Workforce Disability Equality Standard Data Submission
(as at 31st March 2025)

Table 1: Snap shot of BTHFT workforce data over a period of 3 years

Metric 1	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.
	Organisations should undertake this calculation separately for non-clinical and for clinical staff.
	Cluster 1: AfC Band 1, 2, 3 and 4
	Cluster 2: AfC Band 5, 6 and 7
	Cluster 3: AfC Band 8a and 8b
	Cluster 4: AfC Band 8c, 8d, 9 and VSM (including Executive Board members)
	Cluster 5: Medical and Dental staff, Consultants
	Cluster 6: Medical and Dental staff, Non-consultant career grade
	Cluster 7: Medical and Dental staff, Medical and dental trainee grades

Pay Band	31st March 2023			31st March 2024			31st March 2025		
	Disabled	Non-Disabled	Disability Unknkown/ NULL	Disabled	Non-Disabled	Disability Unknkown/ NULL	Disabled	Non-Disabled	Disability Unknkown/ NULL
1a) Non-Clinical Workforce									
Cluster 1 (Bands 1-4)	70 (5%)	1274	151 (10%)	80 (5%)	1323	160 (10%)	94 (6%)	1342	160 (10%)
Cluster 2 (Bands 5-7)	26 (6%)	415	24 (5%)	40 (8%)	438	24 (5%)	45 (7%)	448	29 (7%)
Cluster 3 (Bands 8a-8b)	5 (5%)	95	2 (2%)	7 (7%)	98	3 (3%)	8 (7%)	109	5 (4%)
Cluster 4 (Bands 8c - 9 & VSM)	1 (2%)	40	2 (5%)	1 (2%)	39	3 (7%)	2 (4%)	41	3 (7%)
1b) Clinical Workforce *of which Non-Medical*									
Cluster 1 (Bands 1-4 and other)	46 (4%)	1025	114 (10%)	62 (5%)	1107	112 (9%)	72 (6%)	1111	103 (8%)
Cluster 2 (Bands 5-7)	90 (4%)	2098	142 (6%)	128 (5%)	2306	162 (6%)	159 (6%)	2445	198 (7%)
Cluster 3 (Bands 8a-8b)	6 (3%)	189	13 (6%)	9 (4%)	192	13 (6%)	11 (5%)	191	17 (8%)
Cluster 4 (Bands 8c - 9 & VSM)	2 (8%)	21	1 (4%)	2 (7%)	24	1 (4%)	1 (4%)	26	0 (0%)
Cluster 5 (M&D Staff: Consultants)	6 (2%)	327	27 (8%)	9 (2%)	343	25 (7%)	11 (3%)	357	22 (6%)
Cluster 6 (M&D Non-Consultant Career Grade)	1 (1%)	111	7 (6%)	2 (2%)	110	9 (8%)	14 (4%)	269	67 (19%)
Cluster 7 (M&D: Trainee Grades)	12 (4%)	307	22 (7%)	11 (3%)	313	5 (2%)	1 (1%)	120	10 (8%)
TOTAL	**265 (4%)**	**5902**	**505 (8%)**	**351 (5%)**	**6293**	**517 (7%)**	**418 (6%)**	**6459**	**614 (8%)**

Table 2: BTHFT staffing figures over a 3-year period

Year	Number of Staff in overall workforce	Proportion of Staff in overall workforce who have declared whether they have a disability or not	Number of disabled Staff in overall workforce	Percentage of disabled Staff in overall workforce
March 2023	6672	6167 (92%) ⬆	265 ⬆	4% ⬌
March 2024	7161	6644 (93%) ⬆	351 ⬆	5% ⬆
March 2025	**7491**	**6877 (92%)** ⬇	**418** ⬆	**6%** ⬆

See Appendix 1 (at the end) for key showing the meaning of the arrows in the data tables

Table 3

Metric 2	Relative likelihood of non-disabled staff compared to Disabled staff being appointed from shortlisting across all posts.					
	Number of shortlisted applicants		Number appointed from shortlisting		Likelihood of appointment from shortlisting		The relative likelihood of non-disabled staff being appointed compared to disabled staff
	Disabled	Non-Disabled	Disabled	Non-Disabled	Disabled	Non-Disabled	
March 2023	275	4729	68	1386	25% ⬆	29% ⬆	1.19 ⬇
March 2024	558	7593	61	1177	10.9% ⬇	15.5% ⬇	1.42 ⬆
March 2025	264	2939	32	520	12.12%	17.69% ⬆	**1.46** ⬆

Nb A figure above 1:00 indicates that non-disabled staff are more likely than disabled staff to be appointed from shortlisting (1:00 = equal chances)

Table 4

Metric 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.
	Note:
	i) This metric will be based on data from a two-year rolling average of the current year and the previous year
	ii) This metric applies to capability on the grounds of performance and not ill health or disciplinary. This is different from Indicator 3 of the WRES, which measures entry into the disciplinary process.
	Data for **metric 3** has not been published as there are 10 or fewer cases (in line with guidance from the national WDES team).

