Indicator		Data for 2018/19				Data for 2019/20			
		Band	Disabled	Not Disabled	Not Disc/Unknown	Band	Disabled	Not Disabled	Not Disc/Unknown
Percentage of staff in		1	3%	78%	19%	1	3%	79%	18%
		2	2%	84%	15%	2	3%	81%	17%
		3	4%	82%	14%	3	4%	84%	13%
		4	2%	86%	12%	4	3%	86%	11%
each of the AfC Bands 1-9	<u> </u>	5	8%	87%	6%	5	7%	86%	7%
and VSM (including	Ξ	6	3%	94%	3%	6	5%	92%	3%
executive Board members)	∺	7	2%	93%	5%	7	2%	91%	7%
compared with the	Ē	8a	6%	91%	3%	8a	7%	89%	4%
percentage of staff in the	Non-Clinical	8b	0%	91%	9%	8b	0%	93%	7%
overall workforce.	~	8c	0%	100%	0%	8c	0%	100%	0%
		8d	0%	100%	0%	8d	0%	100%	0%
		9	0%	50%	50%	9	0%	75%	25%
		Non Exec Director	0%	80%	20%	Non Exec Director	0%	100%	0%
		VSM	0%	100%	0%	VSM	0%	100%	0%
		Total	3%	84%	13%	Total	3%	84%	12%
					Not				Not
		Band	Disabled	Not Disabled	Disc/Unknown	Band	Disabled	Not Disabled	Disc/Unknown
		1			,	1			
		2	1%	87%	12%	2	1%	88%	11%
1. Percentage of staff in		3	3%						
			3%	80%	16%	3	2%	82%	16%
		4	0%	80% 90%	16% 10%	3 4	2% 2%	82% 65%	16% 33%
1. Percentage of staff in		4 5	0%				2%		
1. Percentage of staff in each of the AfC Bands 1-9				90%	10%	4	-	65%	33%
	la l	5	0% 2%	90% 88%	10% 10%	4 5	2% 2%	65% 86%	33% 11%
each of the AfC Bands 1-9	nical	5 6	0% 2% 3%	90% 88% 84%	10% 10% 13%	4 5 6	2% 2% 2%	65% 86% 86%	33% 11% 12%
each of the AfC Bands 1-9 and VSM (including	linical	5 6 7	0% 2% 3% 1%	90% 88% 84% 91%	10% 10% 13% 8%	4 5 6 7	2% 2% 2% 1%	65% 86% 86% 92%	33% 11% 12% 7%
each of the AfC Bands 1-9 and VSM (including executive Board members)	Clinical	5 6 7 8a	0% 2% 3% 1% 2%	90% 88% 84% 91% 91%	10% 10% 13% 8% 7%	4 5 6 7 8a	2% 2% 2% 1% 0%	65% 86% 86% 92% 93%	33% 11% 12% 7% 7%
each of the AfC Bands 1-9 and VSM (including executive Board members) compared with the	Clinical	5 6 7 8a 8b	0% 2% 3% 1% 2% 0%	90% 88% 84% 91% 91%	10% 10% 13% 8% 7% 9%	4 5 6 7 8a 8b	2% 2% 2% 1% 0%	65% 86% 86% 92% 93% 90%	33% 11% 12% 7% 7% 10%
each of the AfC Bands 1-9 and VSM (including executive Board members) compared with the percentage of staff in the	Clinical	5 6 7 8a 8b 8c	0% 2% 3% 1% 2% 0%	90% 88% 84% 91% 91% 91%	10% 10% 13% 8% 7% 9%	4 5 6 7 8a 8b 8c	2% 2% 2% 1% 0% 0%	65% 86% 86% 92% 93% 90% 88%	33% 11% 12% 7% 7% 10%
each of the AfC Bands 1-9 and VSM (including executive Board members) compared with the percentage of staff in the	Clinical	5 6 7 8a 8b 8c 8d	0% 2% 3% 1% 2% 0% 0%	90% 88% 84% 91% 91% 91% 91%	10% 10% 13% 8% 7% 9% 9%	4 5 6 7 8a 8b 8c 8d	2% 2% 2% 1% 0% 0%	65% 86% 86% 92% 93% 90% 88%	33% 11% 12% 7% 7% 10%
each of the AfC Bands 1-9 and VSM (including executive Board members) compared with the percentage of staff in the	Clinical	5 6 7 8a 8b 8c 8d 9	0% 2% 3% 1% 2% 0% 0% 0%	90% 88% 84% 91% 91% 91% 100%	10% 10% 13% 8% 7% 9% 9% 0%	4 5 6 7 8a 8b 8c 8d 9	2% 2% 2% 1% 0% 0%	65% 86% 86% 92% 93% 90% 88%	33% 11% 12% 7% 7% 10%
each of the AfC Bands 1-9 and VSM (including executive Board members) compared with the percentage of staff in the	Clinical	5 6 7 8a 8b 8c 8d 9	0% 2% 3% 1% 2% 0% 0% 0% 0%	90% 88% 84% 91% 91% 91% 91% 100% 100%	10% 10% 13% 8% 7% 9% 9% 0% 0%	4 5 6 7 8a 8b 8c 8d 9	2% 2% 2% 1% 0% 0% 0%	65% 86% 86% 92% 93% 90% 88% 100%	33% 11% 12% 7% 7% 10% 13% 0%
each of the AfC Bands 1-9 and VSM (including executive Board members) compared with the percentage of staff in the	Clinical	5 6 7 8a 8b 8c 8d 9 VSM Consultants	0% 2% 3% 1% 2% 0% 0% 0% 0% 1%	90% 88% 84% 91% 91% 91% 100% 100%	10% 10% 13% 8% 7% 9% 9% 0% 0% 0%	4 5 6 7 8a 8b 8c 8d 9 VSM Consultants	2% 2% 2% 1% 0% 0% 0% 0%	65% 86% 86% 92% 93% 90% 88% 100%	33% 11% 12% 7% 7% 10% 13% 0%

