

Appendix 1 – WDES and WRES Results and Actions

1.1 Workforce Disability Equality Standard

WDES Metric	2019 data	Comments	Action	Timescale
Percentage of staff in AfC paybands or medical and dental subgroups and Very Senior Managers (including Executive Board Members) compared with the percentage of staff in the overall workforce. Snapshot 31st March 2019.	4% Disabled staff across the workforce 6.21% Disabled staff in bands 8a and 8b 2.7% Disabled staff in bands 8c, 9 and VSM.	It is a priority to increase the rate of disclosure within the self service ESR portal and to reduce the number of staff that choose not to answer this question in order to have more comprehensive data to draw from.	Design and send out communication to staff about: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What the information is used for. • How the data is used and shared. • How to enter the ESR portal and update their demographic information on the self-service portal. 	February 2019 Lisa Wright & Claire White
Relative likelihood of Disabled staff being appointed from shortlisting compared to that of Non-Disabled staff being appointed from shortlisting across all posts.	1.15	The difference in likelihood of Disabled and Non-Disabled applicants being appointed to a post after the applicant has been shortlisted is 1.15. A figure below 1:00 indicates that Disabled staff are more likely than Non-Disabled staff to be appointed from shortlisting.	Review and refresh the 'understanding and managing bias' section in the R&S training ensure it is effective and fit for purpose.	January 2020 Ruth Shaw & Richard Wormwell
Percentage of staff that feel the organisation values the work that they do.	33.2% of Disabled staff 47.9% Non-Disabled	There is a significant gap of 14.7% between Disabled and Non-Disabled Staffs perception of this.	This will be investigated through engagement with disabled staff in the established focus groups to understand what is happening to impact on staff perception and experience. The outcome will be reported on in the January update.	March 2020 Lisa Wright
Percentage of disabled staff that felt that their employer had made reasonable adjustments that	79.2%	Four in five respondents answered this positively.	Case studies of reasonable adjustments will be carried out to highlight good and poor	July 2020 Annette Tindall

WDES Metric	2019 data	Comments	Action	Timescale
enabled them to carry out their work.			<p>practice included in the absence management tool kit.</p> <p>The Reasonable Adjustment form will be promoted as a management tool not just as something to carry out if a member of staff with a disability or long-term condition hits sickness triggers but to prevent that from happening where possible.</p>	
Percentage of staff who experienced at least one incident of bullying, harassment or abuse from patients, service users, their relatives or other members of the public.	<p>31.3% Disabled</p> <p>24.3% Non-Disabled</p>	<p>7% more Disabled staff answered yes to this question. This is higher than the percentage difference between BAME and White staff which is 4.9%. That figure has risen over the past year.</p>	<p>The bullying and harassment training for managers will continue to be delivered with a focus on how to address abuse from service users, carers and the public.</p> <p>Implementation of the policy by managers will be audited against incidents and complaints and targeted interventions made.</p>	<p>July 2020</p> <p>Lisa Wright</p>
Percentage of staff who experienced at least one incident of bullying, harassment or abuse from staff.	<p>23.2% Disabled</p> <p>14.2% Non-Disabled</p>	<p>9% more Disabled staff than non-Disabled staff reported experiencing at least one incident of bullying, harassment or abuse from staff.</p>	<p>Staff focus groups will be held and engagement will take place as part of the bullying and harassment training.</p> <p>The work to address bullying and harassment cultures will continue - This includes implementation of the Dignity and Respect Policy, referrals to and promotion of the bullying and harassment support officers and the training that has been developed to empower managers to tackle and prevent bullying and harassment in teams.</p>	<p>April 2020</p> <p>Lisa Wright</p>

