

## King's Disability Inclusion Maturity Model

As outlined in King's Strategic Vision 2029, the success of King's is built on attracting, developing and empowering a diverse workforce and recognising intersectionality. [Our Principles in Action](#), outline the importance of empowering staff to take responsibility and create an inclusive culture where everyone can flourish personally and professionally.

### Purpose of King's Disability Inclusion Maturity Model

The strategic priorities of the model are to:

- Transform the disabled staff experience
- Enable cross-university activity to be mapped and measured against clear success indicators.
- Provide a structured shift towards best practice; moving away from ad-hoc style of working, towards being an anticipatory and innovative one.
- Enable evidence led priorities benchmarked using national standards.
- Educate and engage the entire King's community and create shared responsibility to drive change.

The Maturity Model has 12 indicators (appendix 1), which have a legal basis rooted in the Equality Act (2010) and King's duty to uphold the Public-Sector Equality Duty. King's Disability Inclusion Maturity Model has four levels of maturity to ensure action is taken, and disability inclusion is prioritised to help King's progress in its maturity. This model was informed by industry wide research including the BDF's Retention Maturity Model, which is supported by more than 80 case studies demonstrating best practice in action.

King's maturity model provides the strategic basis to King's Transformation Plan, which is evidence based and been informed by the King's community.

If you would like this document in an alternative format, please contact [diversity@kcl.ac.uk](mailto:diversity@kcl.ac.uk).

INDICATOR	LEVEL 1: BASIC	LEVEL 2: REACTIVE	LEVEL 3: PROACTIVE	LEVEL 4: INNOVATIVE
Inclusive leadership and commitment to disability inclusion	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No disability Senior Sponsor identifiable.</li> <li>Perceived lack of commitment to disabled staff.</li> <li>No engagement with disability specialist organisation.</li> <li>Lack of transparency and accountability and governance of activity.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Senior Sponsor identified but role is unclear.</li> <li>Limited board level focus on disability. Sporadic university-wide disability inclusion activity and limited local activity.</li> <li>Ad hoc activity with expert disability organisation.</li> <li>Limited transparency and accountability and governance of activity.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Senior Sponsor known internally for driving improvement.</li> <li>Board level mandate - disability is part of King's diverse identity and there is demonstrable commitment to inclusion.</li> <li>Well-established partnership with expert disability organisation using benchmarking tools.</li> <li>Established transparency and accountability and governance of activity.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Senior Sponsor recognised externally for driving change.</li> <li>Activity is understood to be a strategic priority across the university.</li> <li>External recognition and influence of disability inclusive best practice. Benchmarking outputs shared externally.</li> <li>Effective transparency and accountability</li> </ul>
Disability inclusive values and culture	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Attitude of leaders that bare minimum compliance with equality law is sufficient.</li> <li>Disability is perceived as barrier in the workplace.</li> <li>Disabled staff feel unable to discuss their disability, and related needs.</li> <li>No acknowledgement of intersectional experiences of disabled staff.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Attitude of a few leaders go beyond minimum compliance of equality law.</li> <li>Disabled staff prefer to not discuss their disability; staff with a mental health condition are particularly reluctant to seek support.</li> <li>Limited understanding of barriers in the workplace.</li> <li>Limited understanding of intersectional experiences of disabled staff in D&amp;I activity.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Attitude of most leaders to go beyond minimum compliance of equality law.</li> <li>Majority of disabled staff feel able to discuss their disability and needs.</li> <li>Shared values and behaviours to address causes, effects and remove workplace barriers.</li> <li>Work underway to better understand intersectional experiences of disabled staff (with other PCs).</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Attitude of all leaders to go beyond minimum compliance of equality law.</li> <li>A culture of being your authentic self at work and celebrating differences.</li> <li>Staff feel empowered to discuss their disability and have a sense of belonging.</li> <li>Disabled staff feel confident in King's as a disability-smart workplace.</li> <li>Good understanding of intersectional experiences of disabled is embedded into work streams and self-assessments.</li> </ul>
Visibility of disability/long term conditions, and diverse role models	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>'Absence of' disabled people who speak openly about their experiences in King's communication channels/platforms.</li> <li>Disability referred to or considered to be about physical conditions.</li> <li>Little communication about disability inclusion and activity.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Limited number of disabled people sharing and speaking about their experiences or do so reluctantly.</li> <li>Disability still largely refers to physical conditions with limited discussion and recognition of all long-term conditions.</li> <li>Ad hoc communications about disability inclusion.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Diverse disabled role models and local representatives operating effectively.</li> <li>Recognition and equal prioritisation of all types of disabilities/long term conditions.</li> <li>Regular communications about disability inclusion.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Prominent disabled role models across the organisation who are also known to be in senior positions.</li> <li>Disability recognised as diverse strand of King's identity, which includes all types of disabilities/long term conditions.</li> <li>Effective communication and campaign activity that promotes King's</li> </ul>

