



**Workforce Disability
Equality Standard (WDES)**

2021-2022 Report

Workforce Disability Equality Standard (WDES) 2021-2022

Name and job title of board lead for Workforce Race Equality Standard:

Peter Blythin, Group Executive Director of Workforce and Corporate Business.

Name and job title of lead manager compiling the report:

Nick Bailey, Director of Corporate Workforce.

Abdul Khan, Equality and Diversity Lead.

Name of commissioner this report has been sent to:

NHS Greater Manchester Integrated Care Board (ICB).

Name and job title of coordinating commissioner this report has been sent to:

Jackie Driver, Strategic Equality, Diversity and Human Rights (EDHR) Business Partner.

Date Workforce Disability Equality Standard reported to Board of Directors:

9th May 2022



Contents

- 4.** Introduction
- 5.** Scope
- 6.** Analysis
 - 6. – Metric 1
 - 7. – Metric 2 & 3
 - 8. – Metric 4
 - 9. – Metric 5
 - 10. – Metric 6 & 7
 - 11. – Metric 8, 9 & 10
- 12.** The actions the Trust is taking to advance workforce disability equality
- 14.** Appendix A: WDES Data for Manchester University NHS Foundation Trust (MFT) 2020-2021



Introduction

- 1.1.** The Workforce Disability Equality Standard (WDES) is a set of ten specific measures (metrics) that enable NHS organisations to compare the experiences of Disabled and non-disabled staff. This information informs the development of an action plan to demonstrate progress against the metrics to improve equality and inclusion for Disabled staff. The WDES was mandated for all Trust's from April 2019. It is included in the NHS Standard Contract.
- 1.2.** The purpose of the WDES is to improve the experience of Disabled staff and those seeking employment within the NHS. This report outlines the Trust's performance against the WRES metrics and actions to address areas for improvement.
- 1.3.** The specifications for the data presented in this report are outlined in the WDES Technical Guidance.



Scope

2.1. The data in this report has been obtained from the following sources:

- Metrics 1 and 10 - Electronic Staff Record (ESR).
- Metric 2 - Trac.
- Metric 3- Human Resource Department.
- Metrics 4, 5, 6, 7, 8 and 9- NHS National Staff Survey.

2.2. While Other Locally Agreed pay scales remain in use. This year, this data has been applied to the Agenda for Change (AfC) salary equivalent rule to determine placement within the relevant clusters.



Analysis

- 3.1.** This report comprises an analysis of each of the WDES Metrics. The Trust's data for 2021-2022 is attached at Appendix A to this report.

3.2. Metric 1

3.2.1 This Metric shows the percentage of staff in AfC pay bands or medical and dental subgroups and very senior managers (including Executive Board members) compared with the percentage of staff in the overall workforce. The data analysis is separate for non-clinical and for clinical staff. The WDES standard requires organisations to 'group' staff into 'clusters.'

The clusters are as follows:

- Cluster 1: AfC Band 1, 2, 3 and 4
- Cluster 2: AfC Band 5, 6 and 7
- Cluster 3: AfC Band 8a and 8b
- Cluster 4: AfC Band 8c, 8d, 9 and VSM (including Executive Board members)
- Cluster 5: Medical and Dental staff, Consultants
- Cluster 6: Medical and Dental staff, non-consultant career grade
- Cluster 7: Medical and Dental staff, Medical and Dental trainee grades

3.2.2. The data shows that the overall percentage of Disabled staff has increased from 3% to 4% in the last year. The Trust's Disabled workforce is likely higher than this, as indicated by the NHS National Staff Survey declaration rate, where 19% of the Trust's staff who completed the survey declared that they identify as Disabled. The disability declaration percentage from the NHS Staff Survey is closer to the 18% of Manchester's population who identify as Disabled. This small dataset also impacts on data quality and decision making. It is a Trust priority within the WDES action plan and the Trust's Equality, Diversity, and Inclusion Strategy (Diversity Matters) to improve the quality of this data.

3.2.3. Disabled staff are underrepresented in senior roles at MFT, especially in clinical roles. National data shows that 59% of trusts have five or fewer Disabled staff in senior positions (bands 8a and above, including medical consultants and Board members).



Analysis

3.3. Metric 2

- 3.3.1.** The data shows that the relative likelihood of non-disabled candidates compared to Disabled candidates being appointed from shortlisting has improved from 1.65 last year, to 1.29 this year. A likelihood of 1 would be an equal likelihood.
- 3.3.2.** The calculations for metric 2 are also impacted by the low declaration rate. The Trust is a Disability Confident Employer and implements a Guaranteed Interview Scheme (GIS) which means that any Disabled candidate who meets the essential criteria will be offered an interview and supported with any reasonable adjustments they require.
- 3.3.3.** MFT's data corresponds with the National data, which shows that Disabled applicants in the Northwest region are less likely to be appointed than non-disabled applicants which is 1.28 times more likely.