WDES Metric	2019 data	Comments	Action	Timescale
Percentage believing that Trust provides equal opportunities for career progression and promotion.	80.8% Disabled 82.2% Non-Disabled	The gap here is small at 1.4% and significantly less than the difference identified through the WRES question where the gap between White and BAME staff is 28.3%.	Staff focus groups will be held to gain case studies of good practice. The introduction of a systematic approach to Talent Management is expected to reduce unconscious bias by introducing a standard process to be followed by all team leaders. This will be reviewed for impact on reducing perceptions of inequality across protected characteristics	December 2020 Lisa Wright April 2020 Fay Davies
Percentage of staff who experienced at least one incident of bullying, harassment or abuse from managers	17.9% Disabled 8.4% Non-Disabled	9.5% more Disabled staff feel that they have experienced at least one incident of bullying harassment or abuse from managers in the last 12 months.	In staff focus groups this will be explored to understand the nature of these incidents. These will be used as case studies for managers in the bullying and harassment training to help understand how behaviors and actions can be perceived by disabled staff. Any trends that come out of that work will be fed into policy review to reduce the risk of incidents occurring; for example; if the incidents are linked to attendance management or performance management processes.	April 2020 Lisa Wright & Annette Tindall
	10.5% difference			
Relative likelihood of Disabled staff compared to non-disabled staff entering the formal capability process, as measured by entry into the formal capability procedure.	1.54	Reporting on this metric is voluntary in year one as some Trusts will not have the capacity and systems in place to collect the information. Within BDCFT the likelihood score is 1.54. A figure above 1:00 indicates that Disabled staff are more likely than Non-Disabled staff to enter the formal capability process.	A review of capability cases will be conducted to identify any trends or concerns that need reviewing and addressing from a quality perspective.	April 2020 Lisa Wright & Annette Tindall

WDES Metric	2019 data	Comments	Action	Timescale
		Although this is high the figures show that there were 12 capability cases of which one involved a disabled member of staff, none of the cases involved a staff member whose disability status was left unknown.		
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.	28% Disabled 18.2% Non-Disabled	8.9% more Disabled staff felt pressure from their manager to come to work, despite not feeling well enough to perform their duties.	This will be addressed by the promotion of the Reasonable Adjustments form and Supporting Attendance Policy which has been reviewed to include information about reasonable adjustments preventing this pressure occurring. The concern will be picked up with Disabled staff and managers in the focus groups and bullying and harassment workshops with a report being produced to show the outcome.	April 2020 Lisa Wright & HRBP's
The staff engagement score for Disabled staff, compared to non-disabled staff and the overall engagement score for the organisation.	6.6 Disabled 7.1 Non-Disabled	Disabled staff came out as being less engaged than Non-Disabled Staff.	This data will be shared with teams aiming to engage staff; for example, the Communications Team, Crowdsourcing lead and staff engagement lead. The Strategic Reference Group will be asked to think of ways to increase Disabled staffs' engagement and commit to carrying out those actions within their teams.	October 2019 Lisa Wright & HRBPs
Has your Trust taken action to facilitate the voices of Disabled staff in your organisation to be heard? (yes) or (no)	Yes	The Trust has held staff focus groups to share staff survey information and has a strategic reference group for equality where discussion is held about disability. There is a small Disabled Staff	The option to work across the district and develop a district wide network to improve the reach and impact of the Disabled Staff Network will be explored. This may help the group will grow in numbers and hold regular meetings to contribute their views to this	May 2020 Lisa Wright

WDES Metric	2019 data	Comments	Action	Timescale
		Network whose Chairs is engaged in the strategic reference group.	agenda. Presently this is done through staff focus groups.	
<p>Board are expected to be broadly representative of the population they serve. Percentage of the Board that are from a disabled background.</p> <p>Note in 2017 the metric changed to:</p> <p>Percentage difference between the organisations' Board voting membership and its overall workforce.</p>	-4%	No members of the Board have identified themselves as having a disability within ESR. 33% of the Board have not completed this information within the ESR record and have their status as unknown.	Information will be shared with the Board about the importance of completing this demographic information and how to access the ESR self-service portal.	<p>October 2019</p> <p>Lisa Wright</p>

2.0 Workforce Race Equality Standard

2.1 The 2019 column is colour coded according to whether there has been an improvement (green), no change (amber) or worsening (red) of the results since 2018. The proposed actions follow the table in section 3.1. A detailed analysis of all of the metrics is included in [appendix 3](#). An infographic of the headline data is included in [appendix 4](#).