POLICY, PROCESS & PROCEDURE	Disability inclusive recruitment, selection and on boarding processes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Managers and employees do not consider disability when recruiting disabled staff.</li> <li>Poorly coordinated recruitment, and on-boarding of new staff/staff in new roles, with gaps in processes.</li> <li>HR staff, recruiting managers, panellists etc have low disability-confidence and know-how.</li> <li>No disability-smart recruitment and selection guidance available.</li> <li>No positive recruitment scheme for disabled staff.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>HR, recruiting managers, panellists etc seek ad hoc disability-related advice.</li> <li>Link between recruiting and on-boarding of staff understood but managed in isolation. Plans to align processes but no action taken.</li> <li>Recruitment and selection guidance updated to account for all disabilities and roles, but not always used and no training available.</li> <li>Staff are open to but cautious of positive action schemes.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Disability is considered in advance of recruitment campaigns.</li> <li>Recruiting and on-boarding processes are aligned and accessible.</li> <li>Disability-smart recruitment and selection training is available, assessed and monitored for HR staff, recruiting managers, panellists.</li> <li>Positive action scheme piloted &amp; implemented.</li> <li>HR, recruiting managers, panellists etc are confident in, and following processes.</li> <li>Disabled staff experience smooth transition from recruitment to on-boarding.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Disability inclusion is embedded in all recruitment related central and local activity.</li> <li>Feedback opportunities are available and driving improvements.</li> <li>Positive action scheme widely used and increasing recruitment of disabled staff.</li> </ul>
	Institutional policies, processes and procedures that support disabled staff	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Policies that do not meet needs of disabled staff.</li> <li>No defined adjustment process for staff. Lack of data regarding adjustments, assistive software etc.</li> <li>No explicit consideration of disability-related bullying and harassment.</li> <li>No distinction between disability-related sickness absence, disability leave and absence from work.</li> <li>Limited formal support available following absence/return to work.</li> <li>Disability related processes/services between different organisation units are poorly coordinated with limited expertise; staff experiences generally poor.</li> <li>No feedback opportunities available for key services/processes.</li> <li>Processes are not reviewed to check if they are meeting the needs of users.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Policies and guides e.g. absence management and redeployment have limited practical application.</li> <li>Ineffective adjustment process with varied experiences and delays due to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Poor coordination of key stakeholders.</li> <li>Verbal adjustment agreements with no defined way to record and review effectiveness.</li> <li>Funding issues.</li> </ul> </li> <li>No institutional oversight of frequent assistive software/equipment requests.</li> <li>Non-defined approach to disability-related bullying and harassment data.</li> <li>Return to work process is limited, with disability advice sought in ad-hoc fashion.</li> <li>Disability related processes/services are better coordinated between organisational units, with some support and investment in enhancing expertise.</li> <li>Ad hoc feedback opportunities available.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Policies and guidance fit for purpose, up to date, and accessible.</li> <li>Disability-related sickness absence and disability leave are distinguished from absence from work.</li> <li>Well-coordinated and effective adjustment process with service level agreements between key stakeholders. Adjustments recorded, portable and reviewed for effectiveness.</li> <li>Adjustments are resourced, and funding streams reviewed annually.</li> <li>Commonly requested software and equipment are known.</li> <li>Return to work support programme in place.</li> <li>Disability related processes/services are well-coordinated between organisational units.</li> <li>Feedback opportunities available across key processes.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Disabled staff and managers happy with King's policies, processes and procedures relating but not limited to disability-related sickness absence, disability leave, redeployment and return to work.</li> <li>Adjustment process service level agreements are met. Management information used to drive improvements.</li> <li>Adjustments are adequately well-resourced.</li> <li>Commonly requested adjustments are available and communicated to new and current staff.</li> <li>Effective functional alignment of disability-related processes; staff can access and use a streamlined service that meets their needs.</li> <li>Positive feedback about processes.</li> </ul>
	Equality Analysis (EAs) of policies, processes and procurement	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Disability is not considered when rolling out a policy, project, or</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Equality Analysis toolkit is available but not readily used when rolling out a policy, project, programme or</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Equality Analysis used to pro-actively consider disability-related impacts when</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Analysis of Equality Analyses demonstrate 'beyond compliance' approach of the Equality Act &amp; Public-</li> </ul>

