
















## Appendix 1 - Workforce Disability Equality Scheme: Our data as at 31<sup>st</sup> March 2020

Metric		2019	2020	Comments	
<b>Metric1</b> -Percentage of staff in each of the AfC bands 1 - 9 or medical and dental subgroups and VSM (including executive board members) compared with the percentage of staff in the overall workforce.	Workforce headcount	5110	5361	Workforce headcount has steadily increased since 2018	
	Overall % Disability	2%	3% 	This has positively increased but YAS remains underrepresented compared to the community (24%). The National Staff Survey states the number of staff saying they have a disability as 21.8%	
	Disabled headcount	113	136 	The increase in the overall workforce has meant an increase in disabled staff, but more non-disabled staff have also been appointed.	
	Non-disabled headcount	5001	5217	Workforce headcount has steadily increased since 2018	
	Not stated	6	8		
<b>Metric 2</b> - Relative likelihood of Non-Disabled staff being appointed from shortlisting compared to that of Disabled staff being appointed from shortlisting across all posts <i>(A figure below 1.00 indicates that disabled staff are more likely than non-disabled staff to be appointed from shortlisting)</i>		0.14	0.21 	The Trust is a Level 2 Employer for the Disability Confident Scheme and therefore disabled staff do get shortlisted but the number being appointed has deteriorated slightly.	
<b>Metric 3</b> - Relative likelihood of disabled staff entering the formal capability process, compared to that of Non-disabled staff, as measured by entry into a formal capability procedure <i>(A figure above 1.00 indicates that disabled staff are more likely than non-disabled staff to enter the formal capability process)</i>		0.00	0.00 	This year the Employee Relations team introduced a gate review process to ensure all cases should be progressed to a formal process	
<b>Metric 4</b> - Percentage of staff experiencing harassment, bullying or abuse from patients, relatives or the public in last 12	% of staff experiencing harassment, bullying or abuse from patients/service users, their relatives or other members of the public in the last 12 months	<b>Disabled</b>	47.5%	52.3% 	This could have increased due to the start of the Say Yes to Respect Campaign with staff recognising that behaviour they previously tolerated is not acceptable.
		<b>Non-Disabled</b>	37%	40.1%	
	% of staff experiencing	<b>Disabled</b>	20.2%	16.2% 	Positive effect from Say Yes to Respect Campaign

Metric			2019	2020	Comments
months.	harassment, bullying or abuse from managers in the last 12 months	<b>Non-Disabled</b>	11.7%	9.1%	
	% of staff experiencing harassment, bullying or abuse from other colleagues in the last 12 months	<b>Disabled</b>	29.2%	25.9% 	Positive effect from Say Yes to Respect Campaign
		<b>Non-Disabled</b>	14.7%	14.4%	
	% of staff saying that the last time they experienced harassment, bullying or abuse at work, they or a colleague reported it in the last 12 months	<b>Disabled</b>	37.0%	44.4% 	Positive effect from Say Yes to Respect Campaign
		<b>Non-Disabled</b>	40.5%	39.2%	Reduced by 0.7% not statistically significant but need to encourage reporting
<b>Metric 5</b> - Percentage of Disabled staff compared to non-disabled staff believing that the Trust provides equal opportunities for career progression or promotion.	<b>Disabled</b>	59.6%	60.9% 		
	<b>Non-Disabled</b>	76.7%	73.3%	This has reduced slightly but not statistically significant	
<b>Metric 6</b> - 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.	<b>Disabled</b>	44.9%	36.1% 	Although this has improved there remains an issue regarding presenteeism.	
	<b>Non-Disabled</b>	28.0%	23.6%		
<b>Metric 7</b> - Percentage of Disabled staff compared to non-disabled staff saying that they are satisfied with the extent to which their organisation values their work.	<b>Disabled</b>	26.7%	29.0% 	Although this has improved, staff engagement remains as a key area for the Trust	
	<b>Non-Disabled</b>	36.3%	38.9%		

Metric		2019	2020	Comments
<b>Metric 8</b> - Percentage of Disabled staff saying that their employer has made adequate adjustment(s) to enable them to carry out their work.		62.2%	67.7% 	A Task and Finish Group on Reasonable Adjustments has commenced with guidance being developed for managers
<b>Metric 9a</b> - The staff engagement score for Disabled staff, compared to non-disabled staff and the overall engagement score for the organisation.	<b>Disabled</b>	5.8	6.2 	This has improved significantly for the Trust as a whole
	<b>Non-Disabled</b>	6.6	6.8	
<b>Metric 9b</b> - Has your Trust taken action to facilitate the voices of Disabled staff in your organisation to be heard? (yes) or (no)		Yes	Yes 	Yes. Diversity & Inclusion Steering Group, Disability Support Network, Joint Steering Group, Cultural Ambassadors, Employee Voice Network
<b>Metric 10</b> - Percentage difference between the organisations' board membership and its overall workforce disaggregated:	<b>Disabled</b>	8%	8% 	The percentage of disabled staff on the Trust Board is higher than that declared by staff
	<b>Non-Disabled</b>	92%	92%	