disabled colleagues).

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

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Harassment, bullying or abuse from patients / service users, their relatives or the public** | **2019** | **2020** | **2021** | **2022** |
| % Disabled colleagues | 30.1% | 30.7% | 26.3% | **28.4%** |
| % non-disabled colleagues | 20.9% | 20.2% | 21.4% | **18.8%** |
| n. Disabled colleagues | 165 out of 548 | 210 out of 684 | 206 out of 782 | **229 out of 807** |
| n. non-disabled colleagues | 376 out of 1803 | 415 out of 2050 | 435 out of 2037 | **391 out of 2077** |

Graph B: Metric 4ai: The percentages of colleagues with and without disabilities/long-term conditions who experienced harassment, bullying or abuse from patients / service users, their relatives or other members of the public

Table 5: Metric 4a ii: The percentages of Disabled colleagues and non-disabled colleagues who experienced harassment, bullying or abuse from managers

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Harassment, bullying or abuse from managers** | **2019** | **2020** | **2021** | **2022** |
| % Disabled colleagues | 20.5% | 17.7% | 16.2% | **14.7%** |
| % non-disabled colleagues | 8.1% | 8.9% | 7.2% | **6.0%** |
| n. Disabled colleagues | 111 out of 542 | 121 out of 682 | 126 out of 776 | **118 out of 803** |
| n. non-disabled colleagues | 145 out of 1801 | 183 out of 2047 | 145 out of 2021 | **124 out of 2066** |

Graph C: Metric 4aii: The percentages of colleagues with and without disabilities/long-term conditions who experienced harassment, bullying or abuse from managers

Table 6: Metric 4a iii: The percentages of Disabled colleagues and non-disabled colleagues who experienced harassment, bullying or abuse from other colleagues

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Harassment, bullying or abuse from other colleagues** | **2019** | **2020** | **2021** | **2022** |
| % Disabled colleagues | 23.6% | 22.3% | 21.4% | **22.5%** |
| % non-disabled colleagues | 13.5% | 13.0% | 12.3% | **10.6%** |
| n. Disabled colleagues | 126 out of 534 | 150 out of 673 | 165 out of 772 | **180 out of 800** |
| n. non-disabled colleagues | 238 out of 1766 | 262 out of 2020 | 248 out of 2012 | **218 out of 2063** |

Graph D: Metric 4aiii: The percentages of colleagues with and without disabilities/long-term conditions who experienced harassment, bullying or abuse from colleagues

**Narrative for metric 4b:**

* Disabled colleagues were less likely to say they, or a colleague, reported their last incident of harassment, bullying or abuse (50.9%, 166/326 Disabled colleagues and 59.1%, 290/491 non-disabled colleagues). The position has worsened since last year. LPT’s results were worse than Trusts in the benchmark group (60.3% Disabled colleagues and 59.8% non-Disabled colleagues).

Table 7: Metric 4b. The percentages of Disabled colleagues and non-disabled colleagues who say they, or a colleague, reported their last incident of harassment, bullying or abuse

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Reporting harassment, bullying or abuse** | **2019** | **2020** | **2021** | **2022** |
| % Disabled colleagues | 50.2% | 56.3% | 54.5% | **50.9%** |
| % non-disabled colleagues | 56.5% | 57.6% | 52.5% | **59.1%** |
| n. Disabled colleagues | 118 out of 235 | 166 out of 295 | 163 out of 299 | **166 out of 326** |
| n. non-disabled colleagues | 280 out of 496 | 314 out of 545 | 283 out of 539 | **290 out of 491** |

Graph E: Metric 4b: The percentages of colleagues with and without disabilities/long-term conditions who say they, or a colleague, reported their last incident of harassment, bullying or abuse

## Metric 5. Equal opportunities for career progression or promotion

**Description of metric 5:**

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

**Narrative for metric 5:**

* Disabled colleagues were less likely than non-disabled colleagues to feel that the organisation provides equal opportunities for career progression or promotion (59.5%, 481/809 Disabled colleagues and 66.7%, 1390/2083 non-disabled colleagues); a slight improvement on previous years in terms of proportion of colleagues answering positively.
* LPT’s results for this metric were better than Trusts in the benchmark group, in common with previous years (56.0% Disabled colleagues and 61.5% non-Disabled colleagues).