3.4. Metric 3

- 3.4.1.** This year's data shows that the relative likelihood of Disabled staff compared to non-disabled staff entering the formal capability process is 5.35 compared to last year's likelihood of 0. This means that Disabled staff are 5.35 times more likely to enter this process as non-disabled staff.

It should be noted that the high relative likelihood does not definitively imply that there are systematic issues with Disabled staff entering the capability process. High relative likelihoods can be obtained due to the small proportion of the workforce that has declared a disability on ESR. If the number of Disabled staff in the capability process is small (say less than 10), it is highly unlikely there are any fundamental issues. This year there were four cases within the Trust.

- 3.4.2.** National data shows that Disabled staff are nearly twice as likely to enter the formal capability process as their non-disabled colleagues.



Analysis

4. Metrics 4-8: Staff Experience

4.1. Metrics 4 to 8 look at the experience of Disabled staff in the Trust.

Metric 4 is broken down into two sections:

- Section a) looks at the percentage of Disabled staff compared to non-disabled staff experiencing harassment, bullying or abuse from:
 - (i) Patients / service users, their relatives, or other members of the public.
 - (ii) Managers.
 - (iii) Other colleagues.
- Section b) looks at the 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. This data is taken from the NHS National Staff Survey.

4.2. Metric 4

4.2.1. The data shows that the percentage of staff experiencing harassment, bullying, and abuse from patients and the public has increased when compared to last year. This has increased by 7% for Disabled staff and by 5% for non-disabled staff. Disabled staff remain significantly more likely to experience harassment, bullying, and abuse from patients and the public.

4.2.2. The data shows that the percentage of staff experiencing harassment, bullying, or abuse from managers has increased compared to last year. This has increased by 1% for both Disabled and Non-disabled staff. Disabled staff remain significantly more likely to experience harassment, bullying, or abuse from a manager.

4.2.3. The data shows that the percentage of staff experiencing harassment, bullying, and abuse from other colleagues has increased compared to last year. This has increased by 3% for Disabled staff and 2% for non-disabled staff. Disabled staff remain significantly more likely to experience harassment, bullying, and abuse from other colleagues.



Analysis

- 4.2.4.** The percentage of disabled compared to non-disabled staff who, last time they experienced harassment, bullying or abuse at work, they or a colleague reported it has increased by 1% in the last year. The Trust will continue to promote reporting of harassment, bullying or abuse.
- 4.2.5.** National data shows that nearly a third of Disabled staff continue to report that they have experienced harassment, bullying or abuse. This figure is 6.4% higher when compared to non-disabled staff. National data also shows that when considering incidents of harassment, bullying or abuse from managers towards Disabled staff the gap between Disabled and Non-disabled staff has been consistent at around 8% since 2016. The disparity between Disabled and non-disabled staff has remained around 9% since 2016 when considering the level of harassment, bullying or abuse from colleagues. This means that the national data shows that the difference between the amount of harassment, bullying or abuse experienced by Disabled staff compared to non-disabled staff has remained consistently higher over the last five years.

4.3. Metric 5

- 4.3.1.** The data shows that the percentage of Disabled staff compared to non-disabled staff who believe that the Trust provides equal opportunities for career progression or promotion has decreased significantly over the last year. For Disabled staff this has decreased by 30%, from 77% last year, to 48% this year. This has also decreased for non-disabled staff from 84% last year, to 55% this year. Disabled staff remain significantly less likely to believe that the Trust provides equal opportunities for career progression or promotion.
- 4.3.2.** National data shows that the percentage of Disabled staff believing that they have equal opportunities has remained consistent over the five-year period. The difference between Disabled and non-disabled staff experience has reduced slightly, from 8.0 percentage points in 2016 to 6.7 percentage points in 2020.



Analysis

4.4. Metric 6

4.4.1. The data shows that the percentage of Disabled staff compared to non-disabled staff who felt pressure from their manager to come to work, despite not feeling well enough to perform their duties has improved. This has improved by 2% for Disabled and non-disabled staff. Disabled staff remain significantly more likely to feel they experience pressure from their manager to come to work, despite not feeling well enough to perform their duties.

4.4.2. National data shows that nearly a third of Disabled staff say that they have felt pressure from their manager to come to work, despite not feeling well enough. There was an increase of presenteeism for both Disabled and non-disabled staff in 2020. The gap between Disabled and non-disabled staff has declined slowly from 10% in 2017 to 8.2% in 2020, but the gap remains significant.

