RP5 Doncaster and Bassetlaw Teaching Hospitals NHS Foundation T v2.0

						DISA	RI FD		I	NON-D	31st MA	RCH 2019		ABILITY UNKNOWN OR NULL			OVERA	AL STAFF	1
					Total I	Disabled	% Disab	(ed / ratio	Total No	t Disabled	% Not Dis	abled / ratio		own or Null	% Unknown			rtal	
IETRIC	INDICATOR	DATA		MEASURE	Pre-	Verified data	Pre-	Verified data	Pre-	Verified data	Pre-	Verified data	Pre-	Verified data	Pre-	Verified data	Pre-	Verified data	Notes
			1al Non Clinical Staff Banda 1	Headcount	21		4%	4%	439		81%	77%	85		16%	20%	545	522	
		2	Banda 2 Banda 3	Headcount	10	22	25	4%	327	461	85%	82%	49	79	135	14%	38	502	
		4	Banda 4 Banda 5	Headcount Headcount	4	1	- <u>-</u>	2	125	125	85%	86% 87%	10	17	12%	12%	147	145	
			Banda 6 Banda 7	Headcount	-		7%	75	55 42	57	87%	84% 85%	4	ş	6% 10%	25	67 45	68	
			Banda Ba Banda Ba	Headcount		÷	0%	0% 0%	37	35	23% 94%	83% 83%	-	7	8% 6%	175	40	42	
	Percentage of edition 5.5 (polyands) or medical and Anoth Antopoly and very previous managers (polyanding Escataline Barrel methods) amogened with the percentage of edition to neveral excitives. The deal or fram- Barrel method has a singulate as as 31 Mech 2017	10	Banda Bo Banda Bo	Headcount	1	1	7%	7%	10	2	67% 100%	64% 100%	4	4	27%	29%	15	14	
		12	Banda 9 Vete	Headcount Headcount			0%	0% 0%	0	2	0% 80%	0% 75%		ě.	0% 20%	0% 25%	0	0	
		14	Other Other (Bands 1 - 4)	Headcount	0 44		0%	0%	2 1210	0	67% 83%	0%	1	0	23%	0%	3	0	
		15	Cluster 2 (Band 5 - 7)	Total	7	7	4%	376	1210	1369	83%	85%	197	18	14% 8%	10%	1451	171	
		17 Chantar J. Handu, En 50. 16 Chantar 4 (Bandu, Ec 5 & VSM) 18.0 Climical Staff		Total	1	Ĩ	4%	3%	22	24	79%	77%	5	5	18%	19%	28	31	
		19	Teo Cantesi Stan Banda 1 Banda 2	Meedcount	0	۰	0%	0%	45	6	87%	80%	7	1	13%	14%	55	7	
		20	Bands 3	Headcount	42	- 30	2%	25	204 245	232	85%	72%	40	43	14%	18%	1201 293	1023	
		23	Banda 4 Banda 5 Banda 6	Headcount Headcount Headcount	38	y	2% 2%	25	972 656	919	82% 80% 80%	79% 76% 77%	1/20	254	18% 16% 18%	215	1209 822	1210 827	
		25	Banda 7	Headcount	19	19	2%	2%	323	314	82%	80% 83%	61	69	10%	18%	305	394	
			Banda Ba Banda Bb	Headcount Headcount	0	0	25	25	14	12	23% 100%	83% 92% 100%	12	12	7%	8%	83 15 13	83	
		28 29 30	Banda Sc Banda Sd Banda 9	Headcount	÷	÷	0% 0%	0% 0%	13	- 1	100%	100% 100% 67%	0	-	0% 0% 33%	0% 0%	13	13	
			VSM	Headcount Headcount	0		0%	0%	3	1	75%	67% 50%	1	1	25%	50%	4	2	
			Medical & Dentel Staff, Consultants Medical & Dentel Staff, Non-Consultants career grade Medical & Dentel Staff, Medical and dentel trainee oracles	Headcount Headcount	1	2	25	2% 1%	200 80 201	194 201	79% 75% 86%	75% 76% 100%	50 22	63	20% 24% 14%	23%	254 92 234	255	
			Other	Headcount Headcount	0	°.	0%	0%	2	64 0	100%	0%	32	0	0%	0% 0%	2	64 0	
			Chater 1 (Bands 1 - 4) Chater 2 (Bands 5 - 7)	i cnal Total	47	20 67	3%	3%	1369	1125	83%	80% 77% 84%	229 407	247	14%	18%	1645	2431	
		38	Cluster 3 (Bands 8a - 8b) Cluster 4 (Bands 8c - 9 & VSM)	Total	0	2	2%	2% 0%	83 21	81 19	85%	84% 90%	13	13	13%	14%	98 23	96 21	
		40	Ciuster 5 (Medical & Dental Staff, Consultants) Ciuster 6 (Medical & Dental Staff, Non-Consultants career grade)	i oral Total	1	2	2%	2%	200 60	194 201	79%	75%	50 22	60	20%	23%	254	255	
				Total		°	0%	0%	201	64	85%	100%	32	0	14%	<u>ox</u>	234	64	
	Relative likelihood of Disabled staff compared to non-disabled staff being appointed from shortlisting across all posts.	43	Number of shorflated applicants	Headcount		20				705									
	Note: () This refers to both external and internal posts.	44	Number appointed from shortlisting	Headcount		10				273									
	ii) If your organisation implements a guaranteed interview scheme, the data may not be companiable with organisations that do not operate such a scheme. This information will be collected on the WDES online reporting form to ensure	45	Relative likelihood of shortlisting/spointed	Auto-Populated	-	0.50				0.39							-		
	nparability between organizations.	45	Relative likelihood of Disabled staff being appointed from shortlisting compared to Non-Disabled staff	Auto-Populated				0.77											A figure below 1:00 indicates that Disabled staff are more likely than Non-Disabled staff to be appointed from shortlisting.
