



Workforce Disability Equality Standard (WDES) 2018/2019

Name of organization

East Midlands Ambulance Service NHS Trust

Date of report (Month/Year)

August 2019

Name and title of Board lead for the Workforce Disability Equality Standard

Kerry Gulliver, Director Human Resources and Organisational Development

Name and contact details of lead manager compiling this report

Paul Fitzgerald, Equality and Diversity Manager paul.fitzgerald@emas.nhs.uk

Does your Organisation participate in any programmes or initiatives that are focused on disability equality and inclusion?

EMAS Provide the following:

- Trust wide induction programme
- Equality Everyday training for new and existing staff
- Professional standards training

Name and contact details of commissioner(s) this report will be sent to:

Derby & Derbyshire CCG
Cardinal Square
10 Nottingham Road
Derby
DE1 3QT

Date of Board meeting at which organisation's WDES Metrics data and action plan were, or will be, ratified:

Presented to Board on 3 September as part of a development session.

Total number of staff employed within this organization on 31 March 2019:

3982 Headcount

Overall percentage of staff in the following groups:

% Disabled staff – 2.5%

% Non-disabled staff – 17.5%

% Unknown/Null – 35.6%

% Other – 0%

% Prefer not to say – 44.4%

Did your organisation undertake the NHS Staff Survey in the past year?

A full Staff Survey was undertaken by EMAS.

Give the total number and % of responses to the NHS Staff Survey in your organisation: e.g. survey sent to 1000 staff – 400 (40%) returned.

3276 Staff Surveys were sent out
1823 Staff Surveys were returned

Give the total number and % of Disabled staff responses to the NHS Staff Survey in your organisation: e.g. 80 Disabled staff responded – 20% of survey respondents.

404 – 22.16%

Do your staff have access to the ESR self reporting portal?

Yes

Metric 1 – Workforce representation. Percentage of staff in each AfC Pay Band compared with the percentage of staff in the overall workforce

Non-Clinical staff by Pay Band

| | Disabled | | Non-Disabled | | Unknown/Null | | Overall Staff |
|-------------------------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|
| | Total | % | Total | % | Total | % | Total |
| | Verified data | Verified data | Verified data | Verified data | Verified data | Verified data | Verified data |
| 1a) Non-Clinical Staff | | | | | | | |
| Bands 1 | 4 | 6% | 10 | 16% | 48 | 77% | 62 |
| Bands 2 | 6 | 2% | 24 | 10% | 221 | 88% | 251 |

| | | | | | | | |
|----------|----|----|----|-----|-----|------|-----|
| Bands 3 | 10 | 4% | 40 | 17% | 183 | 79% | 233 |
| Bands 4 | 4 | 3% | 14 | 10% | 125 | 87% | 143 |
| Bands 5 | 8 | 5% | 25 | 14% | 141 | 81% | 174 |
| Bands 6 | 3 | 2% | 19 | 14% | 113 | 84% | 135 |
| Bands 7 | 2 | 3% | 14 | 24% | 42 | 72% | 58 |
| Bands 8a | 2 | 6% | 5 | 14% | 29 | 81% | 36 |
| Bands 8b | 0 | 0% | 1 | 4% | 22 | 96% | 23 |
| Bands 8c | 0 | 0% | 3 | 19% | 13 | 81% | 16 |
| Bands 8d | 0 | 0% | 0 | 0% | 9 | 100% | 9 |
| Bands 9 | 0 | 0% | 0 | 0% | 2 | 100% | 2 |
| VSM | 0 | 0% | 1 | 9% | 10 | 91% | 11 |
| Other | 0 | 0% | 0 | 0% | 0 | 0% | 0 |

Non-Clinical staff broken down into AfC Pay Band 'Clusters'

| Non-Clinical Staff (Clusters) | Disabled | | Non-Disabled | | Unknown | | Overall Staff |
|-------------------------------|----------|----|--------------|-----|---------|-----|---------------|
| | Total | % | Total | % | Total | % | Total |
| Bands 1 - 4 | 24 | 3% | 88 | 13% | 577 | 84% | 689 |
| Band 5 - 7 | 13 | 4% | 58 | 16% | 296 | 81% | 367 |
| Bands 8a - 8b | 2 | 3% | 6 | 10% | 51 | 86% | 59 |
| Bands 8c - 9 & VSM | 0 | 0% | 4 | 11% | 34 | 89% | 38 |