		<p>before procurement of a service/product.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Disabled staff needs are considered too late; decisions made without disabled staff 'in the room'.</li> <li>Disabled staff disadvantaged by new policy, project, programme.</li> </ul>	<p>before procurement of a service/product.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Disability impacts considered in ad-hoc manner in post-design phase; action prioritised to what is perceived to be high risk issues only.</li> <li>Incomplete record of decisions/follow up.</li> <li>Limited consideration of all types of disabilities/long term conditions.</li> <li>Acknowledgement that most environmental barriers can be mitigated but little action taken to address this.</li> </ul>	<p>rolling out a policy, project, or before procurement of a service/product.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>All disabilities/long term conditions considered; few negative impacts reported.</li> <li>Data about outcomes and experiences are reviewed post implementation.</li> <li>Disabled people regularly consulted during Equality Analysis.</li> <li>Internally review Equality Analyses for disability-related trends, best practice and areas for development.</li> </ul>	<p>Sector Equality Duty; King's recognised as sector leader.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Externally publish disability-related Equality Analyses as good practice to share knowledge and enable scrutiny.</li> <li>Disability inclusion embedded into project design.</li> <li>Disabled staff report positive</li> </ul>
LOCAL EXPERIENCE	Effective management/supervisory support of disabled staff	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Managers have limited understanding of how to support disabled staff.</li> <li>Managers lack know-how to support disability related absences.</li> <li>No identifiable commitment to effective and inclusive performance management and progression of disabled staff (PS and academic).</li> <li>Disabled staff feel unsupported by managers.</li> <li>No data or process to review or monitor local disability-related trends.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Managers have inconsistent understanding of how to support staff with all types of disabilities/ long term conditions. Mental health related management are commonly cited as an area of concern.</li> <li>Some motivated managers pro-actively seek advice and guidance about disability related matters in ad hoc manner.</li> <li>Process in place to monitor performance management and progression of some disabled staff; plans to review and improve pathway for all staff. Sufficient guidance available but improvements needed.</li> <li>Some disabled staff seek disability-related support from managers only when necessary but wary of doing so.</li> <li>Plans to review and monitor local trends.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Managers have good understanding of how to support disabled staff with all types of disabilities/long term conditions including mental health conditions.</li> <li>Managers trained in supporting with long term absence, disability related absence, and employees that acquire disabilities or return to work after disability-related absence.</li> <li>Effective process in place to evaluate performance management and progression of disabled staff; quality guidance available.</li> <li>Disabled staff feel able to approach managers for disability-related support.</li> <li>Standardised local data collection (departments/faculties/functions).</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Managers are skilled supporting disabled staff with all types of disabilities/long term conditions and feel confident using approaches to manage disability related absence issues and return to work.</li> <li>Good performance management and progression data for all disabled staff.</li> <li>Staff are satisfied with approaches to disability related leave, sick leave and absence from work.</li> <li>Disabled staff feel confident in their managers disability know how and feel well-supported.</li> <li>Risks anticipated and managed resulting in fewer issues reported.</li> </ul>
	Disability-smart workforce	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No training or disability confidence guidance available for all staff.</li> <li>Key staff (HR, front-facing, specialists) have limited disability-know.</li> <li>No resource invested in improving disability-competency of staff.</li> <li>Frequent generalist disability-related queries and concerns.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Generalist D&amp;I training available for staff - primarily focused on the legal requirements.</li> <li>Specialist disability training delivered in response to issue, or locally with no oversight.</li> <li>Limited resource invested in staff training.</li> <li>Learning and development analysis required to identify target audiences, needs and solutions.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Training strategy fully coordinated and resourced; training quality regularly monitored and reviewed.</li> <li>All employees complete disability confidence training.</li> <li>Managers receive training to support staff, manage difficult conversations etc.</li> <li>Comprehensive disability-related guidance available to accompany policies &amp; processes.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Training data shows good level of disability know-how of all staff. Staff report improved disability confidence.</li> <li>Range of accessible, blended-learning products informed by research; considered integral to institution-wide Learning and Development delivery.</li> <li>Feedback improves quality of training.</li> <li>Staff report usefulness of resources.</li> <li>Few disability-related queries and concerns.</li> </ul>