	Relative likelihood of Diabled staff compared to non-diabled staff terming the format capability processes, as measured by entry linits the termin capability procedure. Name: The staff of the staff of the staff of the staff of the staff of the process of the previous year of the current process of the staff of the staff of the staff of the staff of the staff of the staff of the staff of the staff of the process of the staff of the	47	Number of staff in workforce	Headcount		174				5144									
		48	Number of staff entering the formal capability process	Headcount		17				340									
		49	Likelihood of staff entering the formal capability process	Auto-Populated	-	0.10			-	0.07							-		
		50	Relative likelihood of Disabled staff entering the formal capability process compared to Non-Disabled staff	Auto-Populated				1.48									-		A figure above 1:00 indicates that Disabled staff are more likely than Non-Disabled staff to enter the formal capability process.
	el Percentego el Diabide da all' companie lo non-chabide dall' esperindrol plasmara, Livilyog el adua presidente, l'Autorna el adua el	51	% of staff experiencing harasament, bullying or abuse from patienta/service users, their relatives or other members of the public in the last 12 months % of staff experiencing harasament, bullying or abuse from managers. In the	Number of Respondents/% Number of	512	512	29.3%	29.3%	2505	2508	25.5%	26.6%							
		52	laat 12 months	Respondents/%	504	504	17.1%	17.1%	2576	2576	10.1%	10.1%					_		
		53	% of staff experiencing harasament, builying or abuse from other colleagues in the last 12 months % of staff sector that the last time they exercise or harasament hubbing or	Number of Respondents/%	501	501 212	25.9%	25.9%	2574	2574	15.9%	15.9%							
		54	% of staff saying that the last time they experienced harasament, bullying or abuse at work, they or a colleague reported it in the last 12 months % of staff believing that the Trust provides equal occontinities for career	Respondents/%	212		36.3%			821	42.4%								
5	the Trust provides equal opportunities for career progression or promotion.	55	% of staff believing that the Trust provides equal opportunities for career progression or promotion.	Number of Respondents/%	318	318	73.3%	73.3%	1711	1711	87.1%	87.1%							
e	Percentage of Disabled staff compared to non-disabled staff saying that they have feit preasure from their manager to come to work, despite not feeling well enough to perform their daties.	55	% of staff saying that they have felt pressure from their manager to come to work, despite not feeling well enough to perform their duties.	Number of Respondents/%	385	385	37.9%	37.9%	1462	1462	29.7%	29.7%							
	Percentage of Disabled staff compared to non-disabled staff saying that they are satisfied with the extent to which their organisation values their work.	57	% shaff saying that they are satisfied with the extent to which their organisation values their work.	Number of Respondents/%	512	512	32.2%	32.2%	2505	2505	45.1%	45.1%							
	Percentage of Disabled staff saying that their employer has made adequate adjuatment(s) to enable them to carry out their work.	58	% of disabled staff saying that their employer has made adequate adjustment(s) to enable them to carry out their work.	Number of Respondents/%	268	255	63.8%	63.8%											
24	a) The staff annanement score for Disabled staff, corrected to non-disabled	59	The staff ergagement score for Disabled staff, compared to non-disabled staff and the overall ergagement score for the organization.	Number of Respondents/Sco	513	513	6.3	63	2617	2617	6.5	6.5					6.7	6.7	
	staff and the overall engagement score for the organisation. b) Has your Trust taken action to facilitate the volces of Disabled staff in		and use over an eigiligement accre for the organization.	ne															
	your organization to be heard? (yea) or (no) Mote: For your Tuntik exponse to b) If yea, please provide at least one practicell example of current action being taken in a relevant action of your VICES servicel apport. For please include what least on the WICES technical guidance.	60	Has your Trust takan action to facilitate the voices of Disabled staff in your organisation to be heard? (yes) or (yes)	(yea) or (no)		Yes													
		61 Total Board members 62 of which: Voting Board members		Headcount						10				5			15		
		63 : Non Voting Board members		Auto-Populated Auto-Populated		0				3				0			12 3 15		
			64 Total Board members 65 of which: Exec Board members 75 10 percenter Board members							6				0			8		
	Percentage difference between the organisation's Board vollag memberahlp and its organisation's overall workforce, disaggregated: - by Vollag memberahip of the Board The data for this metric should be a snapshot as of 31st March 2019	So :: Non Executive Board reambers Number of staff in overall workdonce Total Board members - % by Deablify		Auto-Populated Headcount Auto-Populated		174				5141 67%				1183			6428		
		60 Voting Board Member - % by Disability 20 Non-Voting Board Member - % by Disability		Auto-Populated Auto-Populated		0%				58%				42%					
		71 Executive Board Member - % by Disability 72 Non Executive Board Member - % by Disability		Auto-Populated		0% 0%				100%				0% 0% 50%					
		73	Overall workforce - % by Deablity Overall workforce - % by Deablity Difference (Total Board - Overall workforce)	Auto-Populated Auto-Populated		25				72%				18%					
		75	Difference (Voting memberahip - Overal) Workforce)	Auto-Populated Auto-Populated		-3%				-21%	222222222222			23%					
		76	conservation (conscudive memoeranip - coverall worksproe)	Auto-Populated	**********	-3%	*************	100022222222222						-18%	*************		**********		
