



Workforce Disability Equality Standard (WDES)

Data Summary Report 2025/26

Spectrum Community Health CIC

Workforce Disability Equality Standard (WDES) – 2025/26

Contents:

- 1. Introduction**
- 2. WDES Metric 1 - Workforce Disability Equality Standard (WDES) Metric Reports**
- 3. WDES Metric 2 – Relative likelihood of Disabled staff compared to non-disabled staff being appointed from shortlisting across all posts**
- 4. 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.**
- 5. WDES Metric 4 – Percentage of Disabled staff compared to non-disabled staff experiencing harassment, bullying or abuse.**
- 6. WDES Metric 5 - Percentage of Disabled staff compared to non-disabled staff believing that the trust provides equal opportunities for career progression or promotion.**
- 7. 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.**
- 8. 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.**
- 9. WDES Metric 8 – Percentage of Disabled staff saying that their employer has made adequate adjustment(s) to enable them to carry out their work.**
- 10. WDES Metric 9 – Disabled Staff Engagement**
- 11. WDES Metric 10 – Percentage difference between the organisation's board voting membership and its organisation's overall workforce**

1. Introduction

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 2025 and 31 March 2026.

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 2026.

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. This includes backfill staff.

Table 1: Overall Workforce

Band	No	Yes	Not Declared	Band	No	Yes	Not Declared
Band 2	87.18%	10.26%	2.56%	Band 2	34	4	1
Band 3	85.42%	10.42%	4.17%	Band 3	246	30	12
Band 4	83.93%	10.71%	5.36%	Band 4	47	6	3
Band 5	82.76%	11.21%	6.03%	Band 5	192	26	14
Band 6	83.47%	9.27%	7.26%	Band 6	207	23	18
Band 7	89.42%	6.73%	3.85%	Band 7	93	7	4
Band 8a	88.06%	8.96%	2.99%	Band 8a	59	6	2
Band 8b	80.77%	11.54%	7.69%	Band 8b	21	3	2
Band 8c	80.00%	4.00%	16.00%	Band 8c	20	1	4
Band 8d	100.00%	0.00%	0.00%	Band 8d	3		
Director	100.00%	0.00%	0.00%	Director	5		
Medical Staff	87.72%	10.53%	1.75%	Medical Staff	50	6	1
Grand Total	84.96%	9.74%	5.30%	Grand Total	977	112	61

Table 2: Clinical disabled staff by band

Band	No	Yes	Not Declared	Band	No	Yes	Not Declared
Band 2	100.00%	0.00%	0.00%	Band 2	1		
Band 3	86.21%	10.84%	2.96%	Band 3	175	22	6
Band 4	81.82%	9.09%	9.09%	Band 4	18	2	2
Band 5	83.84%	10.61%	5.56%	Band 5	166	21	11
Band 6	82.82%	10.13%	7.05%	Band 6	188	23	16
Band 7	88.51%	6.90%	4.60%	Band 7	77	6	4
Band 8a	89.09%	9.09%	1.82%	Band 8a	49	5	1
Band 8b	86.96%	4.35%	8.70%	Band 8b	20	1	2
Band 8c	81.82%	0.00%	18.18%	Band 8c	18		4
Band 8d	100.00%	0.00%	0.00%	Band 8d	1		
Medical Staff	87.72%	10.53%	1.75%	Medical Staff	50	6	1
Grand Total	85.16%	9.60%	5.25%	Grand Total	763	86	47

Table 3: Non-Clinical disabled staff by band

Band	No	Yes	Not Declared	Band	No	Yes	Not Declared
Band 2	86.84%	10.53%	2.63%	Band 2	33	4	1
Band 3	83.53%	9.41%	7.06%	Band 3	71	8	6
Band 4	85.29%	11.76%	2.94%	Band 4	29	4	1
Band 5	76.47%	14.71%	8.82%	Band 5	26	5	3
Band 6	90.48%	0.00%	9.52%	Band 6	19		2
Band 7	94.12%	5.88%	0.00%	Band 7	16	1	
Band 8a	83.33%	8.33%	8.33%	Band 8a	10	1	1
Band 8b	33.33%	66.67%	0.00%	Band 8b	1	2	
Band 8c	66.67%	33.33%	0.00%	Band 8c	2	1	
Band 8d	100.00%	0.00%	0.00%	Band 8d	2		
Director	100.00%	0.00%	0.00%	Director	5		
Grand Total	84.25%	10.24%	5.51%	Grand Total	214	26	14

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	Non-disabled	Disabled	Unknown
Shortlisted applicants	2854	2449	331	74
Appointed from shortlisting	344	270	30	44
Percentage of applicants appointed following shortlisting	12.05%	11.02%	9.06%	59.46%

The relative likelihood of non-disabled staff being appointed from shortlisting compared to disabled staff is **1.22**. 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 non-disabled staff

	Total	Non-Disabled	Disabled	Prefer not to say
Workforce	1150	977	112	61
Number of staff entering the formal capability process	1	1	0	0
Percentage of staff entering the formal capability process	0.87%	0.10%	0.00%	0.00%

The relative likelihood of disabled staff entering the formal cabability 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	23%	36%

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	4%	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	14%	30%

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%	71%

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.	52%	73%

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	46%	30%

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	41

*41% 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)	6.3	7.1

10. **WDES Indicator 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

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)	1150	14	977	13	112	1	61	0
Percentage overall			84.96%	92.86%	9.74%	7.14%	5.30%	0.00%

The percentage difference between Spectrum's Board voting membership and its overall workforce is **-2.60%**.

