

WORKFORCE DISABILITY EQUALITY STANDARD (WDES) REPORT July 2021

1. Introduction

- 1.1 The NHS long term plan commits Trusts to becoming a model employer for Disabled people. This is seen as essential to guaranteeing the highest standards of care for patients. As an inclusive employer KCHFT knows the value of a diverse workforce. We also recognise that the experience of our colleagues with a Disability is not always as positive as that of our colleagues without a disability and are committed to changing this for the better.
- 1.2 The national NHS workforce disability equality standard (WDES) report for 2019 released in June 2020, stated there were 7.7 million Disabled people in employment in the UK aged between 16-64. 52.6% of working age Disabled people were in employment, compared to 81.5% for working age non-disabled people. In relation to the unemployment rate, the percentage for non-disabled people was over twice the percentage for Disabled people; 7.3% vs 3.4%¹. The report for 2020 is yet to be published.
- 1.3 Results of the national annual NHS staff survey (NHSS) show that disabled staff consistently report higher levels of bullying and harassment and less satisfaction with appraisals and career development opportunities². The purpose of the WDES is to improve the experience of disabled staff working for, and seeking employment in the NHS.
- 1.4 The WDES encourages the development of a more diverse, empowered and valued workforce and implementing it will support NHS organisations in complying with the provisions of the Equality Act 2010.
- 1.5 The WDES became mandatory following the revision to the 2018 NHS standard contract and came into force on 1 April 2019.
- 1.6 Underpinning the WDES is the “social model of disability”³, this recognises that Disabled people face a range of societal barriers and these create disability rather than the impairment or long-term condition.

¹ [NHS England: NHS Workforce Disability Equality Report \(WDES\) Annual Report 2019](#)

² [NHS England: NHS Workforce Disability Equality Report \(WDES\) Annual Report 2019](#)

³ <https://www.scope.org.uk/about-us/social-model-of-disability/>

- 1.7 There is a requirement for every NHS organisation to publish data annually showing the workplace experience of Disabled staff compared to non-disabled staff following analysis of workforce information, staff survey results and disability representation on boards. The analysis is undertaken against 10 metrics.

2. WDES metrics

- 2.1 There are 10 WDES metrics;
- Three metrics focus on workforce data;
 - Five are based on questions from the national NHS Staff Survey (NHSS).
 - One metric focuses on disability representation on boards,
 - One metric (metric 9) focuses on the voices of disabled staff, 9b asks for evidence to be provided in the WDES annual report
- 2.2 The data used to report on the workforce metrics is taken from ESR either as a snapshot on 31 March 2021 or as data for the year up to this date.
- 2.3 The information used to report against the metrics concerned with the staff survey is taken from the 2020 NHSS.

3. Demographics

- 3.1 Data from the National Office of Statistics for 2011, which asks people whether their day to day activities are limited because of a health problem or disability which has lasted, or is expected to last, at least 12 months, shows that across England 17.9 per cent of the population in England and Wales reported a disability that limited their daily activities⁴.
- 3.2 According to the 2011 Census, 17.6 per cent of residents in Kent have a health problem or disability which limits their day-to-day activities⁵, in East Sussex it is 20.3 per cent⁶ and in North East London it is 14.7 per cent⁷.

4. Workforce

- 4.1 At KCHFT an accurate picture is more difficult to ascertain. The Electronic Staff Record (ESR) indicates 4.62 per cent of colleagues have declared they have a disability which is a slight rise on last years' figure of 4.28 percent. However, of those colleagues that completed the 2020 staff survey (3,083) 22.5 per cent

⁴ [Office for National Statistics](#)

⁵ [Disability in Kent Bulletin 2018](#)

⁶ [2011 Census Equalities... in brief](#)

⁷ [2011 Census: Long-term health problem or disability, local authorities in England and Wales](#)

indicated they have a physical or mental health condition, disability or illness that has lasted or is expected to last for 12 months or more.

5. Trust results

5.1 Metric one

- 5.1.1 Metric one represents 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 that have declared their disability status.

There has been very little change in this metric since 2020. Work is continuing to try to improve declaration rates with a focus on capturing equalities monitoring data at the time of recruitment as well as a targeted effort to request colleagues whose data we know to be missing to update their records using a new function in ESR.

Non-Clinical Staff		DISABLED	NON-DISABLED	DISABILITY UNKNOWN OR NULL
Cluster 1 (Band 1 - 4)	Total	5.4%	85.7%	9%
Cluster 2 (Band 5 - 7)	Total	7.4%	83.6%	9.1%
Cluster 3 (Band 8a - 8b)	Total	1.3%	89.6%	9.1%
Cluster 4 (Band 8c - 9 & VSM)	Total	5.3%	92.1%	2.6%