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

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Equal opportunities for career progression or promotion** | **2019** | **2020** | **2021** | **2022** |
| % Disabled colleagues | 52.9% | 54.6% | 59.0% | **59.5%** |
| % non-disabled colleagues | 58.5% | 64.1% | 65.7% | **66.7%** |
| n. Disabled colleagues | 291 out of 550 | 375 out of 687 | 459 out of 778 | **481 out of 809** |
| n. non-disabled colleagues | 1056 out of 1804 | 1320 out of 2058 | 1336 out of 2032 | **1390 out of 2083** |

Graph F: Metric 5: Percentage of colleagues with and without disabilities/long-term conditions feeling the organisation provides equal opportunities for career progression or promotion

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

**Description of metric 6:**

* Percentage of Disabled colleagues compared to non-disabled colleagues 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:**

* Disabled colleagues were more likely than non-disabled colleagues to have felt pressure from their manager to come to work, despite not feeling well enough to perform their duties, (24.2%, 132/545 Disabled colleagues and 12.8%, 125/977 non-disabled colleagues). The gap has widened between Disabled and non-disabled colleagues.
* LPT’s results for this metric were worse than Trusts in the benchmark group for Disabled colleagues (18.9% Disabled colleagues and 12.7% non-Disabled colleagues).

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

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Pressure from a manager to come to work, despite not feeling well enough** | **2019** | **2020** | **2021** | **2022** |
| % Disabled colleagues | 26.2% | 26.6% | 22.0% | **24.2%** |
| % non-disabled colleagues | 17.9% | 18.9% | 15.1% | **12.8%** |
| n. Disabled colleagues | 101 out of 386 | 119 out of 447 | 121 out of 549 | **132 out of 545** |
| n. non-disabled colleagues | 161 out of 900 | 154 out of 814 | 146 out of 968 | **125 out of 977** |

Graph G: Metric 6: The percentages of colleagues with and without disabilities/long-term conditions feeling pressure from their manager to come into work

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

**Description of metric 7:**

* Percentage of Disabled colleagues compared to non-disabled colleagues saying that they are satisfied with the extent to which their organisation values their work.

**Narrative for metric 7:**

* Disabled colleagues were less likely than non-disabled colleagues to be satisfied with the extent to which the organisation valued their work (44.4%, 358/806 Disabled colleagues and 54.9%, 1141/2078 non-disabled colleagues); however, the percentage has increased since last year and the gap between Disabled and non-disabled colleagues has narrowed.
* LPT’s results for this metric were similar to Trusts in the benchmark group (44.0% Disabled colleagues and 53.2% non-Disabled colleagues).

Table 10: Metric 7. The percentages of Disabled colleagues and non-disabled colleagues who were satisfied with the extent to which the organisation valued their work

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Satisfaction with the extent to which the organisation values work** | **2019** | **2020** | **2021** | **2022** |
| % Disabled colleagues | 37.8% | 38.7% | 38.1% | **44.4%** |
| % non-disabled colleagues | 47.4% | 53.1% | 51.0% | **54.9%** |
| n. Disabled colleagues | 207 out of 547 | 265 out of 685 | 296 out of 777 | **358 out of 806** |
| n. non-disabled colleagues | 853 out of 1801 | 1086 out of 2045 | 1035 out of 2028 | **1141 out of 2078** |

Graph H: Metric 7: The percentages of colleagues with and without disabilities/long-term conditions feeling valued by the organisation

**Metric 8. Adequate adjustments**

**Description of metric 8:**

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

**Narrative for metric 8:**

* Amongst colleagues with disabilities or long-term conditions at LPT, 79.2% (374/472) reported that their employer had made adequate adjustments to enable them to carry out their work: slightly down from last year but slightly more than the national average of 78.8%.