WRES Metric	2014 data	2015 data	2016 data	2017 data	2018 data	2019 data	Trends and Comments	Benchmark
Percentage of BAME staff in bands 8 – 9 VSM (Including Executive Board members and Senior Medical Staff) compared with the BAME staff in the overall workforce.	6.76% BAME 19.81% White	6.69% BAME 20.61% White	Metric changed to bands 1-9. 18.7% White	18.7% BAME 10.40% BAME band 8-9 (VSM)	18.65% BAME 8.65% BAME band 8-9 (VSM)	22% BAME 12.6% (Bands 8-9 (VSM))	The % of BME staff in bands 8-9 is 12.6%. 22% of the overall workforce are from a BME background meaning that BME staff are under-represented in bands 8, 9 and VSM.	2017 - Nationally, the proportion of BAME staff in Bands 8a - 9 and VSM was 11.1% compared with 17.7% in the workforce as a whole
Relative likelihood of White staff being appointed from shortlisting compared to that of BAME staff being appointed from shortlisting across all posts.	10:1 BAME 11:1 White	8:1 BAME 6:1 White	8:1 BAME 6:1 White	0.99	1.15	1.71	The difference in likelihood of BAME and White applicants being appointed to a post after the applicant has been shortlisted has increased since 2017 to 1.71 in favour of White applicants.	2018 - 1.45
Relative likelihood of BAME staff entering the formal disciplinary process, compared to that	41:1 BAME 56:1 White	36:1 BAME 44:1 White	45:1 BAME 49:1 White	1.98 Previous metric method: 44:1 BAME	2.00	1.98	The way that this metric is measured was changed in 2016.	2018 – 1.24

WRES Metric	2014 data	2015 data	2016 data	2017 data	2018 data	2019 data	Trends and Comments	Benchmark
of White staff entering the formal disciplinary investigation.				88:1 White Last 6 months 138:1 BAME 215:1 White			BAME staff are just less than twice as likely to enter a formal disciplinary process.	
Relative likelihood of BAME staff accessing non-mandatory training and CPD as compared to White staff	1:1 BAME 1:1 White	1:1 BAME 1:1 White	1:1 BAME 1:1 White	1.05	1.04	1.00	There is no difference in the likelihood of BAME staff accessing training compared with White staff.	2018 – 1.15
Percentage of staff experiencing harassment, bullying or abuse from patients, relatives or the public in the past 12 months.	–	31% BAME 25% White	30% BAME 27% White	27.72% BAME 27.97% White	28.71% BAME 28.13% White	30.1% BAME 25.2% White	The gap between BAME staff and White staff reporting having experienced harassment, bullying or abuse from patients, relatives or the public has reduced over the time period from 6% more BAME staff having experienced it to 3% and to 0.58 in 2018. However, the difference has increased in 2018 to just below the benchmark average at 4.9%	2018 - 29% of BAME staff
		6% difference	3% difference	0.25% difference	0.58%	4.9%		
Percentage of staff experiencing harassment, bullying or abuse	21% BAME 17% White	23% BAME 19% White	24% BAME 19% White	24.16% BAME 20.20% White	24.26% BAME 19.83% White	27.7% BAME 20.5% White	There has been an increase of 2.8% in the gap between BAME and White staff responses to this question in	2018 - 28% BAME

