

Workforce Disability Equality Standard Data Submission (as at 31st March 2026)

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 2024			31st March 2025			31st March 2026		
	Disabled	Non-Disabled	Disability Unknkown/ NULL	Disabled	Non-Disabled	Disability Unknkown/ NULL	Disabled	Non-Disabled	Disability Unknkown/ NULL
Non-Clinical Workforce									
Cluster 1 (Bands 1-4)	80 (5%)	1323	160 (10%)	94 (6%)	1342	160 (10%)	118 (7%)	1339	149 (9%)
Cluster 2 (Bands 5-7)	40 (8%)	438	24 (5%)	45 (7%)	448	29 (7%)	44 (8%)	463	28 (5%)
Cluster 3 (Bands 8a-8b)	7 (7%)	98	3 (3%)	8 (7%)	109	5 (4%)	9 (7%)	111	3 (2%)
Cluster 4 (Bands 8c - 9 & VSM)	1 (2%)	39	3 (7%)	2 (4%)	41	3 (7%)	2 (2%)	42	3 (7%)
1b) Clinical Workforce (Non-Medical)									
Cluster 1 (Bands 1-4 and other)	62 (5%)	1107	112 (9%)	72 (6%)	1111	103 (8%)	73 (6%)	1093	97 (8%)
Cluster 2 (Bands 5-7)	128 (5%)	2306	162 (6%)	159 (6%)	2445	198 (7%)	186 (7%)	2494	179 (6%)
Cluster 3 (Bands 8a-8b)	9 (4%)	192	13 (6%)	11 (5%)	191	17 (8%)	13 (6%)	198	16 (7%)
Cluster 4 (Bands 8c - 9 & VSM)	2 (7%)	24	1 (4%)	1 (4%)	26	0 (0%)	2 (8%)	23	0
Medical & Dental Workforce									
Cluster 5 (M&D Staff: Consultants)	9 (2%)	343	25 (7%)	11 (3%)	357	22 (6%)	12 (3%)	387	18 (4%)
Cluster 6 (M&D Non-Consultant Career Grade)	2 (2%)	110	9 (8%)	14 (4%)	269	67 (19%)	1 (1%)	124	7 (5%)
Cluster 7 (M&D: Trainee Grades)	11 (3%)	313	5 (2%)	1 (1%)	120	10 (8%)	25 (7%)	319	29 (8%)
TOTAL	351 (5%)	6293	517 (7%)	418 (6%)	6459	614 (8%)	484 (6.4%)	6593	529 (7%)

Nb: Red squares show an decrease for disability declaration, green squares show an increase and blue has stayed the same as last year

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 2024	7161	6644 (93%) ↑	351 ↑	4.9% ↑
March 2025	7491	6877 (92%) ↓	418 ↑	5.6% ↑
March 2026	7606	7077 (93%) ↑	484 ↑	6.4% ↑

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 2024	558	7593	61	1177	10.9% ↓	15.5% ↓	1.4 ↑
March 2025	264	2939	32	520	12.1% ↑	17.7% ↑	1.5 ↑
March 2026	298	3700	40	598	13.4% ↑	16.6% ↓	1.2 ↓

*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 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% ↓
March 2026 (2025 survey)	28.4% ↑	20.8% ↓	15.8% ↑	6.9% ↑	23.8% ↑	13.6% ↓

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.	
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 2024 (2023 survey)	53.1% 	51.6% 
March 2025 (2024 survey)	57.6 	52.2% 
March 2026 (2025 survey)	54.6% 	50.7% 

Table 7

Metric 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 2024 (2023 survey)	55.2% ↓	62.2% ↑	29.2% ↓	17.9% ↓	36% ↑	50.2% ↑
March 2026 (2024 survey)	52.1% ↓	59.3% ↓	26.2% ↓	17.8% ↓	36.8% ↑	47.8% ↑
March 2026 (2025 survey)	51.1% ↓	55.9% ↓	27.7% ↓	19.5% ↓	34.3% ↓	48.8% ↑