Relative likelihood of Disabled staff compared to non-disabled staff being appointed from shortlisting across all posts.		ely to be appointed from shortlisting Non-Disabled staff	Disabled staff are 1.95 less likely to be appointed from shortlisting compared to Non-Disabled staff			
3. Relative likelihood of staff entering the formal capability process, as measured by entry into a formal capability procedure (based on a two year rolling average).		d staff entering the formal capability Disabled staff is 0.00 times greater.	Relative likelihood of Disabled staff entering the formal capability process compared to Non-Disabled staff is 0.00 times greater.			
4a. i) Percentage of staff experiencing harassment, bullying or abuse from patients, relatives or the public in the last 12 months	<u>Disabled:</u>	<u>38%</u>	<u>Disabled:</u>	<u>37%</u>		
	Not Disabled:	<u>27%</u>	Not Disabled:	<u>27%</u>		
4a. ii) Percentage of staff experiencing harassment, bullying or abuse from managers in the last 12 months	<u>Disabled:</u>	21%	<u>Disabled:</u>	23%		
	Not Disabled:	<u>12%</u>	Not Disabled:	<u>13%</u>		
4a. iii) Percentage of staff experiencing harassment, bullying or abuse from other colleagues in the last 12 months	<u>Disabled:</u>	<u>26%</u>	<u>Disabled:</u>	27%		
	Not Disabled:	<u>16%</u>	Not Disabled:	<u>17%</u>		
4b. Percentage 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	<u>Disabled:</u>	<u>52%</u>	<u>Disabled:</u>	<u>42%</u>		
	Not Disabled:	<u>45%</u>	Not Disabled:	<u>48%</u>		

Indicator		Data for 2018/19		Data for 2019/20
5. Percentage of staff believing that the Trust provides equal	<u>Disabled:</u>	<u>83%</u>	<u>Disabled:</u>	<u>75%</u>
opportunities for career progression or promotion.	Not Disabled:	<u>83%</u>	Not Disabled:	<u>83%</u>
Percentage of staff that have felt pressure saying that they have felt pressure from their	<u>Disabled:</u>	<u>36%</u>	<u>Disabled:</u>	<u>32%</u>
manager to come to work, despite not feeling well enough to perform their duties	Not Disabled:	<u>24%</u>	Not Disabled:	25%
7. Percentage of staff saying that they are satisfied with the extent	<u>Disabled:</u>	<u>39%</u>	<u>Disabled:</u>	<u>34%</u>
to which their organisation values their work	Not Disabled:	<u>47%</u>	Not Disabled:	<u>52%</u>
8. Percentage of Disabled staff saying that their employer has made adequate adjustments to enable them to carry out their work	<u>Disabled:</u>	71%	<u>Disabled:</u>	70%
9a. The staff engagement score for Disabled Staff, compared to Non-Disabled staff and the overall	<u>Disabled:</u>	<u>7.0</u>	<u>Disabled:</u>	<u>6.7</u>
engagement score for the organisation	Not Disabled:	7.1	Not Disabled:	<u>7.1</u>
9b. Has the Trust taken action to facilitate the voices of Disabled staff in your organisation to be heard?		<u>No</u>		<u>No</u>

9. Percentage difference between the organisations' Board voting membership and its overall workforce.		<u>Disabled</u>	Not Disabled	Not Disc/Unknown		Disabled	Not Disabled	<u>Not</u> <u>Disc/Unknown</u>
	<u>Total Board</u> <u>Members</u>	0.0%	91.0%	9.0%	<u>Total Board</u> <u>Members</u>	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%
	Voting Board Members	0.0%	90.0%	10.0%	Voting Board Members	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%
	Non Voting Board Members	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	Non Voting Board Members	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%
	Executive Board Members	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	Executive Board Members	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%
	Non-Executive Board Member	0.0%	80.0%	20.0%	Non-Executive Board Member	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%
	Overall Workforce	2.2%	86.9%	10.9%	Overall Workforce	2.2%	86.5%	11.4%
	<u>Difference between</u> <u>Trust Board and</u> <u>Overall Workforce</u>	-2.2%	4.1%	-1.9%	<u>Difference</u> <u>between Trust</u> <u>Board and Overall</u> <u>Workforce</u>	-2.2%	13.5%	-11.4%