

Appendix A: Breakdown and Results of WDES Metrics 1 - 10

Key	
Symbol	Meaning
▲ ▼	An Improvement from WDES 2020 Data
▼ ▲	A Decline from WDES 2020 Data
-	No Increase / Decrease from WDES 2020 Data

METRIC 1 – PERCENTAGE OF DISABLED STAFF IN EACH BAND COMPARED TO THE OVERALL WORKFORCE 2021.

This metric compares the data for disabled and non-disabled staff across all pay bands and grades.

Fig 1 – NON-CLINICAL POSTS

Cluster (Bandings)	Disabled	Non-Disabled	Unknown	Total	Same / Higher or Lower than overall Workforce 3.6%	Comparison to NHS (National Medians 2020)*
C1 (1-4)	(70) 3.5% ▼	(1513) 75.4%	(424) 21.1%	2007	Lower	5.2%
C2 (5-7)	(11) 3% ▲	(254) 68.8%	(104) 28.2%	369	Lower	5.4%
C3 (8a / 8b)	(3) 3.9% ▼	(58) 76.3%	(15) 19.7%	76	Higher	4.5%
C4 (8c +)	(2) 3.3% ▲	(42) 68.9%	(17) 27.9%	61	Lower	3.4%

Figure 1 shows that for non-clinical posts, C1, 2 and 4 have under-representation of disabled staff.

Fig 2 - CLINICAL POSTS

Cluster (Bandings)	Disabled	Non-Disabled	Unknown	Total	Same / Higher or Lower than overall Workforce 3.6%	Comparison to NHS (National Medians 2020)*
C1 (1-4)	(108) 3.3% ▲	(2752) 84.2%	(409) 12.5%	3629	Lower	4.7%
C2 (5-7)	(124) 4.1% ▲	(2254) 75.3%	(617) 20.6%	2995	Higher	5.4%
C3 (8a / 8b)	(12) 2.7% ▼	(310) 68.9%	(128) 28.4%	450	Lower	3.8%
C4 (8c +)	(2) 4.8% ▲	(24) 57.1%	(16) 38.1%	42	Higher	3.8%
C5 (Consultants)	(1) 1% ▲	(68) 68%	(31) 31%	100	Lower	Not available
C6 (Career Grade)	0% -	(35) 79.5%	(9) 20.5%	44	Lower	Not available
C7 (Trainees)	(1) 1% ▲	(71) 85.5%	(11) 13.3%	83	Lower	Not available

Figure 2 shows that for clinical posts, despite improvements in the percentage of disabled staff across most bands, all clusters apart from C1 and C3 have under-representation of disabled staff.

METRICS 2 – 10 Fig 3 – Summary of WDES Metrics 2021

Met.	Type	Description	EPUT		Comparison to NHS (National Medians 2020)*
			2020	2021	
1	Workforce Data	Percentage of Disabled staff in the workforce	3%	3.6% ▲	See Fig 1 and 2
2		Relative likelihood of non-disabled staff compared to Disabled staff being appointed from shortlisting across all posts. <i>(Lower scores are better)*</i>	0.95	1.17 ▲	1.08
3		Relative likelihood of Disabled staff compared to non-disabled staff entering the formal capability process, as measured by entry into the formal capability procedure. <i>(A figure above one means this is higher)</i>	1.41	2.61 ▲	Not Available*
4a I	Staff Survey Results 2020	Percentage of Disabled staff compared to non-disabled staff experiencing harassment bullying, or abuse from patients, relatives and public in last 12 months. <i>(Lower %'s are better)</i>	39%	39% -	33.2%
4a II		Percentage of Disabled staff compared to non-disabled staff experiencing harassment, bullying or abuse from managers in last 12 months. <i>(Lower %'s are better)</i>	20%	18% ▼	18.0 %
4a III		Percentage of Disabled staff compared to non-disabled staff experiencing harassment, bullying or abuse from colleagues in last 12 months. <i>(Lower %'s are better)</i>	26%	22% ▼	26.1%
4b		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. <i>(Higher %'s are better)</i>	52%	52% -	50.2%
5		Percentage of Disabled staff compared to non-disabled staff believing the Trust provides equal opportunities for career progression or promotion. <i>(Higher %'s are better)</i>	75%	79% ▲	79.3%
6		Percentage of Disabled staff compared to non-disabled staff feeling pressure from their manager to come to work despite not feeling well enough to perform their duties. <i>(Lower %'s are better)</i>	30%	32% ▲	29.8%
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. <i>(Higher %'s are better)</i>	38%	43% ▲	39.3%
8		Percentage of disabled staff saying that their employer has made adequate adjustments to enable them to carry out their work. <i>(Higher %'s are better)</i>	72%	78% ▲	74.4%
9		The staff engagement score for Disabled staff, compared to non-disabled staff. <i>(Higher scores are better)</i>	6.5	6.8 ▲	6.7
9b		Has your Trust taken action to facilitate the voices of Disabled staff in your organisation to be heard?	See 2020 Report	See Below	N/A
10	Board Membership	Difference between disabled Board membership and overall workforce (lower % = better) **	-3%	8.9% ▲	4.8%

METRIC 9b HAS YOUR TRUST TAKEN ACTION TO FACILITATE THE VOICES OF DISABLED STAFF IN YOUR ORGANISATION?