			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Some online disability guidance available.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Declining generalist disability-related queries and concerns.</li> </ul>	
	<p>Accessible and usable digital and built environments, and communications/information, including products and procured services</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Digital and built environment below minimal level of compliance.</li> <li>Legal compliance is assumed of suppliers.</li> <li>No assistive software expertise available to staff.</li> <li>No Accessibility Standard or process to quality check accessibility-related issues.</li> <li>Non-systematic data collection.</li> <li>Limited consideration of usability of service/product using inclusive design principles.</li> <li>Inaccessible communications (print and digital). No consideration of developing accessible information, and no guidance available.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Digital and built environment considerations meet minimal compliance.</li> <li>Uncoordinated activity to establish Accessibility Standard.</li> <li>Staff receive ad-hoc Assistive Software advice.</li> <li>Suppliers/partners expected to consider disability inclusion but not evidenced.</li> <li>Reactive process in place to deal with accessibility issues with intention to improve but limited resource.</li> <li>Limited accessible information guidance available and sought on ad-hoc basis. No established resource available.</li> <li>Regular data collection but no baseline figures or single monitoring process.</li> <li>Usability of service/product often considered after design phase is implemented.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Plans to go 'beyond compliance' using inclusive design principles with consultation of service users.</li> <li>Designated Assistive Software Lead (staff).</li> <li>An Accessibility Standard is established with clear specifications that consider accessibility and usability of built environment; developed with key stakeholders including disabled staff.</li> <li>Suppliers/partners evidence disability competence.</li> <li>Established process for identifying and following up access issues.</li> <li>Accessible information resource/guidance available and used by the majority.</li> <li>Effective management information system collects data with accurate baseline figures.</li> <li>End to end disabled user engagement - stating needs, suggesting, testing solutions.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Digital and built environment are 'beyond compliance', with inclusive design principles embedded in projects/procurement cycle.</li> <li>Policy to never procure or commission products/services from organisations with low disability competence &amp; commitment.</li> <li>Effective system in place to install, upgrade, and reissue assistive software licenses.</li> <li>Disability-related performance monitored and reviewed during and post contract life; lessons learned fed back to suppliers, who act upon feedback.</li> <li>Developing accessible digital and built environments with disabled service users is embedded in everyday practice.</li> <li>Information (print and digital) is accessible and following best practice.</li> <li>Service users pleased with digital and built environments.</li> </ul>
<p style="writing-mode: vertical-rl; transform: rotate(180deg);">DATA, OUTCOMES &amp; EVALUATION</p>	<p>Employer of choice for disabled staff</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No coordinated data collection of disability information at key stages of employee life cycle.</li> <li>Limited external information communicated about support/benefits for disabled staff.</li> <li>No information on disability related perceptions of employee engagement and satisfaction.</li> <li>Limited understanding and use of exit interview process.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Manual system collects recruitment and new hire information but does not provide institution-wide accurate baseline figures; no KPIs to increase recruitment and retention of disabled staff.</li> <li>Limited information communicated about benefits/support available to disabled staff.</li> <li>Data collected on disability related perceptions of employee engagement and satisfaction, but negative scores and no planned activity.</li> <li>Exit interviews not offered to all staff and no clear process for data analysis.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Effective management information system collects recruitment and retention data of disabled staff with accurate baseline figures</li> <li>Established SMART KPIs to increase recruitment and retention of disabled staff.</li> <li>Information about benefits/support for disabled staff is widely promoted.</li> <li>Planned activity to address gap between disabled and non-disabled employee engagement and satisfaction scores.</li> <li>Exit interviews offered and available to all staff.</li> <li>Central and local analysis of exit data takes account of disability.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Ambitious SMART KPIs that ensure increased recruitment and retention of disabled staff evident through public facing data dashboards.</li> <li>Exit interview data demonstrates that being disabled has no influence on leaving King's.</li> <li>Closing gap between disabled and non-disabled employee engagement and satisfaction scores.</li> <li>Survey results indicate disabled staff and managers (of disabled staff) are engaged and happy with processes/services available.</li> <li>All staff satisfied with support for disabled staff. King's considered to be an employer of choice for disabled staff.</li> </ul>
	<p>Disabled staff achieve positive professional development outcomes</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No investment in development opportunities for disabled staff.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Interest in development opportunities for disabled staff but limited by resource.</li> </ul>		