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

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Adequate adjustments** | **2019** | **2020** | **2021** | **2022** |
| % Disabled at LPT | 80.3% | 79.4% | 79.9% | **79.2%** |
| % Disabled benchmark orgs | 76.9% | 81.4% | 78.8% | **78.8%** |
| n. Disabled at LPT | 281 out of 350 | 359 out of 452 | 366 out of 458 | **374 out of 472** |
| n. Disabled benchmark orgs | Data not available | Data not available | Data not available | **7137 out of 9113** |

Graph I: Metric 8: How the percentages of Disabled colleagues reporting adequate adjustments locally and nationally has changed since 2018

**Metric 9. Staff engagement and facilitating the voices of Disabled colleagues**

**Description of metric 9:**

* 9 a) The staff engagement score for Disabled colleagues, compared to non-disabled colleagues 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:**

* As in previous years, Disabled colleagues scored lower than non-disabled colleagues on the engagement score (6.7 for Disabled colleagues and 7.1 for non-disabled colleagues). LPT’s staff engagement scores are very similar to those Trusts in the benchmark group (6.7 for Disabled colleagues and 7.2 for non-disabled colleagues).

Table 12: The engagement score for Leicestershire Partnership NHS Trust overall, and for Disabled and non-disabled colleagues separately, Staff Survey

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Staff engagement** | **2019** | **2020** | **2021** | **2022** |
| Disabled colleagues | 6.6 | 6.7 | 6.7 | **6.7** |
| Non-disabled colleagues | 7.0 | 7.1 | 7.1 | **7.1** |
| LPT overall | 6.9 | 7.0 | 7.0 | **7.0** |

Graph J: Metric 9a: Staff engagement scores

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

* Channels for voices to be heard:
	+ Disabled Staff Support Group: MAPLE (Mental and Physical Life Experience)
	+ Neurodiversity Support Network

Both groups support the voices of those who want a safe space to share their lived experiences. MAPLE group members are also active partners in developing the WDES action plan.

* Themes identified through the MAPLE group
	+ Continue to promote awareness of reasonable adjustments and use of the Health Passport, particularly around managers’ awareness of their role in supporting people working with disabilities and long-term conditions.
	+ Ensure more accessibility of the recruitment process
	+ Promote our Human Library initiative, giving people the chance to learn first-hand from someone with a disability or long-term condition.
* Outputs
	+ Ongoing co-production of training packages and tools to include upcoming Disability Learning Sets
	+ Policy Reviews
	+ MAPLE Staff Network conference day
	+ Promotion of how and why people can share their disability status on ESR.
	+ Linking of well-being to the appraisal process through the Leadership Behaviour Framework
	+ Equality-related appraisal objectives for all staff members

## Metric 10. Board representation

**Description of metric 10:**

* Percentage difference between Disabled colleagues 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:**

* In March 2023, compared to the level of representation in the workforce of known status overall, Disabled people were proportionally represented amongst voting board members (+1.3% difference in representation). However, Disabled people were under-represented amongst executive board members (-7.8% difference in representation) and board members overall (-2.2% difference in representation).
* The position is similar to previous years.

Table 13: Metric 10. Differences in the levels of representation of Disabled colleagues amongst board members of known status (overall, voting members, and executives), relative to the level of representation in the workforce overall (of known status)

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Board representation** | **March 2020** | **March 2021** | **March 2022** | **March 2023** |
| Percentage Disabled colleagues in the substantive workforce overall | 5.8% | 5.9% | 6.4% | **7.8%** |
| Difference between **all board members** and the substantive workforce overall | +2.5% | +4.1% | -0.9% | **-2.2%** |
| Difference between **voting board members** and the substantive workforce overall | +5.3% | +6.6% | +2.6% | **1.3%** |
| Difference between **executive board members** and the substantive workforce overall | -5.8% | -5.9% | -6.4% | **-7.8%** |

