



Workforce Disability Equality Standard (WDES)

Data Summary Report 2024/25

Spectrum Community Health CIC

Workforce Disability Equality Standard (WDES) – 2024/25

Contents:

1. Introduction
2. Workforce Race Equality Standard (WRES) Indicators
 1. WDES Metric 1 - Workforce Disability Equality Standard (WDES) Metric Reports
 2. WDES Metric 2 – Relative likelihood of Disabled staff compared to non-disabled staff being appointed from shortlisting across all posts
 3. WDES Metric 3 – Relative likelihood of Disabled staff compared to non-disabled staff entering the formal capability process, as measured by entry into the formal capability procedure.
 4. WDES Metric 4 – Percentage of Disabled staff compared to non-disabled staff experiencing harassment, bullying or abuse.
 5. WDES Metric 5 - Percentage of Disabled staff compared to non-disabled staff believing that the trust provides equal opportunities for career progression or promotion.
 6. WDES Metric 6 – 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.
 7. WDES 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.
 8. WDES Metric 8 – Percentage of Disabled staff saying that their employer has made adequate adjustment(s) to enable them to carry out their work.
 9. WDES Metric 9 – Disabled Staff Engagement
 10. WDES Metric 10 – Percentage difference between the organisation's board voting membership and its organisation's overall workforce
3. Workforce Race Equality Standard (WRES) comparison table
4. WRES Action Plan 2025/26

1. Introduction

Cultures and workplaces where people are engaged, experience compassion and feel included will result not only in being a place that our people enjoy working in and thrive, but also in improved patient experience, better outcomes for our beneficiaries (patients) and care too.

Our People Experience Strategy is a critical enabler to the Spectrum Business Strategy 2025-2028. One of the pillars of the People Experience Strategy is focused on Culture & Compassionate Leadership. We want to enable all our staff to feel be valued for who they are and be able bring their whole self to work because we celebrate diversity and lived experience and are inclusive. We need our leaders and managers to create compassionate, inclusive and patient outcome focused cultures where our values are evident every day and you can thrive.

The WRES and WDES reports are important to help us understand where we are now, how staff who are from BME backgrounds or those who have a disability feel about working here and develop improvement plans that address any concerns.

The Workforce Disability Equality Standard (WDES) is a standard that uses a series of ten measures (metrics) to improve the experiences of disabled staff at Spectrum CIC.

The main purpose of the WDES is:

- ✓ Help Spectrum to review their data against the 10 workforce WDES metrics
- ✓ Produce an action plan to close the gaps in workforce experience between non-disabled and disabled colleagues

All of the metrics draw from existing data sources (recruitment dataset, ESR, Spectrum CIC Staff Survey, local HR data).

The metrics have been developed to capture information relating to the workplace and career experiences of disabled staff within Spectrum CIC between the period 1 April 2024 and 31 March 2025.

The annual collection of the WDES Metrics will allow Spectrum CIC to better understand and improve the workplace and career experiences of Disabled staff within the organisation.

The WDES metrics for Spectrum will be uploaded to meet the National deadline of 31st October 2025.

2. Workforce Disability Equality Standard (WDES) Indicators

Nº	WDES Indicator
Workforce Indicators (Source ESR and TRAC)	
1	Percentage of disabled 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
2	Relative likelihood of non-disabled staff compared to disabled staff being appointed from shortlisting across all posts.
3	Relative likelihood of disabled staff compared to non-disabled staff entering the formal capability process on the grounds of performance as measured by entry into the formal capability procedure.
Staff Survey Findings (Source Spectrum CIC Staff Survey)	
4	Percentage of disabled staff compared to non-disabled staff - experiencing harassment, bullying or abuse from patients, relatives or the public - Managers - Other colleagues
5	Percentage of disabled compared to non-disabled staff believing that Spectrum provide equal opportunities for career progression or promotion
6	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.
7	Percentage of disabled staff compared to non-disabled staff saying that they are satisfied with the extent to which the organisation values their work
8	Percentage of disabled staff saying that their employer has made reasonable adjustments to enable them to carry out their work.
9a	The staff engagement score for disabled staff compared to non-disabled staff.
Disabled Staff Engagement	
9b	Has your organisation taken action to facilitate the voices of disabled staff in your organisation to be heard (Yes or No)
Board Representation	
10	Percentage difference between the organisation's board voting membership and its organisation's overall workforce, disaggregated: - By voting and non-voting membership of the Board

The table above details the WDES metrics and where the source of the data can be found.

