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**Workforce Representation**

The first WDES indicator 1 looks at the composition of our workforce (excluding bank) by banding, compared with the overall workforce. The table below show the changes in the overall number of disabled people in Agenda for Change pay band and the medical workforce over the last two financial years.

It should be noted that unknown column in the table below, refers to those staff who have indicated that they prefer not to say, as well as those who have not responded to the disability monitoring question in the staff electronics record system ESR.

**Key Findings.**

* The percentage of disabled staff employed at LYPFT has increased from 5.7 % last year to 6.3% this year.
* The number of disabled people in clinical roles in Bands 5 to 7 and Bands 8a to 8b show continuing growth. This is particularly evident in clinical Bands 5 to 7 where the percentage of disabled people has increased from 7.8% to 8.6%.
* There has been a positive increase in the likelihood of disabled applicants being appointed following shortlisting.
* A favourable continuation of no disabled colleagues entering the formal capability process on the grounds of performance for a second reporting year.
* There has been a substantial 11% favourable increase in disabled staff saying that the last time they experienced bullying, harassment or abuse they or a colleague reported it. This is 8% above the benchmark.

**Table 1- Clinical and non-clinical staff breakdown for 2020/2021 and 2021/202**

|  |
| --- |
| **Non-Clinical** |
|  | 2020/21 | 2021/22 |  |
| Bands | Disabled  | Non-disabled  | Unknown  | Disabled  | Non-disabled  | Unknown  | % Disabled in band 2021/22 |
|  1 to 4 | 25 | 363 | 33 | 29 | 385 | 31 | 6.5% |
|  5 to 7 | 12 | 130 | 7 | 11 | 190 | 8 | 5.3% |
| 8a and 8b | 4 | 62 | 3 | 4 | 72 | 4 | 5.0% |
| 8c to VSM | 1 | 36 | 6 | 1 | 37 | 12 | 2.0% |
| **Clinical** |
| 1 to 4 | 31 | 646 | 71 | 36 | 651 | 82 | 4.7% |
| 5 to 7 | 82 | 902 | 73 | 92 | 912 | 71 | 8.6% |
| 8a and 8b | 3 | 140 | 5 | 11 | 135 | 6 | 7.2% |
| 8c to VSM | 1 | 30 | 8 | 1 | 36 | 8 | 2.2% |
| **Of which are Medical & Dental** |
| Consultants | 2 | 67 | 5 | 2 | 72 | 4 | 2.6% |
| Medical Non-consultant career grade | 0 | 37 | 2 | 1 | 37 | 2 | 2.5% |
| Medical trainee grade | 1 | 47 | 18 | 1 | 33 | 44 | 1.3% |
| Other | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0% |

