













## Appendix 1 - Workforce Disability Equality Standard: Our data as of 31 March 2023

Metric		2021	2022	2023	Alignment to D&I Action Plan	Comments
<b>Metric 1:</b> 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	5736	5907	6104	<b>Actions:</b> <b>5, 6, 7 &amp; 8</b> (5) Recruitment and Progression (6) Diverse Panels (7) Job Description and Person Specification (8) Community Engagement	Workforce headcount has steadily increased since 2019.
	Overall % of staff living with a disability	3.3% ↑	4.38% ↑	5.78% ↑		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 than reported via ESR.
	Disabled headcount	188 ↑	259 ↑	353 ↑		The increase in the overall workforce has meant an increase in staff living with disabilities but shows increase of staff living without disabilities have also been appointed.
	Non-disabled headcount	5489	5542	5600		Workforce headcount has steadily increased since 2019.
	Not stated	59 ↑	106 ↑	151 ↑		The launch of the Diversity Census in March 2023 aims to encourage staff to share this information.
<b>Metric 2:</b> 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>	1.04 ↑	1.29 ↑	1.19 ↓	<b>Actions:</b> <b>5, 6, 7, 8, 17 &amp; 19</b> (17) Inclusive and Compassionate Conversation training (19) Data-led recruitment and progression targets	This metric has significantly decreased meaning that staff living with disabilities are almost similarly appointed after shortlisting. Parity should be at 1:00 for staff living with disabilities and those without.	
<b>Metric 3:</b> 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 ↔	8.56 ↑	0.00 ↓	<b>Actions:</b> (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 (3.5 cases with 1 staff living with disabilities) involved have resulted in this overall <b>average</b> figure.	

Metric			2021	2022	2023	Alignment to D&I Action Plan	Comments
<b>Metric 4:</b> Percentage of staff experiencing harassment, bullying or abuse from patients, relatives or the public, colleagues and managers in last 12 months.	Percentage of staff experiencing harassment, bullying or abuse from patients/service users, their relatives or other members of the public in the last 12 months	<b>Disabled</b>	47.5% 	51.2% 	50.2% 	<b>Actions: 1, 2, 3, 4 &amp; 9</b> (1) Targeted culture work (2) Allyship & Micro-aggressions (3) Say Yes to Respect (4) Resource for targeted and bespoke work on behaviours (9) Support Networks, FTSU and leaders' intelligence	A positive decrease this year although insignificant compared to 2021. 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.
		<b>Non-Disabled</b>	37%	39.5%	35.3%		
	Percentage of staff experiencing harassment, bullying or abuse from managers in the last 12 months	<b>Disabled</b>	19.2% 	19.2% 	18.6% 		This has decreased marginally following two years of negative experiences for staff living with disabilities from their managers.
		<b>Non-Disabled</b>	10.3%	11.1%	9.2%		
	Percentage of staff experiencing harassment, bullying or abuse from other colleagues in the last 12 months	<b>Disabled</b>	24.5% 	28.0% 	25.0% 		This figure has also improved this year, although recognising room for improvement as a Trust. Likely cause may be during times of extreme pressure, relationships may have been strained and deteriorated.
		<b>Non-Disabled</b>	16.7%	16.6%	14.7%		
	Percentage 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	<b>Disabled</b>	47.8% 	47.2% 	50.6% 		An increase of staff reporting bullying, harassment and abuse, highlighting further need for encouragement to report such instances. Staff may have decided that insufficient action has been taken previously which may impact numbers who choose not to report.
		<b>Non-Disabled</b>	46.1%	42.5%	48.2%		

Metric		2021	2022	2023	Alignment to D&I Action Plan	Comments
<b>Metric 5:</b> Percentage of disabled staff compared to non-disabled staff believing that the Trust provides equal opportunities for career progression or promotion.	<b>Disabled</b>	47.3% ↑	43.8% ↓	49.3% ↑	<b>Actions:</b> <b>5, 6, 17, 18 &amp; 19</b>	A positive increase this year and potentially connected to Metric 2.
	<b>Non-Disabled</b>	53.8%	52.0%	55.3%		
<b>Metric 6:</b> 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.	<b>Disabled</b>	29.7% ↓	32.8% ↑	32.5% ↓	<b>Actions:</b> <b>1, 2, 3, 9, 10, 11 &amp; 17</b> (11) Reverse Mentoring roll-out	This figure shows a marginal improvement this year. The extreme operational pressures the Trust has faced for the last couple of years will have impacted on this metric.
	<b>Non-Disabled</b>	22.0%	23.6%	23.1%		
<b>Metric 7:</b> Percentage of disabled staff compared to non-disabled staff saying that they are satisfied with the extent to which their organisation values their work.	<b>Disabled</b>	34.6% ↑	21.5% ↓	25.5% ↑	<b>Actions:</b> <b>1, 2, 3, 9, 10, 11 &amp; 17</b>	This has increased for all staff in the Trust. Staff engagement remains as a key priority for the Trust.
	<b>Non-Disabled</b>	41.6%	30.9%	33.1%		
<b>Metric 8:</b> Percentage of disabled staff saying that their employer has made adequate adjustment(s) to enable them to carry out their work.		73.1% ↑	60.9% ↓	65.7% ↑	<b>Actions:</b> <b>14, 15, 16 &amp; 17</b> (14) Reasonable Adjustment Guidance (15) Health Passport (16) Neurodiversity Guidance	A reduction for all staff. The launch of the Health and Wellbeing Passport is underway, including the introduction of hybrid/flexible working policies.
<b>Metric 9a:</b> The staff engagement score for disabled staff, compared to non-disabled staff and the overall engagement score for the organisation.	<b>Disabled</b>	6.3 ↑	5.5 ↓	5.7 ↑	<b>Actions:</b> <b>10, 11 &amp; 17</b> (10) Staff Equality Conference	Whilst this metric has slightly improved, it is worth noting that the staff engagement score in the National NHS Staff Survey was low for all staff, likely due to extreme pressure.
	<b>Non-Disabled</b>	6.8	6	6.4		
<b>Metric 9b:</b> Has your Trust taken action to facilitate the voices of disabled staff in your organisation to be heard? (yes) or (no)		Yes ↔	Yes ↔	Yes ↔	<b>Actions:</b> <b>2, 9 &amp; 10</b> Strengthen relationships between Support Networks, FTSU and Cultural Ambassadors (9)	Yes. Diversity and Inclusion Steering Group, Disability Support Network (check-ins etc), Joint Steering Group, Cultural Ambassadors, Employee Voice Network

Metric		2021	2022	2023	Alignment to D&I Action Plan	Comments
<b>Metric 10</b> - Percentage difference between the organisation's Board membership and its overall workforce disaggregated.	<b>Disabled</b>	11% ↑	18.18% ↑	23.08% ↑	<b>Actions:</b> <b>6</b>	The percentage of staff living with disabilities on the Trust Board is higher than that declared by staff on the Electronic Staff Record.
	<b>Non-Disabled</b>	89%	81.82% %	76.92% %		