4.5. Metric 7

4.5.1. The data shows that the percentage of Disabled staff compared to non-disabled staff who said that they are satisfied with the extent to which their organisation values their work has decreased by 9% for Disabled staff, from 40% last year to 31% this year. This has also decreased for non-disabled staff from 49% to 43%. Disabled staff remain significantly less likely to feel satisfied with the extent to which their organisation values their work.

4.5.2. National data shows that just over a third of Disabled staff feel valued by their employer: this compares to just over half of non-disabled staff. The gap between Disabled and Non-disabled staff has been constant since 2018, at around 11%.



Analysis

4.6. Metric 8

- 4.6.1.** The data shows that the percentage who felt the Trust has made adequate adjustment(s) to enable them to carry out their work has decreased from 70% last year, to 64% this year.
- 4.6.2.** National data shows 76.6% of Disabled staff report that they have the adjustments necessary to perform their duties effectively, an increase of 2.8 percentage points from 2020. Despite the slight improvement it still means nearly one in four Disabled staff in the NHS do not believe that they are getting the necessary equipment and support needed for them to perform their role as effectively as possible.

5. Metric 9

- 5.1.** The data shows that the engagement score for the Trust has decreased from 7.1 last year to 6.7 this year. This has decreased from 6.5 to 6.2 for Disabled staff, and from 7.1 to 6.8 for non-disabled staff. The engagement score for Disabled staff consistently remains lower than the score for non-disabled staff.
- 5.2.** National data also shows that Disabled staff continue to feel less engaged than non-disabled colleagues, and that although some trusts are taking step to engage Disabled staff, this is not yet having an impact on engagement scores.

6. Metric 10

- 6.1.** 5.6% of the Trust Board have declared that they are Disabled. This is the same percentage representation as last year. The Trust Board is representative of the workforce based on the data; however, it is noted that the declaration rate being significantly low impacts this comparison.
- 6.2.** National data shows that 3.7% of board members have declared they are Disabled, which corresponds with the overall declaration of the workforce.



The actions the Trust is taking to advance workforce disability equality

7.1. The findings of this year's data show that the Trust will need to continue its focus to improve the engagement and experience of Disabled staff, which is notable poorer than that of non-disabled staff. The Trust is committed to amplifying the voice of the Disabled workforce. The Trust will continue to engage with staff through the well-established Disabled Staff Engagement Group, and the DiverseAbility Staff Network. The work of the engagement group has included the revision of the Trusts car parking policy and a review of the Trust risk assessment approach to encourage positive conversations about reasonable adjustments.

7.2. Improving the provision of reasonable adjustments for Disabled staff will remain a priority for the Trust in the coming year. A reasonable adjustment sub-group of the Engagement Group has been established to deliver a revised approach to providing staff with reasonable adjustments. The Trust will continue to partner with ACAS to deliver bespoke webinars to increase the awareness and understanding of reasonable adjustments. This work will include the development of resources and dedicated spaces on the staff intranet dedicated to supporting Disabled staff to gain reasonable adjustments.

7.3. The Trust has undertaken additional engagement with the Disabled workforce through the delivery of an engagement and communications campaign to increase declaration rates via ESR. The insights collected from Disabled staff will inform a programme of work designed to develop an inclusive workplace for disabled staff directed by disabled staff. The ESR campaign included information and guidance on how to access ESR to update Disabled status, and where to gain support to address accessibility needs.

7.4. The Trust will work toward 'Disability Lead Employer' status over the coming year, through the national Disability Confident Scheme.

7.5. The Trust will address the finding of the WDES relating to experiences of harassment, bullying or abuse through the implementation of its Choose Kindness Campaign. Choose Kindness will outline a clear zero-tolerance approach to bullying through the delivery of actions plans, guidance and a Trust wide 'Big Conversation'. The approach to bullying, harassment and abuse is part of the Trust's broader Putting People First programme aimed at strengthening culture around employment issues. It builds on what is already in place such as Freedom to Speak Up and builds on national NHS initiatives such as the NHS violence reduction and Hate Crime reporting provisions at MFT.



