
















Workforce Disability Equality Standard: Our data as of 31 March 2024

Metric		2022	2023	2024	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	5,907	6,104	6,518	Workforce headcount has steadily increased since 2019.
	Overall % of staff living with a disability	4.38% ↑	5.78% ↑	7.79% ↑	This metric has shown improvement although, NSS figures indicate the number of staff who live with a disability, or a long-term health condition, is higher than reported via ESR, there are several factors for this including staff not wanting to share their status.
	Disabled headcount	259 ↑	353 ↑	508 ↑	An increase in the overall workforce number could be a reason for this increase, however there is still a higher percentage of appointments of non-disabled staff.
	Non-disabled headcount	5,542	5,600	5,851	Workforce headcount has continued to increase since 2019.
	Not stated	106 ↑	151 ↑	159 ↑	The number of staff not sharing their disability status has increased, this is evident from the NSS results where a higher percentage of staff (31.67%) living with disabilities have shared this.
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>		1.29 ↑	1.19 ↓	1.08 ↓	A small decrease from 1.19 in 2023 to 1.08 demonstrates that staff living with disabilities remain less likely to be appointed. We are however, moving much closer to achieving parity.
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>		8.56 ↑	0.00 ↓	0.00 ↔	This metric is a data average of two years, between 2023 and 2024 there were 10 cases which went through the formal capability procedure, of which 2 were on the grounds of ill health. The Employee Relations review process to assess if progression to a formal process remains in place.

Metric			2022	2023	2024	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	51.2% ↑	50.2% ↓	47.5% ↓	Whilst there is a small 1% decrease in staff living with disabilities experiencing harassment, bullying and abuse from last year, this has increased for non-disabled staff demonstrating an increase of 1.7%. The data highlights over half our staff population living with disabilities (NSS) experience harassment, bullying and abuse in comparison to a third of non-disabled staff (NSS).
		Non-Disabled	39.5%	35.3%	37%	
	% of staff experiencing harassment, bullying or abuse from managers in the last 12 months	Disabled	19.2% ↔	18.6% ↓	16.6% ↓	For staff living with disabilities, there is a 2% decrease in bullying experienced from managers which shows a positive shift towards reduction across the Trust.
		Non-Disabled	11.1%	9.2%	6.9%	
	% of staff experiencing harassment, bullying or abuse from other colleagues in the last 12 months	Disabled	28.0% ↑	25.0% ↓	23.8% ↓	Further improvements in bullying, harassment and abuse from colleagues is reported from staff living with disabilities with a 1.2% decrease from 2023.
		Non-Disabled	16.6%	14.7%	14%	
	% 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	47.2% ↓	50.6% ↑	51.3% ↑	An 0.7% increase of staff reporting bullying, harassment and abuse since last year, highlights a positive improvement as staff feel safer to report negative experiences. Reporting has increased through FTSU/DATIX on incidents which supports the development of cultural change programmes at the Trust.
		Non-Disabled	42.5%	48.2%	49.8%	
Metric 5: Percentage of disabled staff compared to non-disabled staff believing that the Trust provides equal opportunities for career progression or promotion.	Disabled	43.8% ↓	49.3% ↑	50.2% ↑	A positive increase for 2024 by 0.9%, However, whilst half of our staff living with disabilities felt there were equal opportunities for career progression and promotion, the proportion is still marginally lower when compared to the experience of non-disabled staff.	
	Non-Disabled	52.0%	55.3%	57%		

Metric		2022	2023	2024	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	32.8% 	32.47% 	32.54% 	This figure shows a small negative increase this year. Operational pressures may still be a contributing factor impacting this metric. Overall, almost one third of staff living with disabilities feel pressured to come to work despite not feeling well.
	Non-Disabled	23.6%	23.1%	20.1%	
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	21.5% 	25.5% 	25.9% 	A positive increase can be seen for both staff living with disabilities and non-disabled staff feeling valued at the Trust. NSS results indicate staff feeling their work is valued by the organisation is still low, as is the number of non-disabled staff at just over a third. Staff engagement remains a key priority for the Trust including improved visibility and supportive practices e.g. Hybrid and Flexible Working.
	Non-Disabled	30.9%	33.1%	34.3%	
Metric 8: Percentage of disabled staff saying that their employer has made adequate adjustment(s) to enable them to carry out their work.		60.9% 	65.7% 	68.8% 	A positive 3.1% increase and may be attributed to the initiatives from the Working Adjustments Group (Health and Wellbeing Passport and Hybrid/Flexible Working Policies), we are aware of continued negative experiences faced by staff living with disabilities. The figure also indicates over 30% of staff do not believe that they are getting the necessary equipment and support needed for them to effectively perform their role.
Metric 9a: The staff engagement score for disabled staff, compared to non-disabled staff and the overall engagement score for the organisation.	Disabled	5.5 	5.7 	5.8 	The engagement score for the whole Trust improved by a fraction, overall staff living with disabilities continue to feel less engaged than those without.
	Non-Disabled	6	6.4	6.5	
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 	The introduction of Executive Sponsor and NED Champion for the Disability Staff Network will provide additional support at Board level. Increased engagement and membership, alongside check-ins and peer support groups organised by the

Metric		2022	2023	2024	Comments
					Disability Support Network continue to increase engagement for staff living with disabilities and facilitate a channel to ensure voice. Initiatives such as the Sunflower Scheme for hidden disabilities, training and development webinars around neurodiversity also highlight challenges and support required for staff living with disabilities.
Metric 10: Percentage difference between the organisation's board membership and its overall workforce disaggregated:	Disabled	14% ↑	14% ↔	42% ↑	The Trust has 7.79% disabled workforce and 3 of its 6, i.e. 50% of voting members on the Board have a declared disability. The difference between the organisation's voting Board membership and its overall workforce is therefore 42% points.
	Non-Disabled	-12%	-12%	-40%	