Clinical Staff		DISABLED	NON-DISABLED	DISABILITY UNKNOWN OR NULL
Cluster 1 (Band 1 - 4)	Total	3.3%	85.3%	11.4%
Cluster 2 (Band 5 - 7)	Total	4.9%	85.6%	9.6%
Cluster 3 (Band 8a - 8b)	Total	2.8%	87.9%	9.2%
Cluster 4 (Band 8c - 9 & VSM)	Total	5.9%	94.1%	0%
Cluster 5 (Medical & Dental Staff, Consultants)	Total	6.3%	87.5%	6.3%
Cluster 6 (Medical & Dental Staff, Non-Consultants career grade)	Total	3.9%	81.8%	14.3%
Cluster 7 (Medical & Dental Staff, Medical and dental trainee grades)	Total	0%	0%	100%

5.2 Metric two

- 5.2.1 Metric two examines the relative likelihood of Disabled people compared to non-disabled people being appointed from shortlisting across all posts. The figure of 1.12 indicates that there has been a slight worsening in relation to this metric since last years' report.

		2019/2020	2020/2021
		RELATIVE LIKELIHOOD	
Relative likelihood of disabled staff compared to non-disabled staff being appointed from shortlisting across all posts	Total	1.01	1.12

5.3 Metric three

- 5.3.1 Metric three looks at the relative likelihood of Disabled colleagues compared to non-disabled colleagues entering the formal capability process, as measured by entry into the formal capability procedure based on data from a two-year rolling average of the current and previous years.
- 5.3.2 The relative likelihood of Disabled colleagues entering into a formal capability process when compared to their non-disabled colleagues is 0.915 according to current data. This means Disabled colleagues are **less likely** than their non-disabled colleagues to enter this process. The information used to arrive at this figure is taken from the employee relations case management system which contains equalities data taken from ESR so this result may not be representative of the true picture because of the low declaration rates.

		2019/2020	2020/2021
		RELATIVE LIKELIHOOD	
Relative likelihood of disabled staff compared to non-disabled staff entering the formal capability process, as measured by entry into the formal capability procedure	Total	2.45	0.915

5.4 Metric four

- 5.4.1 Metric four looks at the percentage of staff experiencing harassment, bullying or abuse. The period covered by the 2020 survey shows that Disabled respondents reported higher levels of harassment, bullying or abuse compared to non-disabled

respondents in all three aspects of the question on this topic. There was a decrease in the number of colleagues reporting they had experienced harassment, bullying or abuse from patients and colleagues of 1.7% and 4.5% respectively. Unfortunately, there was a rise of 1.8% in response to the question relating to managers. Positively, there was an increase of 6% of respondents to the survey saying they had reported their experiences, although Disabled colleagues were still marginally less likely to report it compared to their non-disabled counterparts.

		2019		2020	
a) Percentage of disabled staff compared to non-disabled staff experiencing harassment, bullying or abuse from:		DISABLED	NON-DISABLED	DISABLED	NON-DISABLED
i. Patients/service users, their relatives or other members of the public	Total	22.7%	19.4%	21%	15%
ii. Managers	Total	10.4%	6.0%	12.2%	6.4%
iii. Other colleagues	Total	18.3%	11.4%	13.8%	9.2%
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. The data for this Metric should be a snapshot as at 31 March 2020	Total	53.6%	57.7%	59.6%	61%

5.5 Metric five

5.5.1 Metric five asks what percentage of Disabled colleagues compared to non-disabled colleagues believe that the trust provides equal opportunities for career progression or promotion. Both figures were very high, although Disabled colleagues were 3.5 per cent less likely to consider this to be the case than their non-disabled colleagues. The gap between Disabled and non-disabled colleagues' perceptions is more than double what it was last year.

Whilst the national WDES report for 2020 has yet to be published, a review of the report for 2019 reveals that on average Disabled staff are 7.4 percentage points less likely to believe that their trust provides equal opportunities for career progression or promotion, compared to non-disabled staff. (75.3% vs. 82.7%) In comparison the Trusts figures are very positive.

2019	2020
------	------

		DISABLED	NON-DISABLED	DISABLED	NON-DISABLED
Percentage of disabled staff compared to non-disabled staff believing that the trust provides equal opportunities for career progression or promotion.	Total	91.9%	93.4%	90.4%	93.9%

5.6 Metric six

- 5.6.1 Metric six asked what percentage of Disabled colleagues compared to non-disabled colleagues said that they have felt pressure from their manager to come to work, despite not feeling well enough to perform their duties. 20.8 per cent of Disabled respondents to the survey reported they had. This is lower than in the previous year, and the disparity between Disabled and non-disabled colleagues' experiences has narrowed. The Trust intends to continue to focus on how the experience of Disabled colleagues can be improved.

One of the actions taken in the previous 12 months has been to include within our absence management policy and in the absence management training we offer to managers a section on presenteeism and the need to support colleagues to take time away from work when they are unwell.

		2019		2020	
		DISABLED	NON-DISABLED	DISABLED	NON-DISABLED
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.	Total	23.0%	13.7%	20.8%	14.1%

5.7 Metric seven

- 5.7.1 Metric seven looked at the percentage of Disabled colleagues compared to non-disabled colleagues saying that they are satisfied with the extent to which their organisation values their work. There has not been improvement in the results this

year and there remains a gap between the responses of our Disabled colleagues their non-disabled comparators.