3.Current Workforce Disability Equality Standard (WDES)

Workforce Disability Equality Standard (WDES) Indicators	Staff	Spectrum 2024/2025	Spectrum 2025/2026	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	85.62%	84.96%	↓	81.4%	Slight decrease 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 and is below the national average
	Disabled	9.44%	9.74%	↑	6.7%	
	Unknown	9.44%	5.30%	↓	11.9%	
WDES 2 - Relative likelihood of non-disabled staff compared to disabled staff being appointed from shortlisting across all posts.		1.87	1.22	↓	0.95	There is an decrease in the likelihood that non-disabled applicanst 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	-	-	As per last year, there are no comparators as none of the workforce have entered the formal capability process. National data is not available.
WDES 4 – Percentage of disabled staff compared to non-disabled staff, experiencing harassment, bullying or abuse from: - patients, relatives or the public	Disabled	29%	36%	↑	29.6%	There has been a reduction in the percentage of non-disabled staff reporting harassment, bullying and abuse from patients and colleagues, but an increase in disable staff reporting abuse, taking this above the national average
	Non-disabled	26%	23%	↓	23.4%	
- Managers	Disabled	20%	20%	-	13.9%	A decrease the percentage of non-disabled staff reporting harassment, bullying and abuse from managers. Disable staff reporting abuse is anove the national average.
	Non-disabled	8%	4%	↑	7.6%	
- Other colleagues	Disabled	26%	30%	↑	23.4%	

	Non-disabled	11%	14%	↑	15.1%	A small increase in harassment from colleagues for disabled and non-disabled employees.
WDES 5 – Percentage of disabled compared to non-disabled staff believing that Spectrum provide equal opportunities for career progression or promotion	Disabled	80%	71%	↓	51.8%	Small increase in disabled staff believing in equal opportunities for progression or promotion, both being above the national average
	Non-disabled	87%	87%	-	57.9%	
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	27%	-		26.6%	This years Staff Survey question was slightly different so we are unable to have a comparison for this year – please see below for the question that our staff was asked
	Non-disabled	20%	-		18.5%	
WDES 6 – Percentage of disabled staff compared to non-disabled staff saying that they have come to work despite being unwell in the last 3 months	Disabled	-	73%		-	This question was not asked in the national survey so there are no comparisons available
	Non-disabled	-	52%		-	
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	36%	30%	↓	36.7%	Slight reduction across disabled and non-disabled, but our percentage is not too far off the national statistics.
	Non-disabled	48%	46%	↓	47.7%	
WDES 8 – Percentage of disabled staff saying that their employer has made reasonable adjustments to enable them to carry out their work.	Disabled	38% (44% did not require any adjustments)	41% (41% did not require any adjustments)	↑	75.3%	There has been an increase in the percentage of disabled staff feeling they have had reasonable adjustments made, but this is still below the national average
WDES 9a – The staff engagement score for disabled staff compared to non-disabled staff.	Disabled	6.6	7.1	↑	6.45	Slight increase for disabled staff and slight reduction for non-disabled staff.
	Non-disabled	7.2	6.3	↓	7.01	

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 (A minus demonstrates there are fewer disabled voting members of the Board who have declared a disability compared to the workforce.)	Disabled	+3.89%	-2.60%	↓	+3.0%	An decrease in board members disclosing a disability
--	----------	--------	--------	---	-------	--

Workforce Disability Equality Standard (WDES) Action Plan 2026/27

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 9.4% to 5.3% but can still be improved further. Monitor data quality via the National WOVEN reporting within ESR.	On-going	People and Culture ESR Lead
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. Recruitment training to include consideration of reasonable adjustments.	On-going	People and Culture 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	on-going	People and Culture OD Team Head of Experience/FTSU Guardian

		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 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 The 'Not Part of The Job' campaign was launched in June 2026, supported by Communications. Ongoing review of campaign and materials		Safeguarding Team We are confident this is all having a positive effect but would like to leave it going for another year and will review again to be certain.
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.	The introduction of the Staff Inclusion Network which now incorporates all the previous individual networks. Collaboration of the Staff Inclusion Networks, Staff Council and Health & Wellbeing Group to share and develop ideas Senior Leaders to be part of the Health and Wellbeing Group as either Wellbeing	on-going	All leaders People and Culture OD Head of Experience/FTSU Guardian

		Buddies, Health and Wellbeing Champion or Staff Network Member Continued provision of people policy training modules to support managers		
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. There was an improvement in non-disabled staff, but the rate for disabled staff feeling pressured went up by 2%	March 2026	People and Culture Different questions between our staff survey and the national results mean the results are not comparable. Will review again next year and see if the questions align.
8	Increasing awareness of how staff with disabilities and/or neurodiversity can be affected Increase staff accessibility	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, including consideration of the provision of training.	On-Going	People and Culture All Leaders Head of Experience

		Stream of work with a focus around neurodiversity		
4	Reduce percentage of disabled staff compared to non-disabled staff, experiencing harassment, bullying or abuse, as this has increased across all areas = from patients, managers and other staff	• Creating a Zero Tolerance awareness for staff • Providing training • Visible awareness – posters etc. • The 'Not Part of The Job' campaign was launched in June 2026, supported by Communications. Ongoing review of campaign and materials	June 2026 and on-going	People and Culture/Head of Experience/Staff Inclusion Network