Clinical Staff by Pay Band

| | Disabled | | Non-Disabled | | Unknown/Null | | Overall Staff |
|---------------------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|
| | Total | % | Total | % | Total | % | Total |
| | Verified data | Verified data | Verified data | Verified data | Verified data | Verified data | Verified data |
| 1b) Clinical Staff | | | | | | | |
| Bands 1 | 0 | 0% | 0 | 0% | 0 | 0% | 0 |
| Bands 2 | 0 | 0% | 0 | 0% | 1 | 100% | 1 |
| Bands 3 | 11 | 3% | 67 | 16% | 346 | 82% | 424 |
| Bands 4 | 26 | 2% | 222 | 20% | 865 | 78% | 1113 |
| Bands 5 | 8 | 4% | 28 | 15% | 153 | 81% | 189 |
| Bands 6 | 15 | 1% | 204 | 19% | 834 | 79% | 1053 |
| Bands 7 | 0 | 0% | 6 | 19% | 25 | 81% | 31 |
| Bands 8a | 0 | 0% | 5 | 31% | 11 | 69% | 16 |
| Bands 8b | 0 | 0% | 0 | 0% | 0 | 0% | 0 |
| Bands 8c | 0 | 0% | 0 | 0% | 0 | 0% | 0 |
| Bands 8d | 0 | 0% | 0 | 0% | 0 | 0% | 0 |
| Bands 9 | 0 | 0% | 0 | 0% | 0 | 0% | 0 |
| VSM | 0 | 0% | 0 | 0% | 0 | 0% | 0 |

| | | | | | | | |
|--|---|----|---|-----|---|------|---|
| Medical & Dental Staff, Consultants | 0 | 0% | 0 | 0% | 2 | 100% | 2 |
| Medical & Dental Staff, Non-Consultants career grade | 0 | 0% | 2 | 33% | 4 | 67% | 6 |

Clinical staff broken down into AfC Pay Band 'Clusters'

| Clinical Staff (Clusters) | Disabled | | Non-Disabled | | Unknown | | Overall Staff |
|--|----------|----|--------------|-----|---------|------|---------------|
| | Total | % | Total | % | Total | % | Total |
| Bands 1 - 4 | 37 | 2% | 289 | 19% | 1212 | 79% | 1538 |
| Band 5 - 7 | 23 | 2% | 238 | 19% | 1012 | 79% | 1273 |
| Bands 8a - 8b | 0 | 0% | 5 | 31% | 11 | 69% | 16 |
| Bands 8c - 9 & VSM | 0 | 0% | 0 | 0% | 0 | 0% | 0 |
| Medical & Dental Staff, Consultants | 0 | 0% | 0 | 0% | 2 | 100% | 2 |
| Medical & Dental Staff, Non-Consultants career grade | 0 | 0% | 2 | 33% | 4 | 67% | 6 |

Please describe any challenges that your organisation has experienced in reporting data for this Metric:

Splitting the workforce into clinical and non-clinical roles requires manual checking of individual roles as not all staff align to either one or the other category.

Have any steps been taken in the last 12 months within your organisation to improve the declaration rate for disability status on ESR?

We have published articles in Enews, our internal online weekly newsletter for colleagues and volunteers, encouraging staff to update their personal Electronic Staff Records.

Please share any examples of interventions that have increased declaration rates at your organisation:

The implementation of our Disability Passport initiative encourages staff members to open up about issues surrounding disability and other health conditions, for the mutual benefit of the employer and employee. This record is used to provide a personalised approach to documenting and monitoring an individual's disability or health condition, that has a substantial and long term effect on their ability to undertake normal daily activities.

The passport is used throughout the screening and assessment stage, when an individual discloses a disability, to document a shared agreement of what reasonable adjustments are required.

Metric 2 – Shortlisting

Relative likelihood of disabled staff compared to non-disabled staff being appointed from shortlisting across all posts

| | Disabled | Non-Disabled |
|------------------------------------|----------|--------------|
| Number of shortlisted applicants | 238 | 3302 |
| Number appointed from shortlisting | 3 | 41 |

likelihood of disabled staff being appointed over non-disabled staff: 0.99

This figure shows that disabled staff are more likely to be appointed from shortlisting over non-disabled staff.