Table 5

Metric 4	National NHS Staff Survey Metrics					
	For each of the following four Staff Survey Metrics, compare the responses for both Disabled and non-disabled staff.					
	Metric 4a Percentage of disabled staff compared to non-disabled staff experiencing harassment, bullying or abuse from: patients, Service users or their relatives		Metric 4b Percentage of disabled staff compared to non-disabled staff experiencing harassment, bullying or abuse from their manager		Metric 4c Percentage of disabled staff compared to non-disabled staff experiencing harassment, bullying or abuse from colleagues	
	Disabled	Non-disabled	Disabled	Non-disabled	Disabled	Non-disabled
March 2023 (2022 survey)	34.8% ⬇	27.0% ⬇	19.4% ⬆	10.7% ⬇	27.3% ⬆	17.6% ⬆
March 2024 (2023 survey)	25.8% ⬇	24.3% ⬇	14.2% ⬇	6.8% ⬇	25.9% ⬇	15% ⬇
March 2025 (2024 survey)	**26.3%** ⬆	**22.4%** ⬇	**12.3%** ⬇	**6.5%** ⬇	**22.8%** ⬇	**14.2%** ⬇

Table 6

Metric 4d	National NHS Staff Survey Metrics For each of the following four Staff Survey Metrics, compare the responses for both disabled and non-disabled staff.	
	Metric 4d 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.	
	Disabled	**Non-disabled**
March 2023 (2022 survey)	53.2% ⬆	42.3% ⬇
March 2024 (2023 survey)	53.1% ⬇	51.6% ⬆
March 2025 (2024 survey)	**57.6%** ⬆	**52.2** ⬆

Table 7

Metrics 5-7	National NHS Staff Survey Metrics For each of the following four Staff Survey Metrics, compare the responses for both disabled and non-disabled staff.					
	Metric 5 Percentage of disabled staff compared to non-disabled staff believing that the Trust provides equal opportunities for career progression or promotion		**Metric 6** 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		**Metric 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.	
	Disabled	**Non-disabled**	**Disabled**	**Non-disabled**	**Disabled**	**Non-disabled**
March 2023 (2022 survey)	55.4% ⬇	62.1% ⬆	29.8% ⬇	23.4% ⬇	33.3% ⬆	46.8% ⬆
March 2024 (2023 survey)	55.2% ⬇	62.2% ⬆	29.2% ⬇	17.9% ⬇	36% ⬆	50.2% ⬆
March 2025 (2024 survey)	**52.1** ⬇	**59.3** ⬇	**26.2%** ⬇	**17.8%** ⬆	**36.8%** ⬇	**47.8%** ⬇

Table 8

Metric 8 (Q26b)	National NHS Staff Survey Metrics Percentage of disabled staff saying that their employer has made reasonable adjustment(s) to enable them to carry out their work.
March 2023 (2022 survey)	74.2% ⬆
March 2024 (2023 survey)	76% ⬆
March 2025 (2024 survey)	**75.1%** ⬇

Metric 9	**NHS Staff Survey and the engagement of Disabled staff** 9a) compare the staff engagement scores for Disabled and non-disabled staff 9b) add evidence to the Trust's WDES Annual Report

Table 9

Metric 9a (Q's: 2a-2c, 4a, 4b, 4d, 21a, 21c, 21d)	**National NHS Staff Survey Metrics** The staff engagement score for Disabled staff, compared to non-disabled staff	
	Disabled	**Non-disabled**
March 2023 (2022 survey)	6.4 ⬆	7.1 ⬆
March 2024 (2023 survey)	6.6 ⬆	7.2 ⬆
March 2025 **(2024 survey)**	**6.5 ⬇**	**7.1 ⬇**

Table 10

Metric 9b	**a) Has your Trust taken action to facilitate the voices of Disabled staff in your organisation to be heard (Yes/No)**
	Yes
	b) Please provide at least one practical example of current action being taken in the relevant section of your WDES annual report
Example	We continue to raise the profile of disability equality by showcasing our innovative WDES innovation fund video, booklet and travelling photograph exhibition (locally, regionally and nationally) and participating in the Act as One "Connected on Ability" festival as part of Disability History Month at the end of 2024. To improve network engagement, we have appointed an Executive sponsor and developed a hybrid approach to network meetings to improve accessibility. The Enable network have a voice at key decision making meetings (People Academy and Equality & Diversity Council, chaired by our Chief Exec). We continue to roll out our ½ day face-to-face training course for managers, which includes a case study and discussion around reasonable adjustments.