1. WDES Indicator 1 - Percentage of disabled 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

Table 1: Overall Workforce

Band	No	Yes	Not Declared	Band	No	Yes	Not Declared
Band 1	100.00%	0.00%	0.00%	Band 1	1		
Band 2	90.00%	10.00%	0.00%	Band 2	36	4	
Band 3	85.20%	9.42%	5.38%	Band 3	190	21	12
Band 4	85.42%	8.33%	6.25%	Band 4	41	4	3
Band 5	86.21%	9.85%	3.94%	Band 5	175	20	8
Band 6	79.17%	11.81%	9.03%	Band 6	114	17	13
Band 7	86.84%	7.89%	5.26%	Band 7	66	6	4
Band 8A	93.65%	4.76%	1.59%	Band 8A	59	3	1
Band 8B	78.95%	15.79%	5.26%	Band 8B	15	3	1
Band 8C	88.89%	11.11%	0.00%	Band 8C	8	1	
Band 8D	100.00%	0.00%	0.00%	Band 8D	1		
Director	83.33%	16.67%	0.00%	Director	5	1	
Medical Staff	91.67%	5.56%	2.78%	Medical Staff	33	2	1
Grand Total	85.62%	9.44%	4.95%	Grand Total	744	82	43

Table 2: Clinical disabled staff by band

Band	No	Yes	Not Declared	Band	No	Yes	Not Declared
Band 3	84.93%	10.96%	4.11%	Band 3	124	16	6
Band 4	83.33%	5.56%	11.11%	Band 4	15	1	2
Band 5	87.12%	9.82%	3.07%	Band 5	142	16	5
Band 6	77.24%	13.82%	8.94%	Band 6	95	17	11
Band 7	83.61%	9.84%	6.56%	Band 7	51	6	4
Band 8A	93.62%	6.38%	0.00%	Band 8A	44	3	
Band 8B	87.50%	6.25%	6.25%	Band 8B	14	1	1
Band 8C	100.00%	0.00%	0.00%	Band 8C	5		
Director	50.00%	50.00%	0.00%	Director	1	1	
Medical Staff	91.67%	5.56%	2.78%	Medical Staff	33	2	1
Grand Total	84.93%	10.21%	4.86%	Grand Total	524	63	30

Table 3: Non-Clinical disabled staff by band

Band	No	Yes	Not Declared	Band	No	Yes	Not Declared
Band 1	100.00%	0.00%	0.00%	Band 1	1		
Band 2	90.00%	10.00%	0.00%	Band 2	36	4	
Band 3	85.71%	6.49%	7.79%	Band 3	66	5	6
Band 4	86.67%	10.00%	3.33%	Band 4	26	3	1
Band 5	82.50%	10.00%	7.50%	Band 5	33	4	3
Band 6	90.48%	0.00%	9.52%	Band 6	19		2
Band 7	100.00%	0.00%	0.00%	Band 7	15		
Band 8A	93.75%	0.00%	6.25%	Band 8A	15		1
Band 8B	33.33%	66.67%	0.00%	Band 8B	1	2	
Band 8C	75.00%	25.00%	0.00%	Band 8C	3	1	
Band 8D	100.00%	0.00%	0.00%	Band 8D	1		
Director	100.00%	0.00%	0.00%	Director	4		
Grand Total	87.30%	7.54%	5.16%	Grand Total	220	19	13

2. WDES Indicator 2 – Relative likelihood of Disabled staff compared to non-disabled staff being appointed from shortlisting across all posts

Table 4: Relative likelihood of non-disabled staff being appointed from shortlisting across all posts:

	Total	Disability – No	Disability - Yes	Unknown
Shortlisted applicants	3142	2763	321	58
Appointed from shortlisting	257	241	15	1
Percentage of applicants appointed following shortlisting	8.18 %	8.72%	4.67%	1.72%

The relative likelihood of non-disabled staff being appointed from shortlisting compared to disabled staff is **1.87**. A figure above '1' indicates that non-disabled candidates are more likely than disabled candidates to be appointed from shortlisting.

3. WDES Indicator 3 - Relative likelihood of Disabled staff compared to non-disabled staff entering the formal capability process, as measured by entry into the formal capability procedure.

Table 5: Relative likelihood of disabled staff entering the formal capability process compared to white staff:

	Total	Non-Disabled	Disabled	Prefer not to say
Workforce	869	744	82	43
Number of staff entering the formal capability process	2	2	0	0

Percentage of staff entering the formal disciplinary Process	0.23%	0.27%	0.00%	0.00%
--	-------	-------	-------	-------

The relative likelihood of disabled staff entering the formal capability process compared to non-disabled staff is **0.00**.

4. WDES Indicator 4 – Percentage of Disabled staff compared to non-disabled staff experiencing harassment, bullying or abuse.