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 2024 (2023 survey)	76% 
March 2025 (2024 survey)	75.1% 
March 2026 (2025 survey)	73.4% 

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 2024 (2023 survey)	6.6 	7.2 
March 2025 (2024 survey)	6.5 	7.1 
March 2025 (2024 survey)	6.4 	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 and booklet, with colleagues attending regular events on the main concourse and other venues to increase awareness of our Enable Network. In October 2025 we held our first ever Equality, Diversity & Inclusion Conference "Belonging at BTHFT: Thriving on Inclusion" at Cedar Court Hotel in Bradford, where colleagues had the opportunity to engage in meaningful discussion and activities, and listen to a range of speakers, including a Q&A style panel event where colleagues from our 4 staff equality networks shared some of their lived experience and how they achieve a sense of belonging at BTHFT. The event was really well received, with lots of positive feedback and colleagues felt this made a positive statement on how the Trust values our diverse workforce. The Organisational Development and Equality, Diversity & Inclusion teams continue to work hard in ensuring staff engagement is a high priority. We recently held a series of engagement events across the organisation, including discussions

	with colleagues from our Enable network to understand their experiences in response to the recent staff survey results (with a refreshed action plan in development). There has also been engagement with diverse colleagues to understand our EDI priorities with a view to co-developing our refreshed EDI strategic objectives for the next 3 years. With the recent appointment of a new Chair for the Enable Network and the development of a comprehensive work plan, aligned to planned EDI activity we are keen to ensure the next 12-months sees a marked improvement in the experience of disabled colleagues in the workplace. To improve network engagement, our network chair is working with the Enable Executive sponsor and a hybrid approach to network meetings has improved accessibility. The Enable network have a voice at key decision-making meetings (People Academy and Equality & Diversity Council, chaired by our Chief Exec). We have continued to roll out our ½ day face-to-face training course for managers, which includes a case study and discussion around reasonable adjustments (this training is currently being reviewed and refreshed to ensure it remains up to date). We are currently developing a series of bitesize sessions for line managers in collaboration with our Occupational Health Department, which will include a session focussed on reasonable adjustments and another focussed on Wellness Action plans.
--	---

Table 11

Metric 10	Board representation metric <i>For this Metric, compare the difference for Disabled and non-disabled staff.</i> 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%	76.9%	23.1%	11.1%	77.8%	11.1%

Summary of WRES Findings and areas of further focus for 2026/2027

Analysis: Although we are not outliers (based on national benchmarking data), there has been a decline in our WDES data across the board this year, with the exception of experiences in Recruitment & Selection, likelihood to enter the formal capability process and representation at Executive level. In addition, if we are to meet our target of 10% representation by 2027, we need some significant focus over the next 12 months to improve the experiences of our disabled colleagues.

Summary of WDES data for 2025/2026:

- ↑ **Metric 1:** Overall representation of disabled staff has increased by 0.8% to 6.4%
 - All banding groups are above the Trustwide average declaration rate (above 6.4%), with the exception of non-clinical Bands 8c-9 & VSM which are significantly below at 2%.
 - Medical & Dental Consultants continue below the Trust average (3%)
 - Non-Consultant career grade doctors have seen a 3% decrease to 1%
 - Exec Board level representation has increased to 11.1%
- ↑ **Metric 2:** An increase in the number and proportion of disabled applicants being shortlisted and appointed has increased their likelihood of being appointed from shortlisting (with non-disabled staff being 1.2 times more likely and moving closer to equity).
- ↓ **Metric 3:** An improvement in the likelihood of disabled staff entering the formal capability process (performance). Low numbers, but now 1.1 times more likely which is close to equity.
- ↑ **Metrics 4a, 4b, 4c & 4d:** An increase for disabled staff in relation to harassment & bullying from colleagues, line managers and patients/ members of the public, and with disabled staff reporting a worse experience than non-disabled staff, including a reduction in the likelihood that staff will report this (this metric continues to be worse for non-disabled staff - now 54.6% likelihood for disabled staff to report issues of harassment & bullying compared to 50.7% for non-disabled staff. ↓
- ↓ **Metric 5:** a 1% reduction in disabled staff believing the Trust provides equal opportunities in career progression or promotion (now 51.1%), and still lower than for non-disabled staff (55.9%).
- ↑ **Metric 6:** a 1.5% increase in disabled staff feeling pressured to attend work when unwell (now 27.7%), and much higher than for non-disabled staff (19.5%), but on a par with the national average (27.2%).
- ↓ **Metric 7:** A 2.5% decrease in disabled staff feeling the organisation values their work (now 34.3%) and lower than for non-disabled staff (48.8%), but slightly better than the national average (32.1%).
- ↓ **Metric 8:** A 1.7% reduction in disabled staff feeling the organisation has provided reasonable adjustments (to 73.4%), on a par with the national average (73.7%).
- ↓ **Metric 9a:** A slight reduction in staff engagement for both disabled (score of 6.4) and non-disabled staff (score of 7.1), but slightly higher than the national average (score of 6.3)
- ↓ **Metric 10:** Whilst disabled representation of voting board members has reduced slightly, this has increased for Executive Board members to 11.11%. ↑