## Appendix 1: Directorate Data

**INDICATOR 1**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **CHS** | **No** | **Yes** | **%No (of known status)** | **%Yes (of known status)** |
| **total** | 1478 | 85 | 94.6% | 5.4% |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **DMH** | **No** | **Yes** | **%No (of known status)** | **%Yes (of known status)** |
| **total** | 1204 | 129 | 68.4% | 7.3% |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FYPCLDA** | **No** | **Yes** | **%No (of known status)** | **%Yes (of known status)** |
| **total** | 1291 | 124 | 91.2% | 8.8% |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Enabling, Hosted, and WB** | **No** | **Yes** | **%No (of known status)** | **%Yes (of known status)** |
| **total** | 910 | 73 | 92.6% | 7.4% |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Directorate | Not Stated (% of directorate) |
| CHS | 7.8% |
| DMH | 24.2% |
| FYPCLDA | 13.1% |
| Enabling, Hosted, Workforce Bureau | 14.1% |

**INDICATOR 2**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Directorate | % not disabled Offered roles of those shortlisted (offered/shortlisted) | % Disabled Offered roles of those shortlisted (offered/shortlisted) | Likelihood ratio (not disabled/Disabled) |
| CHS | 36.5% (291/797) | 46.7% (28/60) | 0.78 |
| DMH | 38.4% (383/997) | 40.9% (47/115) | 0.94 |
| FYPCLDA | 35.6% (314/883) | 30.2% (26/86) | 1.18 |

**STAFF SURVEY**

**Indicator 4a(i):** Percentage of Disabled staff and non-disabled staff who experienced at least one incident of harassment, bullying or abuse from patients / service users, their relatives or other members of the public in the last 12 months

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **CHS** | **Yes** | **Total** | **%Yes** |
| Disabled | 78 | 200 | 39.0% |
| Not disabled | 142 | 714 | 19.9% |
|   |   |   |   |
| **DMH** | **Yes** | **Total** | **%Yes** |
| Disabled | 92 | 231 | 39.8% |
| Not disabled | 129 | 422 | 30.6% |
|   |   |   |   |
| **FYPCLDA** | **Yes** | **Total** | **%Yes** |
| Disabled | 51 | 250 | 20.4% |
| Not disabled | 102 | 592 | 17.2% |

**Indicator 4a(ii):** Percentage of Disabled staff and non-disabled staff who experienced at least one incident of harassment, bullying or abuse from Managers in the last 12 months

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **CHS** | **Yes** | **Total** | **%Yes** |
| Disabled | 23 | 197 | 11.7% |
| Not disabled | 31 | 710 | 4.4% |
|   |   |   |   |
| **DMH** | **Yes** | **Total** | **%Yes** |
| Disabled | 49 | 231 | 21.2% |
| Not disabled | 38 | 418 | 9.1% |
|   |   |   |   |
| **FYPCLDA** | **Yes** | **Total** | **%Yes** |
| Disabled | 25 | 250 | 10.0% |
| Not disabled | 37 | 590 | 6.3% |
|   |   |   |   |
| **Enabling, Hosted, and Workforce Bureau** | **Yes** | **Total** | **%Yes** |
| Disabled | 21 | 125 | 16.8% |
| Not disabled | 18 | 348 | 5.2% |

**Indicator 4a(iii):** Percentage of Disabled staff and non-disabled staff who experienced at least one incident of harassment, bullying or abuse from Other colleagues in the last 12 months