The actions the Trust is taking to advance workforce disability equality

- 7.6.** The Trust will aim to ensure that all HR cases are recorded using the Empactis-Case Manager system. This will enable the annual review of capability cases to be assessed so that any variation in experience or outcome can be identified and addressed.
- 7.7.** The Trust has the “Guaranteed Interview Scheme” in place to ensure all Disabled candidates who meet the essential criteria for a role will be offered an interview for the post. The Trust will provide reasonable adjustment(s) to candidates who require them as part of the recruitment process.
- 7.8.** The Trust Widening Participation Team will continue to provide opportunities to attract the best of the talent. This includes work-based internships study programmes giving students with special educational need to develop employability skills. The Internship prepares learners for employment, builds confidence and abilities, and helps them gain independence. The Trust now hosts circa 40 interns a year across North Manchester, Trafford, Oxford Road, and Wythenshawe sites making it one of the largest employer hosts in the country.

The team will continue to proactively monitor demographic information for all activity with the aim to increase and diversify our workforce through targeted engagement with our local communities.



Appendix A

| WDES Metric | MFT 2019-20 | | MFT 2020-21 | | MFT 2021-22 | | | |
|---|---------------------|--------------|----------------|--------------|-------------|----------------|--------------|-------------|
| Metric 1 | | | | | | | | |
| Percentage of staff in Agenda for Change (AfC) pay bands or medical and dental subgroups and very senior managers (including Executive Board members) compared with the percentage of staff in the overall workforce: | Overall | 2.97% | Overall | 3.17% | 789 | Overall | 3.69% | 1029 |
| | Cluster 1 | 2.96% | Cluster 1 | 3.35% | 301 | Cluster 1 | 4.22% | 394 |
| | Cluster 2 | 3.47% | Cluster 2 | 3.53% | 420 | Cluster 2 | 3.92% | 543 |
| | Cluster 3 | 2.52% | Cluster 3 | 2.83% | 41 | Cluster 3 | 3.41% | 58 |
| | Cluster 4 | 2.26% | Cluster 4 | 1.73% | 7 | Cluster 4 | 2.20% | 10 |
| | Cluster 5 | 0.58% | Cluster 5 | 0.72% | 9 | Cluster 5 | 0.77% | 11 |
| | Cluster 6 | 0.78% | Cluster 6 | 1.09% | 2 | Cluster 6 | 1.70% | 4 |
| | Cluster 7 | 1.16% | Cluster 7 | 1.24% | 9 | Cluster 7 | 1.04% | 9 |
| | OLA * | 1.11% | | | | | | |
| Cluster 1: AfC Band 1, 2, 3 and 4 Cluster 2: AfC Band 5, 6 and 7 Cluster 3: AfC Band 8a and 8b Cluster 4: AfC Band 8c, 8d, 9 and VSM (including Executive Board members) | Clinical | | | | | | | |
| Cluster 5: Medical and Dental staff, Consultants | Overall | 2.83% | Overall | 2.98% | 544 | Overall | 3.37% | 701 |
| Cluster 6: Medical and Dental staff, Non-consultant career grade | Cluster 1 | 2.70% | Cluster 1 | 3.05% | 134 | Cluster 1 | 3.53% | 166 |
| Cluster 7: Medical and Dental staff, Medical and dental trainee grades | Cluster 2 | 3.37% | Cluster 2 | 3.47% | 366 | Cluster 2 | 3.89% | 476 |
| | Cluster 3 | 2.34% | Cluster 3 | 2.14% | 22 | Cluster 3 | 2.74% | 33 |
| | Cluster 4 | 2.19% | Cluster 4 | 1.40% | 2 | Cluster 4 | 1.21% | 2 |
| | Cluster 5 | 0.58% | Cluster 5 | 0.72% | 9 | Cluster 5 | 0.77% | 11 |
| | Cluster 6 | 0.78% | Cluster 6 | 1.09% | 2 | Cluster 6 | 1.70% | 4 |
| | Cluster 7 | 1.16% | Cluster 7 | 1.24% | 9 | Cluster 7 | 1.04% | 9 |
| | OLA * | 0% | | | | | | |
| Note: Definitions for these categories are based on ESR occupation codes except for medical and dental staff, which are based upon grade codes. | Non-Clinical | | | | | | | |
| | Overall | 3.37% | Overall | 3.70% | 245 | Overall | 4.67% | 328 |
| | Cluster 1 | 3.20% | Cluster 1 | 3.63% | 167 | Cluster 1 | 4.93% | 228 |
| | Cluster 2 | 4.38% | Cluster 2 | 4.02% | 54 | Cluster 2 | 4.16% | 67 |
| | Cluster 3 | 3.01% | Cluster 3 | 4.48% | 19 | Cluster 3 | 5.02% | 25 |
| | Cluster 4 | 2.30% | Cluster 4 | 1.92% | 5 | Cluster 4 | 2.77% | 8 |
| | OLA * | 2.17% | | | | | | |