Table 6: Percentage of staff experiencing harassment, bullying or abuse from patients, relatives or the public in the last 12 months

	Non-disabled	Disabled
Percentage of staff reporting harassment, bullying or abuse from patients, service users, relatives or other member of the public	26%	29%

Table 7: Percentage of staff experiencing harassment, bullying or abuse from managers in the last 12 months

	Non-disabled	Disabled
Percentage of staff reporting harassment, bullying or abuse from managers	8%	20%

Table 8: Percentage of staff experiencing harassment, bullying or abuse from other colleagues in the last 12 months

	Non-disabled	Disabled
Percentage of staff reporting harassment, bullying or abuse from other colleagues	11%	26%

5. WDES Indicator 5 - Percentage of Disabled staff compared to non-disabled staff believing that the organisation provides equal opportunities for career progression or promotion.

Table 9: Percentage of disabled compared to non-disabled staff believing that Spectrum provide equal opportunities for career progression or promotion

	Non-disabled	Disabled
Percentage of staff reporting equal opportunities for career progression or promotion	87%	80%

- 6. WDES Indicator 6** – 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.

Table 10: Percentage of disabled compared to non-disabled staff saying that they have felt pressure from their managers to come to work despite not feeling well enough to perform their duties

	Non-disabled	Disabled
Percentage of staff reporting feeling pressure from their managers to come to work when not feeling well enough.	20%	27%

- 7. WDES Indicator 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.

Table 11: Percentage of disabled compared to non-disabled staff saying they are satisfied with the extent to which the organisation values their work

	Non-disabled	Disabled
Percentage of staff reporting they are satisfied with the extent to which the organisation values their work	48%	36%

- 8. WDES Indicator 8** – Percentage of Disabled staff saying that their employer has made adequate adjustment(s) to enable them to carry out their work.

Table 12: Percentage of disabled staff saying that Spectrum has made adequate adjustments to enable them to carry out their work:

	Percentage
Percentage of Disabled staff saying that Spectrum has made adequate adjustment(s) to enable them to carry out their work	38% *

*44% of staff have indicated that they do not require any adjustments to be made

- 9. WDES Indicator 9** – Disabled Staff Engagement Score

Table 13: Disabled staff engagement score

	Non-disabled	Disabled
Disabled engagement by mean score (disabled responses/count)	7.2	6.6

10. WDES Indicator 10 - Percentage difference between the organisation's board voting membership and its organisation's overall workforce, including voting and non-voting membership of the Board

Table 14: Percentage difference between Spectrum's Board voting membership and its overall workforce

	Total Workforce	Total Board Members	Non-disabled Workforce	Non-disabled Board	Disabled Workforce	Disabled Board	Prefer not to say Workforce	Prefer not to say Board members
Board Members (all voting members)	869	15	744	12	82	2	43	1
Percentage overall	-	-	85.62%	80%	9.44%	13.33%	4.95%	6.67%

The percentage difference between Spectrum's Board voting membership and its overall workforce is **+3.89% who have a disability**. A minus demonstrates there are fewer disabled voting members of the Board who have declared a disability compared to the workforce.

3.Current Workforce Disability Equality Standard (WDES)

Workforce Disability Equality Standard (WDES) Indicators	Staff	Spectrum 2023/2024	Spectrum 2024/2025	Comparison	National Results	Progress in Comparison to previous year
WDES 1 – Percentage of staff in Agenda for Change pay bands or medical and dental subgroups and VSM compared to the percentage of staff in the overall workforce	Not disabled	84.30%	85.62%	↑		Slight increase in workforce diversity. Work has been undertaken to support staff to in keeping their EDI information up to date on ESR so the number of ‘unknown’ has decreased from last year
	Disabled	9.03%	9.44%	↑	5.7%	
	Unknown	6.67%	4.95%	↓	14.3%	
WDES 2 - Relative likelihood of non-disabled staff compared to disabled staff being appointed from shortlisting across all posts.		1.71	1.87	↑	1.00	There is a slight increase in the likelihood that non-disabled applicantst are being appointed from shortlisting compared to disabled applicants
WDES 3 – Relative likelihood of disabled staff compared to non-disabled staff entering the formal capability process on the grounds of performance as measured by entry into the formal capability procedure.		0.00	0.00	-	1.25	As per last year, there are no comparators as none of the workforce have entered the formal capability process.
WDES 4 – Percentage of disabled staff compared to non-disabled staff, experiencing harassment, bullying or abuse from: - patients, relatives or the public	Disabled	29%	29%	-	30.0%	There has been a reduction in the percentage of non-disabled staff reporting harassment, bullying and abuse from patients and colleagues.
	Non-disabled	27%	26%	↓	23.3%	
- Managers	Disabled	20%	20%	-	14.6%	A small increase the percentage of non-disabled staff reporting harassment, bullying and abuse from managers
	Non-disabled	7%	8%	↑	8.2%	
- Other colleagues	Disabled	24%	26%	↑	23.8%	A small increase in harassment from colleagues for disabled employees, but a considerable decrease for non-disabled employees
	Non-disabled	16%	11%	↓	15.4%	

