

Appendix 1 - Workforce Disability Equality Standard: Our data as at 31st March 2021

Metric			2019	2020	2021	Comments
Metric 1 - 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	5736	Workforce headcount has steadily increased since 2019
	Overall % Disability		2%	3% ↑	3.3% ↑	This has positively increased but YAS remains underrepresented compared to the community (24%). The National Staff Survey also states the number of staff who live with a disability or a long-term health condition is 24%, which indicates the Electronic Staff Record is not as accurate as it should be.
	Disabled headcount		113	136 ↑	188 ↑	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	5489	Workforce headcount has steadily increased since 2019
	Not stated		6	8	59	It is concerning that more staff have been unwilling to share this information with the Trust. The launch of a Diversity Census is planned to address this potential concern that staff may have and encourage them to share this information with confidence.
Metric 2 - 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 ↑	1.04 ↑	The metric demonstrates that disabled and non-disabled staff are nearly equally as likely to be appointed after shortlisting.
Metric 3 - 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 ↔	0.00 ↔	This year the Employee Relations team introduced a gate review process to ensure all cases should be progressed to a formal process
Metric 4 - Percentage of staff experiencing	% of staff experiencing harassment, bullying	Disabled	47.5%	52.3% ↑	47.5% ↓	A positive decrease overall for all staff.

Metric			2019	2020	2021	Comments
harassment, bullying or abuse from patients, relatives or the public in last 12 months.	or abuse from patients/service users, their relatives or other members of the public in the last 12 months	Non-Disabled	37%	40.1%	37%	
	% Of staff experiencing harassment, bullying or abuse from managers in the last 12 months	Disabled	20.2%	16.2% ↓	19.2% ↑	Disappointing increase for all staff. Leadership in Action middle leadership remains ongoing. During times of extreme pressure, relationships may have been strained and declined as a result.
		Non-Disabled	11.7%	9.1%	10.3%	
	% Of staff experiencing harassment, bullying or abuse from other colleagues in the last 12 months	Disabled	29.2%	25.9% ↓	24. 5% ↓	This figure has positively decreased for the second year.
		Non-Disabled	14.7%	14.4%	16.7%	
	% 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	Disabled	37.0%	44.4% ↑	47. 8% ↑	Again, a positive increase which may be attributed to the continued roll out of the Say Yes to Respect Campaign.
		Non-Disabled	40.5%	39.2%	46.1%	A positive increase this year which indicates staff feel confident in reporting poor behaviour from colleagues.
	Metric 5 - Percentage of Disabled staff compared to non-disabled staff believing that the Trust provides equal opportunities for career progression or promotion.		Disabled	59.6%	60.9% ↑	71. 5% ↑
Non-Disabled			76.7%	73.3%	79.1%	Again, a positive increase that now shows improvement.
Metric 6 - Percentage of Disabled staff compared to non-disabled staff saying that they have felt		Disabled	44.9%	36.1% ↓	29.7% ↓	This figure has improved for second year.

Metric		2019	2020	2021	Comments
pressure from their manager to come to work, despite not feeling well enough to perform their duties.	Non-Disabled	28.0%	23.6%	22.0%	
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	26.7%	29.0% ↑	34.6% ↑	This has steadily improved for all staff in the Trust. Staff engagement remains as a key priority for the Trust. This may also represent the considerable Health and Wellbeing support given during pandemic, particularly that from the Disability Staff Network.
	Non-Disabled	36.3%	38.9%	41.6%	
Metric 8 - 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% ↑	73.1% ↑	An improvement for all staff.
Metric 9a - The staff engagement score for Disabled staff, compared to non-disabled staff and the overall engagement score for the organisation.	Disabled	5.8	6.2 ↑	6.3 ↑	A slight improvement for staff with disabilities.
	Non-Disabled	6.6	6.8	6.8	
Metric 9b - Has your Trust taken action to facilitate the voices of Disabled staff in your organisation to be heard? (yes) or (no)		Yes	Yes ↔	Yes ↔	Yes. Diversity & Inclusion Steering Group, Disability Support Network (check-ins etc), Joint Steering Group, Cultural Ambassadors, Employee Voice Network
Metric 10 - Percentage difference between the organisations' board membership and its overall workforce disaggregated:	Disabled	8%	8% ↔	11% ↑	The percentage of disabled staff on the Trust Board is higher than that declared by staff on the Electronic Staff Record.
	Non-Disabled	92%	92%	89%	