* Other Locally Agreed

Appendix A

| WDES Metric | MFT 2019-20 | MFT 2020-21 | MFT 2021-22 |
|---|---|--|--|
| <p>Metric 2</p> <p>Relative likelihood of non-disabled staff compared to Disabled staff being appointed from shortlisting across all posts.</p> | 1.53 times more likely | 1.65 times more likely | 1.29 times more likely |
| <p>Metric 3</p> <p>Relative likelihood of Disabled staff compared to non-disabled staff entering the formal capability process, as measured by entry into the formal capability procedure.</p> | 7.68 times more likely | 0 times more likely | 5.35 times more likely |
| <p>Metric 4</p> <p>Staff Survey</p> <p>a) Percentage of Disabled staff compared to non-disabled staff experiencing harassment, bullying or abuse from:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Patients/service users, their relatives or other members of the public ii. Managers iii. Other colleagues <p>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.</p> | <p>a)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Disabled – 26% non-disabled – 20% ii. Disabled – 18% Non-disabled – 9% iii. Disabled – 25% Non-disabled – 15% <p>b)</p> <p>Disabled – 49% Non-disabled – 46%</p> | <p>a)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Disabled – 26% Non-disabled – 20% ii. Disabled – 21% Non-disabled – 11% iii. Disabled – 27% Non-disabled – 16% <p>b)</p> <p>Disabled – 47% Non-disabled – 44%</p> | <p>a)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Disabled – 33% Non-disabled – 25% ii. Disabled – 22% Non-disabled – 11% iii. Disabled – 30% Non-disabled – 18% <p>b)</p> <p>Disabled – 48% Non-disabled – 45%</p> |
| <p>Metric 5</p> <p>Staff Survey</p> <p>Percentage of Disabled staff compared to Non-disabled staff believing that the Trust provides equal opportunities for career progression or promotion.</p> | <p>Disabled – 75% Non-disabled – 85%</p> | <p>Disabled – 77% Non-disabled – 84%</p> | <p>Disabled – 48% Non-disabled – 55%</p> |
| <p>Metric 6</p> <p>Staff Survey</p> <p>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.</p> | <p>Disabled – 32% Non-disabled – 21%</p> | <p>Disabled – 35% Non-disabled – 24%</p> | <p>Disabled – 33% Non-disabled – 22%</p> |

Appendix A

| WDES Metric | MFT 2019-20 | MFT 2020-21 | MFT 2021-22 |
|--|---|---|---|
| <p>Metric 7</p> <p><i>Staff Survey</i></p> <p>Percentage of Disabled staff compared to Non-disabled staff saying that they are satisfied with the extent to which their organisation values their work.</p> | <p>Disabled – 41%</p> <p>Non-disabled – 52%</p> | <p>Disabled – 40%</p> <p>Non-disabled – 49%</p> | <p>Disabled – 31%</p> <p>Non-disabled – 43%</p> |
| <p>Metric 8</p> <p><i>Staff Survey</i></p> <p>Percentage of Disabled staff saying that their employer has made adequate adjustment(s) to enable them to carry out their work.</p> | <p>Yes – 70%</p> | | <p>Yes – 70%</p> <p>Yes – 64%</p> |
| <p>Metric 9</p> <p>a) The staff engagement score for Disabled staff, compared to Non-disabled staff and the overall engagement score for the organisation.</p> <p>b) Has your trust taken action to facilitate the voices of Disabled staff in your organisation to be heard? (Yes) or (No)</p> | <p>a)</p> <p>Disabled – 6.6</p> <p>Non-disabled – 7.2</p> <p>Trust – 7.1</p> <p>b)</p> <p>Yes</p> | <p>a)</p> <p>Disabled – 6.5</p> <p>Non-disabled – 7.1</p> <p>Trust – 7.1</p> <p>b)</p> <p>Yes</p> | <p>a)</p> <p>Disabled – 6.2</p> <p>Non-disabled – 6.8</p> <p>Trust – 6.7</p> <p>b)</p> <p>Yes</p> |
| <p>Metric 10</p> <p>Percentage difference between the organisation's Board voting membership and its organisation's overall workforce, disaggregated:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> By voting membership of the Board. By Executive membership of the Board. | <p>Overall representation: 5.56%</p> <p>Difference:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> By voting membership of the Board – 2.59% By Executive membership of the Board – 2.97% | <p>Overall representation: 5.56%</p> <p>Difference:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> By voting membership of the Board – 2.83% By Executive membership of the Board – 3.17% | <p>Overall representation: 5.56%</p> <p>Difference:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> By voting membership of the Board – 1.87% By Executive membership of the Board – 7.49% |