WDES 5 – Percentage of disabled compared to non-disabled staff believing that Spectrum provide equal opportunities for career progression or promotion	Disabled	78%	80%	↑	52.2%	Small increase in both disabled and non-disabled staff believing in equal opportunities for progression or promotion, both being above the national average
	Non-disabled	84%	87%	↑	58.1%	
WDES 6 – 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.	Disabled	25%	27%	↑	26.6%	Slight improvement for non-disabled staff, but this percentage has unfortunately increased for disabled staff. We have introduced the Health and Wellbeing Group to provide a forum to share health and wellbeing issues and concerns to try and help with this.
	Non-disabled	22%	20%	↓	18.5%	
WDES 7 - Percentage of disabled staff compared to non-disabled staff saying that they are satisfied with the extent to which the organisation values their work	Disabled	42%	36%	↓	36.9%	Slight reduction across disabled and non-disabled, but our percentage is not too far off the national statistics.
	Non-disabled	50%	48%	↓	47.8%	
WDES 8 – Percentage of disabled staff saying that their employer has made reasonable adjustments to enable them to carry out their work.	Disabled	52% (33% did not require any adjustments)		38% (44% did not require any adjustments)	74.5%	There has been a reduction in the percentage of disabled staff feeling they have had reasonable adjustments made, but there has been an increase in the number of staff who do not need adjustments.
WDES 9a – The staff engagement score for disabled staff compared to non-disabled staff.	Disabled	6.7	6.6	↓	6.5	Slight reduction for disabled staff
	Non-disabled	7.2	7.2	-	7.0	
WDES 10 - Percentage difference between the organisation's board voting membership and its organisation's overall workforce, disaggregated: - By voting and non-voting membership of the Board	Disabled	-9.03%	+3.89%	↑	6.8% non-executive	An increase in board members disclosing a disability
					6.2% executive	

Workforce Disability Equality Standard (WDES) Action Plan 2025/26

Metric	Objective	Action/s	Timescales	Lead/s
1	Increase in staff declaring status	Continue to promote the declarations including an annual promote to all employees. The percentage of unknown status has gone down from 6.67% to 4.95% but can still be improved further. Monitor data quality via the National WOVEN reporting within ESR.	On-going	HL/TS
2	Increase the number of applicants with a disability who are appointed into role.	Ensure that job descriptions reflect reasonable adaptations for jobs so that disabled applicants are not put off applying. Agreed wording for Job Descriptions of Job Adverts to be agreed.	On-going	HR and OD Team Recruitment Team
4	Improve manager's ability to provide support to staff and providing information on how to raise concerns about issues.	Continue the roll-out of Leadership Development Programme with the support of OD Communicate steps that can be taken to raise concerns in relation to bullying and harassment Provide training to managers for undertaking effective 1:1 supervision	on-going	HR and OD Team FTSU Guardian

		Raising awareness of Freedom to Speak Up Guardian and role. Training and awareness on mental health Embedding a trauma informed approach into our leadership training		
4,5,6,7,8,9	Improved satisfaction for disabled staff in Spectrum CIC Staff Survey. Also monitor impact via HR employee relations issues for disabled staff.	Expansion of the Lived Experience Network to introduce a Disability Group Collaboration of Staff Networks, Staff Council and Health and Wellbeing Group to share and develop ideas Senior Leaders to be part of the Health and Wellbeing Group as either Mental Health First Aider, Health and Wellbeing Champion or Staff Network Member Continued provision of people policy training modules to support managers	on-going	All leaders HR and OD Head of Experience
6	Improved position in staff not feeling pressured into working when feeling unwell	As part of the improving attendance and wellbeing training to include information about supporting staff not at work and any reasonable adjustments that may need to be considered.	March 2026	HL/HR Team

		There was an improvement in non-disabled staff, but the rate for disabled staff feeling pressured went up by 2%		
8	Increasing awareness of how staff with disabilities and/or neurodiversity can be affected	Implementing the Accessibility Passport and providing training for Managers Supporting the use of OH to give advice to Managers Increasing support for existing staff Reviewing our recruitment processes around reasonable adjustments Stream of work with a focus around neurodiversity	On-Going	HR & OD All Leaders Head of Experience