























Workforce Disability Equality Standard: Our data as of 31 March 2022

Metric		2020	2021	2022	Alignment to D&I Action Plan	Comments
Metric 1: Percentage of staff in each of the AfC bands 1 - 9 or medical and dental subgroups and VSM (including executive board members) compared with the percentage of staff in the overall workforce.	Workforce headcount	5361	5736	5907	Actions: 5, 6, 7 & 8 (5) Recruitment & Progression (6) Diverse Panels (7) JD and Person Specification (8) Community Engagement	Workforce headcount has steadily increased since 2019
	Overall % of staff living with a disability	3%	3.3% ↑	4.38% ↑		This metric has improved. However, the National Staff Survey indicates the number of staff who live with a disability, or a long-term health condition, is higher
	Disabled headcount	136	188 ↑	259 ↑		The increase in the overall workforce has meant an increase in staff living with disabilities.
	Non-disabled headcount	5217	5489	5542		Workforce headcount has steadily increased since 2019
	Not stated	8	59 ↑	106 ↑		The launch of the Diversity Census in June 2022 aims to encourage staff to share this information.
Metric 2: Relative likelihood of non-disabled staff being appointed from shortlisting compared to that of disabled staff being appointed from shortlisting across all posts <i>(A figure below 1.00 indicates that disabled staff are more likely than non-disabled staff to be appointed from shortlisting)</i>		0.21	1.04 ↑	1.29 ↑	Actions: 5, 6, 7, 8, 17 & 19 (17) Inclusive and Compassionate Conversation training (19) Data-led recruitment and progression targets	This metric has deteriorated meaning that staff living with disabilities are less likely to be appointed than staff without, after shortlisting.
Metric 3: Relative likelihood of disabled staff entering the formal capability process, compared to that of non-disabled staff, as measured by entry into a formal capability procedure <i>(A figure above 1.00 indicates that disabled staff are more likely than non-disabled staff to enter the formal capability process)</i>		0.00	0.00 ↔	8.56 ↑	Actions: (17) Inclusive and Compassionate Conversation training	The Employee Relations review process to assess if progression to a formal process remains in place. The small numbers (7 cases with 2 staff living with disabilities) involved have resulted in this overall figure.

Metric			2020	2021	2022	Alignment to D&I Action Plan	Comments	
Metric 4: Percentage of staff experiencing harassment, bullying or abuse from patients, relatives or the public, colleagues and managers in last 12 months.	% of staff experiencing harassment, bullying or abuse from patients/service users, their relatives or other members of the public in the last 12 months	Disabled	52.3%	47.5% 	51.2% 	Actions: 1, 2, 3, 4 & 9 (1) Targeted culture work (2) Allyship & Microaggressions (3) Say Yes to Respect (4) Resource for targeted and bespoke work on behaviours (9) Staff Networks, FTSU and leader's intelligence	A deterioration for all staff with a slightly larger increase for staff living with disabilities. Some explanation could be levels of demand and increase in waiting times, potentially staff living with disabilities have received the result of more public frustrations.	
		Non-Disabled	40.1%	37%	39.5%			
	% Of staff experiencing harassment, bullying or abuse from managers in the last 12 months	Disabled	16.2%	19.2% 	19.2% 		This has remained the same for staff living with disabilities and slightly increased for staff without disabilities.	
		Non-Disabled	9.1%	10.3%	11.1%			
	% Of staff experiencing harassment, bullying or abuse from other colleagues in the last 12 months	Disabled	25.9%	24.5% 	28.0% 		This figure unfortunately has deteriorated this year. During times of extreme pressure, relationships may have been strained and declined as a result.	
		Non-Disabled	14.4%	16.7%	16.6%			
	% Of staff saying that the last time they experienced harassment, bullying or abuse at work, they or a colleague reported it in the last 12 months	Disabled	44.4%	47.8% 	47.2% 		A slight deterioration in reporting, despite encouragement for staff to report such instances. Staff may have decided that insufficient action has been taken previously and hence choose not to report.	
		Non-Disabled	39.2%	46.1%	42.5%			
	Metric 5: Percentage of disabled staff compared to non-disabled staff believing that the Trust provides equal opportunities for career progression or promotion.	Disabled	41.1%	47.3% 	43.8% 		Actions: 5, 6, 17, 18 & 19	A disappointing deterioration this year and potentially connected to Metric 2. This could also be connected to the HEE CPD budget available to professionally registered staff.
		Non-Disabled	47.7%	53.8%	52.0%			

Metric		2020	2021	2022	Alignment to D&I Action Plan	Comments
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.	Disabled	36.1%	29.7% 	32.8% 	Actions: 1, 2, 3, 9, 10, 11 & 17 (11) Reverse Mentoring roll-out	This figure has deteriorated this year. The extreme operational pressures the Trust has faced for the last couple of years will have impacted on this metric.
	Non-Disabled	23.6%	22.0%	23.6%		
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.	Disabled	29.0%	34.6% 	21.5% 	Actions: 1, 2, 3, 9, 10, 11 & 17	This has decreased for all staff in the Trust. Staff engagement remains as a key priority for the Trust.
	Non-Disabled	38.9%	41.6%	30.9%		
Metric 8: Percentage of disabled staff saying that their employer has made adequate adjustment(s) to enable them to carry out their work.		67.7%	73.1% 	60.9% 	Actions: 14, 15, 16 & 17 (14) Reasonable Adjustment Guidance (15) Health Passport (16) Neurodiversity Guidance	A reduction for all staff. Unfortunately, the launch of the reasonable adjustment passport came after the national staff survey and extreme pressure may have led to less support for staff with disabilities
Metric 9a: The staff engagement score for disabled staff, compared to non-disabled staff and the overall engagement score for the organisation.	Disabled	6.2	6.3 	5.5 	Actions: 10, 11 & 17 (10) Staff Equality Conference	Whilst this metric has significantly deteriorated, it is worth noting that the staff engagement score in the National Staff Survey deteriorated for all staff, likely due to extreme pressure.
	Non-Disabled	6.8	6.8	6		
Metric 9b: Has your Trust taken action to facilitate the voices of disabled staff in your organisation to be heard? (yes) or (no)		Yes	Yes 	Yes 	Actions: 2, 9 & 10 Strengthen relationships between Staff Networks, FTSU and Cultural Ambassadors (9)	Yes. Diversity & Inclusion Steering Group, Disability Support Network (check-ins etc), Joint Steering Group, Cultural Ambassadors, Employee Voice Network
Metric 10 - Percentage difference between the organisations' board membership and its overall workforce disaggregated:	Disabled	8%	11% 	18.18% 	Actions: 6	The percentage of staff living with disabilities on the Trust Board is higher than that declared by staff on the Electronic Staff Record.
	Non-Disabled	92%	89%	81.82%		