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Existing performance development and capability processes are not reviewed for disability bias.</li> <li>No data collection to monitor professional development outcomes of disabled staff.</li> <li>No professional development/networking opportunities for disabled staff.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Acknowledgement that performance development processes and capability procedures need to be reviewed for disability bias but little progress.</li> <li>Limited, ad-hoc data collection to monitor outcomes of professional development for disabled employees.</li> <li>Disabled staff have limited professional development/networking opportunities.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Targeted and resourced development opportunities available to disabled employees.</li> <li>Performance development processes and capability procedures are reviewed for disability bias.</li> <li>Regular monitoring of professional development outcomes of disabled staff considered a priority.</li> <li>Well-established professional development/networking opportunities available to disabled staff.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Disability inclusion is factored into existing professional development framework.</li> <li>Improved professional development outcomes for disabled staff.</li> <li>Performance development processes and capability procedures are considered disability smart.</li> <li>Professional development/networking opportunities</li> </ul>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Collaborative learning, informed decision making, and sharing of disability related best practice</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No disabled staff consultation, group or engagement.</li> <li>Staff feel as if their experiences do not matter.</li> <li>No sharing of best practice within institution.</li> <li>Issues and risks are not understood and managed effectively.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Disabled staff group set up but limited activity across the organisation.</li> <li>Disabled staff experiences are considered but no clear agenda on how insight is used to drive change.</li> <li>Ad hoc ways of sharing best practice within institution, and rarely share learning externally.</li> <li>Limited understanding of risks and issues, which are managed in ad-hoc fashion.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Disabled staff group is organisationally supported via D&amp;I governance structure.</li> <li>Disabled employees routinely consulted on projects and their views help to drive improvements.</li> <li>Routine process/service review informs learning.</li> <li>Improved understanding and management of risks and issues, with sharing and application of best practice.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Well-established disabled staff group set up as a community voice and empowered to inform strategic decisions in policy and change making processes.</li> <li>Learning drives improvements in delivery of processes.</li> <li>Regular sharing of best practice, internally, and across the HE sector.</li> <li>Leading conversation in disability inclusion best practice within HE, and growing influence outside HE.</li> <li>Data collection used to drive improvements</li> </ul>