**WDES metrics 2 to 9**

The table below details the WDES data over a two- year period, details of key findings and available benchmark data. It should be noted that for WRES metrics 2 to 4 the national benchmark data used was published in 2021. Further benchmark data will be published by the national team in early 2023. Further detailed benchmarking will be undertaken as part of ongoing analysis.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **WDES theme/Question** | **Staff Group** | **Reporting Period-2021** | **Reporting Period- 2022** | **Benchmark****2021** | **Key Findings** |
| **2.**Relative likelihood of non-Disabled staff compared to Disabled staff being appointed from shortlisting. |  | Non-disabled | 0.83 | 0.72 | 1.11 | Positive increase in the likelihood of Disabled staff being appointed from shortlisting. The probability indicator is in the range of no adverse effect. |
| **3.** Relative likelihood of Disabled staff entering the formal capability process compared to non-Disabled staff. |  | Disabled | 0 | 0 | 1.94 | This metric applies to capability on the grounds of performance and not ill health. Over the two-year rolling period there have been two formal capability cases (one disabled and one non-disabled). Neither case was on the grounds of performance. |
| **WDES theme/Question** | **Long Term Condition or illness** | **Staff Survey****2020** | **Staff Survey****2021** | **Benchmark**  | **Key Findings** |
| **4. a)** Percentage experiencing harassment, bullying or abuse from patients, relatives, or the public in last 12 months. |  | With  | 33% | 31% | 32% | Favourable 2% decline in bullying, harassment, and abuse (B&H) by service users, their families, or the public towards our staff with a disability or long-term health condition.  |
| Without | 24% | 26% | 25% |
| **WDES theme/Question** | **Long Term Condition or illness** | **Staff Survey****2020** | **Staff Survey****2021** | **Benchmark**  | **Key Findings** |
| **4. a)** Percentage experiencing harassment, bullying or abuse from manager in last 12 months.  |  | With | 14% | 12% | 13% | Favourable 2% decline in bullying, harassment, and abuse (B&H) from managers towards our staff with a disability or long-term health condition. |
| Without | 5% | 7% | 7% |
| **4. a)** Percentage experiencing harassment, bullying or abuse from other colleagues in last 12 months.  |  | With | 21% | 22% | 20% | Slight 1% unfavourable increase in bullying, harassment, and abuse (B&H) from other colleagues towards our staff with a disability or long-term health condition. |
| Without | 11% | 11% | 12% |
| **4. b)** Percentage saying that the last time they experienced harassment, bullying or abuse at work, they or a colleague reported it.  |  | With | 56% | 67% | 59% | Substantial 11% favourable increase in disabled staff saying that the last time they experienced bullying, harassment or abuse they or a colleague reported it, this is 8% above the benchmark. |
| Without | 66% | 61% | 61% |
| **5.** Percentage believe that their organisation provides equal opportunities for career progression or promotion.  |  | With | 49% | 50% | 54% | Slight favourable increase of 1% for staff with a long-term condition to 50%, although this is 4% below the benchmark of 54%. Although there has been a 3% reduction when comparing responses from those with a disability and those without, this currently identifies a 9% gap. |
| Without | 61% | 59% | 60% |
| **WDES theme/Question** |  | **Long Term Condition or illness** | **Staff Survey****2020** | **Staff Survey****2021** | **Benchmark**  | **Key Findings** |
| **6.** Percentage felt pressure from their manager to come to work, despite not feeling well enough to perform their duties.  |  | With | 20% | 17% | 21% | Favourable 3% reduction for staff with a disability or long-term condition feeling pressure to come to work, despite not feeling well enough. Although there is a 5% gap when comparing responses from those with a disability and those without. |
| Without | 14% | 12% | 15% |
| **7.**Percentage satisfied with the extent to which their organisation values their work.  |  | With | 41% | 42% | 44% | Slight favourable increase of 1% for staff with a long-term condition to 42%, although this is 2% below the benchmark of 44%. When comparing responses from those with a disability and those without, there is an increasing gap of 12%. |
| Without | 55% | 54% | 52% |
| **8.** Percentage with a long-lasting health condition or illness saying their employer has made adequate adjustment(s) to enable them to conduct their work |  | With | 82% | 81% | 79% | 81% of staff with a long-term condition reported that the trust had made reasonable adjustments. This is favourably 2% above the benchmark. |
| **9.** Staff engagement score. |  | With | 6.7 | 6.8 | 6.7 | Favourable increase in staff engagement score from 6.7 to 6.8, but still below Trust score of 7.0 |
| Without | 7.4 | 7.1 | 7.2 |
| Trust | 7.2 | 7.0 | 7.0 |
| **WDES Theme/Question** | **Reporting Period-2021** | **Reporting Period-2022** | **Key Findings** |
| **10**.Percentage difference between the organisations Board voting membership and its overall workforce. |  | -6% | -6.2% | Trusts are required to look at the percentage difference between the organisations Board membership and its overall workforce. The data is disaggregated by:.* voting membership of the Board
* executive membership of the Board.

Percentage of Board members with a declared disability as of 31st March 2021 was 0%, this leads to a difference of -6% in comparison to the overall workforce. Percentage of Board members with a declared disability remained at 0% as of 31st March 2022, this leads to a difference of -6.2% |