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **CHS** | **Yes** | **Total** | **%Yes** |
| Disabled | 48 | 201 | 23.9% |
| Not disabled | 74 | 709 | 10.4% |
|   |   |   |   |
| **DMH** | **Yes** | **Total** | **%Yes** |
| Disabled | 62 | 229 | 27.1% |
| Not disabled | 63 | 421 | 15.0% |
|   |   |   |   |
| **FYPCLDA** | **Yes** | **Total** | **%Yes** |
| Disabled | 45 | 245 | 18.4% |
| Not disabled | 54 | 587 | 9.2% |
|   |   |   |   |
| **Enabling, Hosted, and Workforce Bureau** | **Yes** | **Total** | **%Yes** |
| Disabled | 25 | 125 | 20.0% |
| Not disabled | 27 | 346 | 7.8% |

**Indicator 4b:** Percentage of Disabled staff and non-disabled staff saying they, or a colleague, reported their last incident of harassment, bullying or abuse in the last 12 months

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **CHS** | **Yes** | **Total** | **%Yes** |
| Disabled | 49 | 94 | 52.1% |
| Not disabled | 84 | 158 | 53.2% |
|   |   |   |   |
| **DMH** | **Yes** | **Total** | **%Yes** |
| Disabled | 65 | 120 | 54.2% |
| Not disabled | 100 | 150 | 66.7% |
|   |   |   |   |
| **FYPCLDA** | **Yes** | **Total** | **%Yes** |
| Disabled | 37 | 77 | 48.1% |
| Not disabled | 83 | 137 | 60.6% |
|   |   |   |   |
| **Enabling, Hosted, and Workforce Bureau** | **Yes** | **Total** | **%Yes** |
| Disabled | 15 | 35 | 42.9% |
| Not disabled | 23 | 46 | 50.0% |

**Indicator 5:** Percentage of Disabled staff and non-disabled staff who believe that their organisation provides equal opportunities for career progression or promotion

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **CHS** | **Yes** | **Total** | **%Yes** |
| Disabled | 127 | 203 | 62.6% |
| Not disabled | 515 | 716 | 71.9% |
|   |   |   |   |
| **DMH** | **Yes** | **Total** | **%Yes** |
| Disabled | 126 | 229 | 55.0% |
| Not disabled | 251 | 425 | 59.1% |
|   |   |   |   |
| **FYPCLDA** | **Yes** | **Total** | **%Yes** |
| Disabled | 158 | 251 | 62.9% |
| Not disabled | 396 | 593 | 66.8% |
|   |   |   |   |
| **Enabling, Hosted, and Workforce Bureau** | **Yes** | **Total** | **%Yes** |
| Disabled | 70 | 126 | 55.6% |
| Not disabled | 228 | 349 | 65.3% |

**Indicator 6:** Percentage 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

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **CHS** | **Yes** | **Total** | **%Yes** |
| Disabled | 42 | 133 | 31.6% |
| Not disabled | 52 | 354 | 14.7% |
|   |   |   |   |
| **DMH** | **Yes** | **Total** | **%Yes** |
| Disabled | 42 | 171 | 24.6% |
| Not disabled | 26 | 197 | 13.2% |
|   |   |   |   |
| **FYPCLDA** | **Yes** | **Total** | **%Yes** |
| Disabled | 24 | 164 | 14.6% |
| Not disabled | 28 | 277 | 10.1% |
|   |   |   |   |
| **Enabling, Hosted, and Workforce Bureau** | **Yes** | **Total** | **%Yes** |
| Disabled | 24 | 77 | 31.2% |
| Not disabled | 19 | 149 | 12.8% |

**Indicator 7:** Percentage of Disabled staff and non-disabled staff satisfied with the extent to which their organisation values their work

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **CHS** | **Yes** | **Total** | **%Yes** |
| Disabled | 83 | 203 | 40.9% |
| Not disabled | 391 | 714 | 54.8% |
|   |   |   |   |
| **DMH** | **Yes** | **Total** | **%Yes** |
| Disabled | 96 | 230 | 41.7% |
| Not disabled | 212 | 423 | 50.1% |
|   |   |   |   |
| **FYPCLDA** | **Yes** | **Total** | **%Yes** |
| Disabled | 115 | 247 | 46.6% |
| Not disabled | 344 | 592 | 58.1% |
|   |   |   |   |
| **Enabling, Hosted, and Workforce Bureau** | **Yes** | **Total** | **%Yes** |
| Disabled | 64 | 126 | 50.8% |
| Not disabled | 194 | 349 | 55.6% |