Table 11

Metric 10	**Board representation metric** *For this Metric, compare the difference for Disabled and non-disabled staff.* **Percentage difference between the organisations' Board membership and its overall workforce disaggregated:** • By voting membership of the Board • By executive membership of the Board					
	Voting membership of the Board			**Executive membership of the Board**		
	Disabled	**Non-disabled**	**Not declared**	**Disabled**	**Non-disabled**	**Not declared**
March 2023	14.3% ⬆	71.4% ⬇	14.3% ⬆	0% ↔	88.9% ↔	11.1% ↔
March 2024	7.1% ⬇	64.3% ⬇	28.6% ⬆	0% ↔	83.3% ⬇	16.7% ⬆
March 2025	**0% ⬇**	76.92% ⬆	**23.08% ⬇**	**11.11% ⬆**	77.78% ⬇	11.11% ⬇

Summary of WDES data findings

Overview of findings and Improvement: Although some of these area's still require action, there have also been some definite improvements in our WDES data this year:

- Increase in overall representation of disabled staff up 1% to 6%:
    - 1% increase for non-clinical bands 1-4 (now 6%)
    - 2% increase for non-clinical bands 8C-9 &VSM (now 4%)
    - 1% increase for each clinical cluster from bands 1 through to 8b

- An increase in the proportion of disabled applicants being shortlisted. However, the increase for non-disabled applicants has been higher, therefore this has very slightly increased the likelihood figure this time with non-disabled applicants now being 1.46 times more likely to be appointed from shortlisting.

- Improvements for disabled staff in relation to harassment & bullying from colleagues and from their line manager. Disabled staff do still report a worse experience than non-disabled staff. However, there has been a 4.5% increase in disabled staff reporting issues (and continues to be better than for non-disabled staff)

- 4% reduction in disabled staff feeling pressure to attend work when unwell (but still higher than for non-disabled staff).

- 0.8% increase in disabled staff feeling the organisation values their work, but still 11% lower for disabled staff.

- 0.9% reduction in disabled staff feeling the organisation has provided reasonable adjustments.

- A slight reduction in staff engagement for both disabled and non-disabled staff

- Whilst disabled representation of voting board members has reduced slightly, this has increased for Executive Board members to 11.11%.

Areas for Further Action: Despite some significant positives in this years' data, there is room for improvement on one or two key areas for the WDES which we propose to focus on this year, and some of this aligns to the WRES:

- Improving disability declaration rates (confidence to declare) from 6%, ensuring engagement with disabled staff remains a priority and setting targets to ensure greater focus, accounatability and monitoring of progress.

- Further focus on fair and inclusive approaches to recruitment & selection, including innovative positive action approaches.

- Improving the provision of reasonable adjustments (support for managers and staff in developing open and compassionate relationships)

- Improve staff experience in relation to harassment & bullying, including confidence to report it and nip issues in the bud at an early stage

- Equity in career development opportunities and developing confidence that approaches are fair and equitable.

- Refresh of the Disability Equality & Disability Leave policy, including comms and engagement

We know we are on a journey in raising the profile of disability equality across the Trust. We want to ensure our recruitment & selection processes are inclusive and our staff and managers feel supported

in understanding the needs of disabled colleagues and the need to consider reasonable adjustments to ensure colleagues can achieve their potential and feel equally valued in the workplace.

We will continue to develop and roll out the ad hoc training provision for teams and departments around civility in the workplace, along with our wider efforts in raising the profile of equality, diversity & inclusion in the Trust to improve the experience for all our diverse staff.

Appendix 1:

Key for symbols used in the data tables:

⬆ (green)	*A higher % or score is better and this has shown an increase this year*	⬆ (red)	*A lower % or score is better and this has shown an increase*
⬇ (green)	*A lower % or score is better and this has shown a decrease this year*	⬌ (blue)	*The score has stayed the same from the previous year*
⬇ (red)	*A higher % or score is better and this has shown a decrease this year*		

Appendix 2

Workforce Disability Equality Standard (WDES): The 10 Metrics

Metric 1	Percentage of disabled staff in each of the Agenda for Change bands 1-9, medical & dental subgroups and very senior managers (VSM), including executive board members compared with the percentage of staff in the overall workforce.
Metric 2	Relative likelihood of disabled staff being appointed from shortlisting across all posts.
Metric 3	Relative likelihood of disabled staff entering the formal capability procedure (performance and not-ill health). allowing
	National Staff Survey Responses (Metrics 4-9 only)
Metric 4a	Q13a: Percentage of disabled staff experiencing harassment, bullying or abuse from patients, relatives or the public. Q13b: Percentage of disabled staff experiencing harassment, bullying or abuse from their manager. Q13c: Percentage of disabled staff experiencing harassment, bullying or abuse from colleagues.
Metric 4b	(Q13a) 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.
Metric 5	Q14: Percentage of disabled staff who believe the Trust provides equal opportunities for career progression or promotion.
Metric 6	Q11e: Percentage of disabled staff who say they have felt pressure from their manager to come to work, despite not feeling well enough to perform their duties.
Metric 7	Q5f: Percentage of disabled staff saying they are satisfied with the extent to which their organisation values their work.
Metric 8	Percentage of disabled staff saying that their employer has made adequate adjustment(s) to enable them to carry out their work.
Metric 9	Comparison of the engagement scores for disabled and non-disabled staff.
Metric 10	Comparison of disabled and non-disabled members of the board (voting membership/ executive membership) against the overall workforce.