WRES Metric	2014 data	2015 data	2016 data	2017 data	2018 data	2019 data	Trends and Comments	Benchmark
from staff in the past 12 months.	4% difference	4% difference	5% difference	3.96% difference	4.4% difference	7.2% Difference	2018 which is now above the national average.	
Percentage believing that Trust provides equal opportunities for career progression and promotion.	70% BAME	78% BAME	68% BAME	66.41% BAME	65.89% BAME	58.4% BAME	The number of BAME staff answering yes to this question has decreased by 7.49% since 2018. The Trust is 17.8% below the national benchmark for BAME staffs' answer to this question. The difference between BAME and White staffs' answer to this question is 16.8% higher than the national benchmarked average.	2018 – 72% BAME
	93% White	87% White	88% White	84.64% White	85.36% White	86.7% White		
In the last 12 months have you personally experienced discrimination at work from any of the following? Manager / Team Leader or other colleagues.	23% difference	9% difference	20% difference	18.23% difference	19.47% difference	28.3% Difference	The gap has decreased in 2018. The difference between ethnic groups responses is 10.5%. The national benchmark responses were 12.8% for BAME staff and 5.6% for White staff which is a difference in response by ethnic group of 7.2% meaning the Trust is 3.3% above the benchmark.	2018 – 15% BAME
	41% BAME	25% BAME	16% BAME	15.85% BAME	20.10% BAME	16.1% BAME		
	11% White	9% White	5% White	7.52% White	6.6% White	5.6% White		
Percentage difference between the organisations' Board voting membership and its overall workforce.	30 % difference	16% difference	11% difference	8% difference	13.5% difference	10.5% Difference	13.3% of the Board members have 'ethnicity unknown' within their ethnicity field.	2018 – 7%
	6.25% BAME	7.7% BAME	8.3% BAME	-10.3% BAME	-18.6% BAME	-22.8%		
				-10.5% White	-0.1% White	-18.6%		

2.2 Action Plan

WDES Metric	Metric	Proposed Action	Timescale for Completion
Percentage of BAME staff in bands 8 – 9 VSM (Including Executive Board members and Senior Medical Staff) compared with the BAME staff in the overall workforce.	22% BAME 12.6% (Bands 8-9 (VSM))	The positive increase in BAME staff in bands 8a and above to be celebrated. BAME staff in these roles will be encouraged to share their stories as role models throughout the year.	October 2020 Lisa Wright & Comms
Relative likelihood of White staff being appointed from shortlisting compared to that of BAME staff being appointed from shortlisting across all posts.	1.71	Include the updated WRES and WDES data in the recruitment and selection training along with key messages about bias and its impact.	January 2020 Ruth Shaw & Claire Sheridan
Percentage of BAME staff in bands 8 – 9 VSM (Including Executive Board members and Senior Medical Staff) compared with the BAME staff in the overall workforce. Relative likelihood of White staff being appointed from shortlisting compared to that of BAME staff being appointed from shortlisting across all posts.	22% BAME 12.6% (Bands 8-9 (VSM))	Assess the BAME representation on 8a and above recruitment panel pilots and review the impact of that on the appointment after shortlisting figures.	July 2020 Lisa Wright & Claire Sheridan
Relative likelihood of BAME staff entering the formal disciplinary process, compared to that of White staff entering the formal disciplinary investigation.	1.98	Review the disciplinary and grievance data alongside the data collected from Bullying and Harassment Support Officers to identify themes and trends and to look at the impact that the work carried out in 2018 and 2019 to address the data has had. Develop actions as a result of that data.	February 2020 Lisa Wright

Relative likelihood of BAME staff entering the formal disciplinary process, compared to that of White staff entering the formal disciplinary investigation.	1.98	<p>Promote the work of the Wellbeing @ Work Team to ensure staff are aware of the support that is available to them when experiencing bullying, harassment and abuse.</p> <p>Respond to the crowdsourcing priorities identified in the last engagement programme.</p> <p>Triangulate data from bullying and harassment support officers, disciplinary and grievances, Freedom to Speak Up and Risk Reporting to identify bullying and harassment hotspots to target the training and focus groups.</p>	<p>On-going with a review in May 2020.</p> <p>Lisa Wright, Fay Davies and Helen Farrar</p>
Percentage believing that Trust provides equal opportunities for career progression and promotion	<p>58.4% BAME 86.7% White 28.3 % difference</p>	<p>Further exploration into the outcome of the metric that asks BAME staff whether they consider the Trust to promote equal opportunities to career progression and promotion is required. This will include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Staff focus groups. • Analysis of what opportunities for career progression have taken place in the last 2 years and what the outcome of that recruitment process has been and develop an appropriate response. 	<p>April 2020</p> <p>Lisa Wright</p>
Percentage difference between the organisations' Board voting membership and its overall workforce.	<p>28.3% Difference</p>	<p>Work to ensure that the number of unknown demographic categories in the Board's ESR profile is reduced.</p>	<p>November 2020</p> <p>Lisa Wright & Paul Hogg</p>