Please describe any challenges that your organisation has experienced in reporting data for this Metric:

- Applicants are required to complete the equality monitoring questions at the application stage for a role. Each question has the option of “I do not wish to disclose”. The recruitment tool is a national tool that EMAS has no local influence over in terms of questions.
- Not all shortlisted applicants attend interview (information that is not always reported) that impacts upon the data.

Has your organisation signed up to the Disability Confident Scheme?

East Midlands Ambulance Service have signed up to the Disability Confident Scheme and we currently hold a Level 2 accreditation.

Does your organisation use a Guaranteed Interview Scheme?

The Guaranteed Interview Scheme (GIS) allows anyone with a disclosed disability at the application stage to be considered for a guaranteed invitation to interview. You will be guaranteed an interview if you are able to evidence a disability and meet the essential eligibility requirements.

Metric 3 – Capability

Relative likelihood of disabled staff compared to non-disabled staff entering the formal capability process, as measured by entry into the formal capability procedure

| | Disabled | Non-Disabled |
|--|----------|--------------|
|--|----------|--------------|

| | | |
|--|----|-----|
| Number of staff in workforce | 99 | 690 |
| Number of staff entering the formal capability process | 0 | 14 |

Likelihood of disabled staff entering the formal capability process over non-disabled staff: 0

The relative likelihood is 0 as no disabled staff members have entered the formal capability process. This indicates that non-disabled staff are more likely to enter this process over disabled staff members.

Did your organisation submit data for Metric 3 this year?

We have submitted data for Metric 3 this reporting year. The difficulty is the number of staff members who have not declared themselves as either disabled or non-disabled. These low rates of disclosure could have an impact on the overall result for this indicator.

Is capability on the grounds of ill health and capability on the grounds of performance managed by different policies in your organisation?

Capability on the grounds of ill health and performance are managed by separate policies. These are:

- Ill Health – Attendance Policy
- Capability – Capability Policy

Metric 4 – Harassment, bullying and abuse

Percentage of disabled staff compared to non-disabled staff experiencing harassment, bullying or abuse from service users, members of the public, managers or other colleagues

| Percentage of staff experiencing harassment, bullying or abuse from: | Disabled | | Non-Disabled | |
|--|-----------------------|------|-----------------------|------|
| | Number of respondents | % | Number of respondents | % |
| Patients/service users and other members of the public | 404 | 53.5 | 1363 | 42.2 |
| Managers | 401 | 28.4 | 1358 | 13.8 |
| Other colleagues | 404 | 24.8 | 1358 | 14.6 |

The data shows that a higher percentage of disabled staff experience harassment, bullying or abuse from service users, members of the public, managers or other colleagues compared to 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 staff members: 40.9%
Non-disabled staff members: 43.1%

Has your organisation compared Staff Survey results against other datasets that may be held, e.g. bullying and harassment advisors, Freedom to Speak Up guardians, grievances etc.

We can utilise the results from other sources such as:

- Cultural Audit
- Freedom to Speak Up Data

Actions taken to reduce harassment, bullying and abuse in relation to disabled staff:

Our Equality Lead provides 'Professional Behaviours in the Workplace' training to managers throughout the Trust, that includes the topics of harassment, bullying and abuse.

'Equality Every Day' training for new and existing staff, to both clinical and non-clinical roles. Equality Every Day is delivered to new clinical staff members as part of their initial education and all roles are required to undertake statutory and mandatory online learning courses that includes a section on what constitutes bullying and harassment in the workplace.

All training and updates provided are general principles and not currently aimed at specific protected characteristics.

Metric 5 – Career promotion and progression

Percentage of disabled staff compared to non-disabled staff believing that the Trust provides equal opportunities for career progression or promotion

Disabled staff members: 63.6%
Non-Disabled staff members: 77.8%

Does your organisation provide any targeted career development opportunities for Disabled staff?

There are currently no targeted career development opportunities for our disabled workforce, however, equality of opportunity is recognized, understood and implemented via internal and external recruitment processes.

Metric 6 – Presenteeism

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

Disabled staff members: 48.3%
Non-disabled staff members: 35.3%

The figures show that a higher percentage of disabled staff have felt pressure from their manager to come to work, despite not feeling well enough to perform their duties, compared to non-disabled staff.

Does your organisation provide any targeted actions to reduce presenteeism i.e. feeling pressured to come to work when not feeling well?