**Indicator 8:** Percentage of Disabled staff saying their employer has made adequate adjustment(s) to enable them to carry out their work

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **CHS** | **Yes** | **Total** | **%Yes** |
| Disabled | 100 | 128 | 78.1% |
|   |   |   |   |
| **DMH** | **Yes** | **Total** | **%Yes** |
| Disabled | 90 | 130 | 69.2% |
|   |   |   |   |
| **FYPCLDA** | **Yes** | **Total** | **%Yes** |
| Disabled | 132 | 154 | 85.7% |
|   |   |   |   |
| **Enabling, Hosted, and Workforce Bureau** | **Yes** | **Total** | **%Yes** |
| Disabled | 52 | 60 | 86.7% |

## Appendix 2: Professional Group Data

Please note: Students (e.g. Student Health Visitors, Student Physiotherapists) are included in their relevant Staff Group for Indicator 1, but not for the Staff Survey results.

**INDICATOR 1**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Additional Clinical Services** | **No** | **Yes** | **%No (of known status)** | **%Yes (of known status)** |
| Band 2 and below | 358 | 23 | 94.0% | 6.0% |
| Band 3 | 438 | 48 | 90.1% | 9.9% |
| Band 4 and above | 369 | 26 | 93.4% | 6.6% |
| **total** | 1165 | 97 | 92.3% | 7.7% |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Admin & Clerical** | **No** | **Yes** | **%No (of known status)** | **%Yes (of known status)** |
| Band 2 and below | 199 | 32 | 86.1% | 13.9% |
| Band 3 | 246 | 24 | 91.1% | 8.9% |
| Band 4 | 168 | 14 | 92.3% | 7.7% |
| Band 5 | 159 | 13 | 92.4% | 7.6% |
| Band 6 | 89 | 14 | 86.4% | 13.6% |
| Band 7 and above | 216 | 18 | 92.3% | 7.7% |
| **total** | 1077 | 115 | 90.4% | 9.6% |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **AHPs** | **No** | **Yes** | **%No (of known status)** | **%Yes (of known status)** |
| Band 5 & 6 | 434 | 44 | 90.79% | 9.21% |
| Band 7 and above | 174 | 13 | 93.0% | 7.0% |
| **total** | 608 | 57 | 91.4% | 8.6% |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Ancillary** | **No** | **Yes** | **%No (of known status)** | **%Yes (of known status)** |
| **total** | 263 | 25 | 91.3% | 8.7% |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Nursing** | **No** | **Yes** | **%No (of known status)** | **%Yes (of known status)** |
| Band 5 | 429 | 27 | 94.1% | 5.9% |
| Band 6 | 575 | 39 | 93.6% | 6.4% |
| Band 7 and above | 338 | 28 | 91.7% | 8.3% |
| **total** | 1342 | 94 | 93.5% | 6.5% |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Professional Group | Not Stated (%) |
| Additional Clinical Services | 13.7% |
| Admin & Clerical | 17.3% |
| AHPs | 7.5% |
| Ancillary | 3.0% |
| Medical | 23.6% |
| Nursing | 18.3% |
| Scientific & Technical | 13.6% |

**INDICATOR 2**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Directorate | % not disabled Offered roles of those shortlisted (offered/shortlisted) | % Disabled Offered roles of those shortlisted (offered/shortlisted) | Likelihood ratio (not disabled/Disabled) |
| Additional Clinical Services | 34.7% (346/996) | 36.4% (32/88) | 0.96 |
| Admin & Clerical | 27.4% (290/1059) | 28.2% (33/117) | 0.97 |
| AHPs | 49.2% (155/315) | 54.3% (19/35) | 0.91 |
| Nursing | 41.5% (230/554) | 45.2% (19/42) | 0.92 |