Areas for Further Focus on WDES 2026/2027: Despite some significant positives in this years' data (relating to representation, inclusive recruitment & selection processes and entry into the formal capability (performance) process, there are a number of areas where we have seen a decline in progress/ performance (particularly around staff experience metrics). Subsequently, there are a number of areas where we propose to provide some dedicated focus on this year, and some of this aligns to the WRES:

- Increase representation of disabled staff, including focus on positive action in recruitment & selection, succession planning/ talent management, equity in career development opportunities and developing confidence that approaches are fair.

- Work collaboratively with our Enable staff network to raise the profile of disability equality and to celebrate disability, to improve the overall experience of our disabled staff and to ensure colleagues understand why and how they should share their personal diversity information with the Trust, bringing some specific focus to senior management level roles.
- Empowering and developing line managers on their roles and responsibilities around equality, diversity & inclusion and the provision of reasonable adjustments, encouraging managers to have open and compassionate relationships with their teams by raising awareness.
- Improve staff experience in relation to harassment & bullying, including confidence to report it and nip issues in the bud informally (where possible) and at an early stage.

We are currently reviewing and refreshing our Disability Equality & Disability Leave policy, including comms and engagement, with focus on ensuring this is more accessible and easier to navigate for both managers and staff.

We are working with colleagues across the People Directorate to develop a series of bitesize training sessions empowering and developing line managers on their roles and responsibilities around equality, diversity & inclusion, with particular focus on compassionate leadership approaches, and everyone's role in developing cultures of dignity & respect. This will be aligned to the launch of the refreshed Respect, Civility & Resolution policy and the new Sexual Misconduct at Work Policy.

Our Enable Staff Network has recently appointed a new chair and have developed an ambitious work plan, aligned to our wider ambitions around disability equality. The EDI team will work closely with the Enable Network to raise the profile of disability equality and address some of the disparities identified in the WDES.

As part of the newly launched People Strategy (2025-2030) we have identified targets for declaration of 10% by 2027 and 15% by 2030, and there is renewed focus on improving declaration rates in our 2025/2026 WDES action plan.

Following extensive engagement with across both the workforce and our diverse patients and communities, we will Launch our EDI Plan for the next 3-years, including a refreshed set of EDI strategic objectives. We will continue to engage with CSUs/ Departments to develop their own EDI action plans with measurable actions (based on CSU/ dept level diversity data and aligned to our refreshed EDI objectives), further embedding everyone's role in advancing and raising the profile of EDI, which in turn may have a positive impact on the WRES, and particularly to staff experiences.

Appendix 1:

Key for symbols used in the data tables:

	<i>A higher % or score is better and this has shown an increase this year</i>		<i>A lower % or score is better and this has shown an increase</i>
	<i>A lower % or score is better and this has shown a decrease this year</i>		<i>The score has stayed the same from the previous year</i>
	<i>A higher % or score is better and this has shown a decrease this year</i>		

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.