Staff health and wellbeing interventions include:

- Occupational Health assessments
- Employee assistance programme
- Specialist therapies
- Staff support programme
- Alternative duties
- Disability passport
- Flexible working arrangements
- Reasonable adjustments

Metric 7 – Staff satisfaction

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 staff members: 25%
Non-disabled staff members: 35.5%

A higher percentage of non-disabled staff members are satisfied with the extent to which their organisation values their work, compared to disabled staff members.

Does your organisation provide any targeted actions to increase the workplace satisfaction of Disabled staff?

We have introduced the following initiatives:

- Disability guidance for managers
- Disability Passport
- Dying to Work Policy

Metric 8 – Reasonable adjustments

Percentage of disabled staff saying that their employer has made adequate adjustment (s) to enable them to carry out their work

Disabled respondents: 57.2%

Does your organisation have a reasonable adjustment policy?

The Reasonable Adjustment guide is embedded within our Equal Opportunity Policy.

Are costs for reasonable adjustments met through centralised or local budgets?

Costs for reasonable adjustments are met through localised budgets.

Has your organisation taken actions to improve the reasonable adjustments process?

We provide guidance to managers throughout the Trust, continuously review our policies and procedures and provide various training courses that highlight our Reasonable Adjustments guide. The implementation of our Disability Passport initiative also provides guidance for managers and details of what reasonable adjustments specific staff members require.

Matric 9 – Disabled staff engagement

The staff engagement score for disabled staff, compared to non-disabled staff and the overall engagement score for the organisation

| | |
|-----------------------------|-----|
| Disabled staff members: | 5.8 |
| Non-disabled staff members: | 6.4 |
| Organisation score: | 6.2 |

Has your Trust taken action to facilitate the voices of disabled staff in your organisation to be heard?

We have identified development of a staff network as a priority in 2019/20

Does your organisation have a Disabled Staff Network (or similar)?

We are currently in the process of forming a Disability Staff Network and we are aiming to develop this in 2019/20.

Metric 10 – Board representation

Percentage difference between the organisation’s Board voting membership and its overall workforce

| | Disabled | Non-Disabled | Unknown |
|--------------------------|-----------------|---------------------|----------------|
| Total Board members | 0 | 1 | 12 |
| Voting Board members | 0 | 1 | 10 |
| Non-voting Board members | 0 | 0 | 2 |
| Number of staff overall | 99 (2%) | 690 (17%) | 3199 (80%) |

Please describe any challenges that your organisation has experienced in collecting and reporting data for this Metric:

The number of disabled respondents for the Trust is considerably higher in the Staff Survey, compared to the rate of disability disclosure within our Electronic Staff Records.

Does your Board have a champion of disability equality?

Mrs. Vijay Sharma
Non-Executive Director

WDES Action Plan 2019/2020

The priority actions are shown in the table below:

| EMAS Actions | Trust Lead | Timescale |
|---|-----------------------|------------|
| Continue to develop partnership with disability business forum to improve working practices for those with a disability. | Assistant Director WP | Complete |
| Develop and establish a staff disability and carers network. | Assistant Director WP | 30/11/2019 |
| Promote the importance of and improve the rate of disclosure of disability protected characteristics. | Assistant Director WP | 31/03/2020 |
| Providing opportunities for Trust Board and senior leadership team engagement and involvement with the networks. | Assistant Director WP | 31/12/2019 |
| Engaging the networks in recruitment and selection processes/panels. | Assistant Director WP | 31/12/2019 |
| Engaging the networks in supporting equality impact assessment processes. | Assistant Director WP | 31/12/2019 |
| Promoting and encouraging staff who identify with a protected characteristic to engage in leadership development opportunities supporting career progression. | Assistant Director WP | 31/12/2019 |
| Raise awareness across the Trust of the Accessible Information Standard, providing advice and guidance on how to implement the AIS. | Assistant Director WP | 31/03/2020 |
| Develop the Trust Action Plan to support implementation and compliance with the AIS | Assistant Director WP | 31/03/2020 |
| Conduct a gap analysis against the AIS to identify areas of non-compliance. | Assistant Director WP | 31/03/2020 |
| Ensure AIS equality data monitoring of service users who require accessible information; and requests for information in alternative formats. | Assistant Director WP | 31/03/2020 |