**STAFF SURVEY**

**Indicator 4a(i):** Percentage of Disabled staff and non-disabled staff who experienced at least one incident of harassment, bullying or abuse from patients / service users, their relatives or other members of the public in the last 12 months

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Additional Clinical Services** | **Yes** | **Total** | **%Yes** |
| Disabled | 57 | 185 | 30.8% |
| Not disabled | 71 | 418 | 17.0% |
|   |   |   |   |
| **Admin & Clerical** | **Yes** | **Total** | **%Yes** |
| Disabled | 45 | 252 | 17.9% |
| Not disabled | 45 | 610 | 7.4% |
|   |   |   |   |
| **AHPs** | **Yes** | **Total** | **%Yes** |
| Disabled | 26 | 90 | 28.9% |
| Not disabled | 62 | 314 | 19.7% |
|   |   |   |   |
| **Nursing** | **Yes** | **Total** | **%Yes** |
| Disabled | 83 | 220 | 37.7% |
| Not disabled | 172 | 568 | 30.3% |

**Indicator 4a(ii):** Percentage of Disabled staff and non-disabled staff who experienced at least one incident of harassment, bullying or abuse from Managers in the last 12 months

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Additional Clinical Services** | **Yes** | **Total** | **%Yes** |
| Disabled | 28 | 185 | 15.1% |
| Not disabled | 22 | 413 | 5.3% |
|   |   |   |   |
| **Admin & Clerical** | **Yes** | **Total** | **%Yes** |
| Disabled | 41 | 251 | 16.3% |
| Not disabled | 33 | 609 | 5.4% |
|   |   |   |   |
| **Nursing** | **Yes** | **Total** | **%Yes** |
| Disabled | 38 | 218 | 17.4% |
| Not disabled | 47 | 564 | 8.3% |

**Indicator 4a(iii):** Percentage of Disabled staff and non-disabled staff who experienced at least one incident of harassment, bullying or abuse from other colleagues in the last 12 months

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Additional Clinical Services** | **Yes** | **Total** | **%Yes** |
| Disabled | 48 | 185 | 25.9% |
| Not disabled | 46 | 414 | 11.1% |
|   |   |   |   |
| **Admin & Clerical** | **Yes** | **Total** | **%Yes** |
| Disabled | 50 | 248 | 20.2% |
| Not disabled | 56 | 608 | 9.2% |
|   |   |   |   |
| **AHPs** | **Yes** | **Total** | **%Yes** |
| Disabled | 12 | 89 | 13.5% |
| Not disabled | 13 | 311 | 4.2% |
|   |   |   |   |
| **Nursing** | **Yes** | **Total** | **%Yes** |
| Disabled | 57 | 218 | 26.1% |
| Not disabled | 89 | 563 | 15.8% |

**Indicator 4b:** Percentage of Disabled staff and non-disabled staff saying they, or a colleague, reported their last incident of harassment, bullying or abuse in the last 12 months

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Additional Clinical Services** | **Yes** | **Total** | **%Yes** |
| Disabled | 43 | 76 | 56.6% |
| Not disabled | 65 | 88 | 73.9% |
|   |   |   |   |
| **Admin & Clerical** | **Yes** | **Total** | **%Yes** |
| Disabled | 45 | 84 | 53.6% |
| Not disabled | 55 | 95 | 57.9% |
|   |   |   |   |
| **AHPs** | **Yes** | **Total** | **%Yes** |
| Disabled | 17 | 32 | 53.1% |
| Not disabled | 29 | 66 | 43.9% |
|   |   |   |   |
| **Nursing** | **Yes** | **Total** | **%Yes** |
| Disabled | 52 | 110 | 47.3% |
| Not disabled | 120 | 195 | 61.5% |

