Workforce Disability Equality Standard (WDES) Analysis from 2019 - 2022

		2020	2021	2022	Increase or decrease from 2019 - 2022	
Metric 1 - Percentage of staff in AfC pay bands or me	edical and den	ntal subgroups and	very senior manage	rs (including Exe	cutive Board membe	ers) compared
with the percentage of staff in the overall workforce	e					
Disabled 173		184	211	234	64	
Non Disabled 3399	9	3334	3468	3485		
Unknown 380		428	467	491		
			0.07		D 100/	1
1.44		1.23	0.67	1.31	Decreased 9% Since 2019	
1.44 Metric 3 - Relative likelihood of Disabled staff com					Since 2019	ry into the for
Metric 3 - Relative likelihood of Disabled staff com					Since 2019	ry into the for
Metric 3 - Relative likelihood of Disabled staff com capability procedure.	npared to non-	-disabled staff ente	ring the formal cap	ability process,	Since 2019 as measured by ent	
Metric 3 - Relative likelihood of Disabled staff com	npared to non-				Since 2019 as measured by ent Decreased 100%	ry into the for Positive
Metric 3 - Relative likelihood of Disabled staff com capability procedure. 2.06	npared to non-	-disabled staff ente	tring the formal cap	ability process,	Since 2019 as measured by ent Decreased 100% Since 2019	
Metric 3 - Relative likelihood of Disabled staff com capability procedure. 2.06	npared to non-	-disabled staff ente	tring the formal cap	ability process,	Since 2019 as measured by ent Decreased 100% Since 2019	
Metric 3 - Relative likelihood of Disabled staff com capability procedure. 2.06	npared to non-	-disabled staff ente	tring the formal cap	ability process,	Since 2019 as measured by ent Decreased 100% Since 2019	
Metric 3 - Relative likelihood of Disabled staff com capability procedure.	pared to non-	-disabled staff ente	tring the formal cap	ability process,	Since 2019 as measured by ent Decreased 100% Since 2019	
Metric 3 - Relative likelihood of Disabled staff compared capability procedure. 2.06 Metric 4 - Percentage of Disabled staff compared to Patients/service users, their relatives or 40.6	pared to non-	-disabled staff ento 2.83 staff experiencing	ring the formal cap 5.48 narassment, bullying	ability process,	Since 2019 as measured by ent Decreased 100% Since 2019	
Metric 3 - Relative likelihood of Disabled staff com capability procedure. 2.06 Metric 4 - Percentage of Disabled staff compared to	pared to non-	-disabled staff ento 2.83 staff experiencing	ring the formal cap 5.48 narassment, bullying	ability process,	Since 2019 as measured by ent Decreased 100% Since 2019 Increased 0.9%	
Metric 3 - Relative likelihood of Disabled staff compared capability procedure. 2.06 Metric 4 - Percentage of Disabled staff compared to Patients/service users, their relatives or 40.6	npared to non-	-disabled staff ento 2.83 staff experiencing	ring the formal cap 5.48 narassment, bullying	ability process,	Since 2019 as measured by ent Decreased 100% Since 2019 Increased 0.9%	
Metric 3 - Relative likelihood of Disabled staff compared staff compared users, their relatives or 2.06 Metric 4 - Percentage of Disabled staff compared to 2.06 Patients/service users, their relatives or 40.6 other members of the public 40.6	npared to non-	-disabled staff ento 2.83 staff experiencing 45.8%	tring the formal cap 5.48 harassment, bullying 40.6%	ability process, 0 g or abuse from 41.5%	Since 2019 as measured by ent Decreased 100% Since 2019 Increased 0.9% Since 2019	Positive
Metric 3 - Relative likelihood of Disabled staff compared staff compared users, their relatives or 2.06 Metric 4 - Percentage of Disabled staff compared to 2.06 Patients/service users, their relatives or 40.6 other members of the public 40.6	npared to non- o non-disabled	-disabled staff ento 2.83 staff experiencing 45.8%	tring the formal cap 5.48 harassment, bullying 40.6%	ability process, 0 g or abuse from 41.5%	Since 2019 as measured by ent Decreased 100% Since 2019 Increased 0.9% Since 2019 Decreased 5.4%	Positive

	56.6%	60.1%	61.7%	62.3%	Increased 5.7%	Positive
					Since 2019	
Metric 5 - Percentage of Disab	led staff compared to non-disa	abled staff believing	that the Trust provi	ides equal opport	unities for career progr	ession or
promotion		-				
	46.0%	45.5%	47.8%	45.4%	Decreased 0.6%	
					Since 2019	
Metric 6 - Percentage of Disal	pled staff compared to non-di	sabled staff saying	hat they have felt p	pressure from the	ir manager to come to	work, despite
feeling well enough to perforn	n their duties					
reening wen enough to periorn						
	23.9%	26.6%	23.1%	22.7%	Decreased 1.2%	Positive
					Since 2019	
Metric 7 - Percentage of Dis	abled staff compared to no	n-disabled staff sa	ying that they are s	satisfied with th		eir organisatio
-	abled staff compared to nor	n-disabled staff sa	ying that they are s	satisfied with th		eir organisatio
-	abled staff compared to nor 37.2%	n-disabled staff sa	ying that they are s	satisfied with th		ir organisatio
Metric 7 - Percentage of Dis values their work					e extent to which the	ir organisatio
values their work	37.2%	37.4%	43.3%	35.3%	e extent to which the Decreased 1.9% Since 2019	
values their work	37.2%	37.4%	43.3%	35.3%	e extent to which the Decreased 1.9% Since 2019	
-	37.2%	37.4%	43.3%	35.3%	e extent to which the Decreased 1.9% Since 2019	
values their work	37.2% led staff saying that their emp	37.4% loyer has made ade	43.3% quate adjustment(s)	35.3%) to enable them t	e extent to which the Decreased 1.9% Since 2019 to carry out their work.	
values their work Metric 8 - Percentage of Disab	Ied staff saying that their emp	37.4% loyer has made ade 71.2%	43.3% quate adjustment(s) 82.7%	35.3%) to enable them t 71.5%	e extent to which the Decreased 1.9% Since 2019 to carry out their work. Increased 1% Since 2019	Positive
values their work	Ied staff saying that their emp	37.4% loyer has made ade 71.2%	43.3% quate adjustment(s) 82.7%	35.3%) to enable them t 71.5%	e extent to which the Decreased 1.9% Since 2019 to carry out their work. Increased 1% Since 2019	Positive

Key

Showing an increase or decrease year on year