**KING'S DISABILITY INCLUSION JOURNEY TOWARDS EMBEDDING STRATEGIC & OPERATIONAL BEST PRACTICE**



## Appendix 1:

Indicator	Description
Inclusive leadership and commitment to disability inclusion	Clear commitment to disability inclusion from senior leaders; evident within and outside the College. External accolades achieved as a result of being an organisation that recognises disability is an inherent part of its diverse identity and inclusion priorities,
Disability inclusive values and culture	Open, safe and non-judgemental culture where staff feel empowered to discuss their disability-related needs and seek support. Being disability inclusive is more than complying with equality law and regulations, with a shared commitment to be an educator and employer where everyone is valued for their differences and can succeed.
Visibility of disability and diverse disabled role models	Disability recognised as diverse strand of King's identity, which includes all types of disabilities/long term conditions. Effective communication and campaign activity that promotes King's approach to disability inclusion via diverse role models.
Disability inclusive recruitment, selection and on boarding practices	Ensuring fairness during recruitment, access to development and promotional opportunities for disabled people. Recruiting staff and HR professionals are trained and skilled to deliver well-coordinated processes for disabled job applicants and current members of disabled staff.
Institutional policies and practices that support disabled staff	Disabled people's needs are accommodated for by making reasonable adjustments to the physical and digital workplace, and related working arrangements. This applies to job applicants and other current members of staff, in all aspects of employment. Effective university-wide coordination of disability-related processes. This results in an accessible, and user-friendly, end to end service that is quality checked with clear roles, responsibilities and agreed accountability.
Equality Analysis (EAs) of policies, processes and procurement	All types of disabilities/long term conditions are taken into account when conducting Equality Analyses. They ensure disability-related inclusion considerations are applied to changes in policy, process, project or procurement of services. Thorough consultation of key stakeholders will inform impact analyses and prevent negative consequences of change and increase positive impacts in the workplace.
Effective management/supervisory support of disabled staff	Managers receive specialist disability know-how training and feel empowered by their knowledge and ability to support disabled staff with all types of disabilities/long term conditions. Managers apply disability inclusive principles in practice, and disabled staff are confident in their managers' ability to support them.
Disability-smart workforce	All staff receive disability know-how training, giving them a shared understanding and awareness of disability inclusion principles. There is university-wide commitment to promote equality of opportunity for disabled staff and fostering good relations between all staff.
Accessible and usable digital and built environments, and communications/information, including products and procured services	Inclusive design approach used and embedded within digital and built environments. The needs of disabled people are considered to ensure products and services are accessible and usable. This enables all disabled people to participate equally and confidently in a barrier-free, working and learning environment.

Employer of choice for disabled staff	Recognising and valuing diversity by creating a supportive environment. Prospective employees choose to apply for a role because of the disability-related support and services available. Data collection and analysis readily used to identify trends in disability related recruitment and retention. SMART KPIs used to increase recruitment and retention of disabled staff.
Disabled staff achieve positive professional development outcomes	Professional development opportunities and performance management frameworks reflect disability inclusive good practice. These are monitored for achievements, resulting in improved professional development outcomes for disabled staff.
Collaborative learning, informed decision making, and sharing of disability related best practice	Well-established pathway for disabled staff to inform and influence activity. Consultation of staff is pro-actively sought and used to drive learning, and improve the experiences of disabled staff