**Indicator 5:** Percentage of Disabled staff and non-disabled staff who believe that their organisation provides equal opportunities for career progression or promotion

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Additional Clinical Services** | **Yes** | **Total** | **%Yes** |
| Disabled | 113 | 185 | 61.1% |
| Not disabled | 282 | 420 | 67.1% |
|   |   |   |   |
| **Admin & Clerical** | **Yes** | **Total** | **%Yes** |
| Disabled | 148 | 253 | 58.5% |
| Not disabled | 413 | 613 | 67.4% |
|   |   |   |   |
| **AHPs** | **Yes** | **Total** | **%Yes** |
| Disabled | 49 | 89 | 55.1% |
| Not disabled | 217 | 313 | 69.3% |
|   |   |   |   |
| **Nursing** | **Yes** | **Total** | **%Yes** |
| Disabled | 142 | 221 | 64.3% |
| Not disabled | 379 | 570 | 66.5% |
|   |   |   |   |
| **Scientific & Technical** | **Yes** | **Total** | **%Yes** |
| Disabled | 19 | 39 | 48.7% |
| Not disabled | 51 | 86 | 59.3% |

**Indicator 6:** Percentage 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

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Additional Clinical Services** | **Yes** | **Total** | **%Yes** |
| Disabled | 35 | 123 | 28.5% |
| Not disabled | 34 | 191 | 17.8% |
|   |   |   |   |
| **Admin & Clerical** | **Yes** | **Total** | **%Yes** |
| Disabled | 44 | 167 | 26.3% |
| Not disabled | 24 | 262 | 9.2% |
|   |   |   |   |
| **AHPs** | **Yes** | **Total** | **%Yes** |
| Disabled | 14 | 59 | 23.7% |
| Not disabled | 14 | 145 | 9.7% |
|   |   |   |   |
| **Nursing** | **Yes** | **Total** | **%Yes** |
| Disabled | 33 | 160 | 20.6% |
| Not disabled | 44 | 305 | 14.4% |

**Indicator 7:** Percentage of Disabled staff and non-disabled staff satisfied with the extent to which their organisation values their work

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Additional Clinical Services** | **Yes** | **Total** | **%Yes** |
| Disabled | 85 | 185 | 45.9% |
| Not disabled | 233 | 418 | 55.7% |
|   |   |   |   |
| **Admin & Clerical** | **Yes** | **Total** | **%Yes** |
| Disabled | 114 | 250 | 45.6% |
| Not disabled | 357 | 610 | 58.5% |
|   |   |   |   |
| **AHPs** | **Yes** | **Total** | **%Yes** |
| Disabled | 31 | 89 | 34.8% |
| Not disabled | 188 | 315 | 59.7% |
|   |   |   |   |
| **Nursing** | **Yes** | **Total** | **%Yes** |
| Disabled | 106 | 221 | 48.0% |
| Not disabled | 277 | 568 | 48.8% |
|   |   |   |   |
| **Scientific & Technical** | **Yes** | **Total** | **%Yes** |
| Disabled | 16 | 39 | 41.0% |
| Not disabled | 46 | 86 | 53.5% |

**Indicator 8:** Percentage of Disabled staff saying their employer has made adequate adjustment(s) to enable them to carry out their work

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Additional Clinical Services** | **Yes** | **Total** | **%Yes** |
| Disabled | 103 | 129 | 79.8% |
|   |   |   |   |
| **Admin & Clerical** | **Yes** | **Total** | **%Yes** |
| Disabled | 109 | 133 | 82.0% |
|   |   |   |   |
| **AHPs** | **Yes** | **Total** | **%Yes** |
| Disabled | 45 | 54 | 83.3% |
|   |   |   |   |
| **Nursing** | **Yes** | **Total** | **%Yes** |
| Disabled | 99 | 131 | 75.6% |
|   |   |   |   |
| **Scientific & Technical** | **Yes** | **Total** | **%Yes** |
| Disabled | 15 | 17 | 88.2% |