Trusts that answer YES to this question must provide at least one practical example within this report. For EPUT these examples are as follows:-

- EPUT Endorsed as a Mindful Employer and Disability Confident Employer
- A Disability and Mental Health Staff Network which specifically has Mental Health within its title to ensure Mental health conditions and disabilities are given equal weighting when providing support. Messaging of this Network has opened this out to Autistic Staff (as well as those with other forms of neuro-diversity) in 2021.
- Implementation of Reasonable Adjustments Policy into Trust Policy and Procedure, as well as promotion of this through Trust and guidance materials to facilitate manager and employee conversations.
- A Staff Engagement Equality Champion Scheme that includes staff with lived experience of mental or physical health conditions, involved in collecting feedback from and providing guidance to teams across the Trust as well as promoting inclusive behaviours and EPUT E&I projects.
- Lived experience videos and articles share staff lived experience and how colleagues can support these conditions (including Neurodiversity and Long Term Conditions.)
- Staff Inductions now contain guidance on supporting disability and mental health in the workplace, including reasonable adjustments and managing discrimination against those with disabilities and mental health conditions
- Easy to read guide on how to update disability status on ESR
- Equality and Inclusion intranet pages advising how staff can make sure that their accessibility needs are supported by the Trust (including in an emergency) as well as micro-aggressions against disability and mental health. Online resources supporting those with disabilities who feel pressured to come into work.
- Regular articles encouraging staff to update their ESR status.
- Promotion and intranet articles for disability and mental health events across the year.
- Targeted work to engage with and support those with Disabilities during COVID-19 Pandemic through regular MS Team sessions, providing talking therapy services and guidance for reasonable adjustments and wellbeing.
- Sensory Champions training offered across Trust in collaboration with Essex Cares Ltd. Teaching staff how they can support those with sensory impairments in the workplace.
- Interview Panel Disability representative for senior interviews (8a and above).

****METRIC 10 - PERCENTAGE DIFFERENCE BETWEEN THE ORGANISATION'S BOARD MEMBERSHIP AND ITS OVERALL WORKFORCE. (Lower Figure / closer to zero is better)****Executive Membership**

Executive Membership includes members that sit on the BOD e.g. "Executive Medical Director"

EPUT's workforce that has declared a disability is 3.6% and no Executive Members have declared a disability. **This difference between the Executive Membership and its overall workforce is -3.6%**

Board Membership

Board membership includes all voting members of the board irrespective of whether they are executive or non-executive.

EPUT's workforce that has declared a disability is 3.6% and 2 members (12.5%) of its 16 voting board members have declared a disability. **This difference between the Board Voting Membership and its overall workforce is 8.9%**

Regarding the progression from 2020 – 21

In 2020's WDES report, it was identified that there were no members of the Board declaring a Disability. As EPUT's workforce that had declared a disability at this point was 3%, this led to a difference of -3%.

In 2021, EPUT's Board had two members who had declared a disability (12.5%) with the difference between this and the workforce (3.6%) being 8.9%. Whilst this number is an increase in difference in comparison to the previous year, it is an improvement as there is a higher number of board members who have declared a disability, meaning better representation.

*** Comparison to NHS (National Medians 2020)**

Whilst in previous years, our scores were compared to NHS National averages from the previous year's WDES report (the value obtained by dividing the sum of all by the amount of scores) this report was not currently available at the time of developing this document or Appendix B. As a result we have been advised by the WDES Team to use the National Medians (denoting or relating to a value or quantity lying at the midpoint of a frequency distribution of observed values or quantities) available on NHS England's online "Model Hospital" System. It was also explained by the WDES Team that Metric 3 was not provided as part of this data due to the use of likelihood scoring but that this area also needed improvements on a national level.

♦ Discrepancy between Metric 3 and Metric 1

On the 24th August 2021, shortly after the submission of the Data Collection Framework to the WDES. The Trust was contacted with an enquiry. They asked why the Trust had appeared to grow in size by approximately 3000 members but had only had 759 staff members appointed from shortlisting. It was explained that this relates to substantive hires only; extra bank staff were employed to support COVID but employed as bank on 0 hours and this increased the headcount by 3,000 including the 759. This was accepted as a reasonable response by the DCF and our data updated to reflect this.