		2019		2020	
		DISABLED	NON-DISABLED	DISABLED	NON-DISABLED
Percentage of disabled staff compared to non-disabled staff saying that they are satisfied with the extent to which their organisation values their work.	Total	53.8%	63.5%	53.1%	62.2%

5.8 Metric eight

- 5.8.1 Metric eight asked about the percentage of Disabled staff saying that their employer has made adequate adjustment(s) to enable them to carry out their work. 84.9 per cent of Disabled colleagues responded to say that the trust had made the adjustments needed. This figure has improved since the previous year where 80.6 per cent reported this to be the case.

KCHFT offer a range of flexible working options to support colleagues across the organisation. The Trust also provides guidance on reasonable adjustments and encourages colleagues to complete a Wellness passport and share this with their manager to ensure they know how best to support them taking account of their specific needs. KCHFT colleagues have access to occupational health services, staff counselling and a cohort of Time to Change champions all of which are there to provide the support colleagues need to look after their physical and mental health and wellbeing. In addition a health and wellbeing conversation takes place at the time of all our colleagues annual appraisals.

		2019	2020
Percentage of disabled staff saying that their employer has made adequate adjustment(s) to enable them to carry out their work.	Total	80.6%	84.9%

5.9 Metric nine a

5.9.1 Metric nine is made of two parts,

The table below illustrates there has been no change in engagement levels of Disabled colleagues in 2020 in comparison to the 2019 response

	2019		2020	
	DISABLED	NON-DISABLED	DISABLED	NON-DISABLED
a) The staff engagement score for Disabled staff, compared to non-disabled staff	7.2	7.5	7.2	7.5

	DISABLED
b) Has your trust taken action to facilitate the voices of disabled staff in your organisation to be heard? (yes) or (no)	Yes

5.10.1 KCHFT has a workforce equality group comprised of HR, Trade Union representation, management and staff network representatives, including the chair of the Disability and Carers network. The group meets bi-monthly to discuss issues related to workforce equality, diversity and inclusion and the staff network chairs are able to raise any issues or concerns from their network members.

5.10.2 The trust has an active Disability and Carers staff network. They meet on a quarterly basis and their executive sponsor joins them regularly.

5.11 Metric 10

5.11.1 Metric 10 asks about the percentage difference between the organisation's board voting membership and its organisation's overall workforce. There are 16 Board members eight Executive Directors and eight Non-executive Directors. Only seven of the Executive Board are voting members. At KCHFT all Non-executive board members are voting members.

Voting and Executive Board membership has not changed since the WDES report in 2020. Disabled colleagues at KCHFT are represented on the board. However, if taken in isolation the number of Disabled voting board members is not sufficiently high enough to be representative of the workforce.

This picture changes if the analysis focus' exclusively on the executive board members when the gap is only 2.13% when measuring the percentages against colleagues declaring a Disability on the NHSS.

Percentage difference between the organisation's board voting membership and its organisation's overall workforce, disaggregated:

	2020		2021	
	DISABLED	NON-DISABLED	DISABLED	NON-DISABLED
By Voting membership of the board	0%	-21%	2.04%	-25.56%
By Executive membership of the Board	11%	-2%	20.37%	-10.56%

6. Summary

6.1 The issues arising following an analysis of the WDES data are similar to those reported following the 2020 WDES report. They are:

- ESR is not reflective of the disability status of Trust colleagues, there has only been a small improvement observed since last year, when compared to the NHSS. Focus must be given to improving the accuracy and quality of the data within ESR. Work will continue to close the gap.
- Colleagues with a Disability are not more likely to enter into a formal capability process when compared to their non-disabled colleagues. More detailed analysis of the data will be needed to ensure its accuracy particularly given the concern about the quality of information held in ESR.
- Disabled colleagues responding in the NHSS reported experiencing higher levels of harassment, bullying or abuse from patients, relatives or the public and that they were less likely to report this. In two of the responses in Metric 4 the percentages had reduced from the previous years' survey indicating a slight improvement for Disabled colleagues.
- The percentage of Disabled respondents reporting they felt pressured to come to work despite not feeling well enough to do so decreased.
- In comparison to last year, there was a slight decrease in the number of Disabled colleagues compared with non-disabled colleagues reporting levels of satisfaction with the extent to which the organisation values their work. There remains a significant gap, albeit smaller than last year, between the two groups of 9.1 per cent which needs to be addressed.
- The voting membership of the Trust board remains unrepresentative of the workforce at KCHFT nor of the local communities it serves although Executive membership is much close to being representative.

7. Conclusion

7.1 In conclusion, KCHFT has made some positive progress against many of the metrics in the past 12 months' but there is still work to do. We expect to see more

rapid progress in the coming 12 months' now that we have a dedicated resource in our Workforce EDI Lead.

8. Recommendation

- 8.1 The accompanying plan to this report is accepted and all stakeholders commit to carrying out the actions agreed.