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**Workforce Disability Equality Standard**

**(WDES) Report 2025**



**Introduction**

The Workforce Disability Equality Standard (WDES) is a set of ten specific measures (metrics) which enables NHS organisations to compare the workplace and career experiences of Disabled and non-disabled staff. NHS trusts use the metrics data to develop and publish an action plan. Year on year comparison enables trusts to demonstrate progress against the indicators of disability equality.

The WDES is important, because research shows that a motivated, included and valued workforce helps to deliver high quality patient care, increased patient satisfaction and improved patient safety.

The WDES enables NHS organisations to better understand the experiences of their Disabled staff and supports positive change for all existing employees by creating a more inclusive environment for disabled people working and seeking employment in the NHS.

This report summarises the Trust position, and progress against the 10 indicators of the NHS Workforce Disability Equality Standard.

This document reports on the Trust’s workforce data and activity between 1 April 2024 and 31 March 2025.

**The WDES Indicators**



**Workforce indicators**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Indicator | Descriptor |
| 1 | Percentage of staff in each of the AfC Bands 1-9, Medical and Dental and VSM staff groups compared by: • Non-Clinical staff & Clinical staff |
| 2 | Relative likelihood of staff being appointed from shortlisting across all posts |
| 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. |



**National NHS staff survey indicators**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Indicator | Descriptor |
| 4 | a) Percentage of Disabled staff compared to non-disabled staffexperiencing harassment, bullying or abuse from:i. Patients/Service users, their relatives or other members of the publicii. Managersiii. Other colleaguesb) Percentage of Disabled staff compared to non-disabled staff saying that the last time they experienced harassment, bullying or abuse at work, they or a colleague reported it. |
| 5 | Percentage of Disabled staff compared to non-disabled staff believing that the Trust provides 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 their organisation values their work. |
| 8 | Percentage of Disabled staff saying that their employer has made adequate adjustment(s) to enable them to carry out their work. |
| 9 | a) The staff engagement score for Disabled staff, compared to non-disabled staff.b) Has your Trust taken action to facilitate the voices of Disabled staff in your organisation to be heard? (Yes) or (No) |



 **Board representation indicator**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Indicator | Descriptor |
| 10 | Percentage difference between the organisation’s Board voting membership and its organisation’s overall workforce, disaggregated: • By voting membership of the Board. • By Executive membership of the Board.  |

**Reporting against the WDES indicators**

**Indicator 1: Percentage of staff in each of the AfC bands 1-9, medical and dental and VSM staff groups compared by: non-clinical staff & clinical staff.**

Figure 1 (below) shows the distribution of disabled/non-disabled staff across the AfC pay bands in the non-clinical workforce, for both 2024 and 2025.

*Figure 1*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|   | **Change 2024-2025** |
|   | **Disabled** | **Not Disabled** | **Unknown** |
| **Cluster 1: AfC Bands <1 to 4** | 1% | 0% | -1% |
| **Cluster 2: AfC Bands 5 to 7** | 2% | -2% | 0% |
| **Cluster 3: AfC Bands 8a to 8b** | 4% | -4% | 0% |
| **Cluster 4: AfC Bands 8c to VSM** | 0% | 3% | -3% |

Summary analysis shows that:

* There has been an increase in the proportion of staff self-reporting disability across bands 1-4 (1%), bands 5-7 (2%), and bands 8a and 8b (4%).
* There has been an improvement in declaration rates in 2025 in bands 1-4 and bands 8c to VSM, which has shown that there are no staff with a disability in bands 8c to VSM.

Figure 2 (below) shows the distribution of disabled/non-disabled staff across the AfC pay bands in the clinical workforce, for both 2023 and 2024.

The table below shows the changes in the last 12 months:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|   | **Change 2024-25** |
|   | **Disabled** | **Not Disabled** | **Unknown** |
| **Cluster 1: AfC Bands <1 -4** | 1% | 0% | -1% |
| **Cluster 2: AfC Bands 5 to 7** | 1% | 1% | -2% |
| **Cluster 3: AfC Bands 8a to 8b** | 0% | 1% | -1% |
| **Cluster 4: AfC Bands 8c to VSM** | 0% | 0% | 0% |
| **Cluster 5: Med&Den Staff, Consultants** | 0% | -11% | 11% |
| **Cluster 6: Med&Den Staff, Career grade** | 2% | -9% | 6% |
| **Cluster 7: Med&Den Staff, Trainee grade** | 1% | -2% | 1% |

Summary analysis shows that:

* There has been a small increase in the proportion of disabled staff in Clusters 1 and 2 and medical clusters 6 and 7 (SAS grade doctors and Trainee Grade).
* There has been small reduction in the proportion of unknown data, in AfC clinical staff (Clusters 1,2 and 3.
* There has been a significant increase in the proportion of unknown data, in medical clusters (particularly clusters 5 and 6).

**Indicator 2: Relative likelihood of staff being appointed from shortlisting across all posts.**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Relative likelihood in 2024 | Relative likelihood in 2025 | Difference +/- |
| Relative likelihood of disabled staff being appointed from shortlisting across all posts | 1.03 | 1.17 | + 0.14 |

Disabled staff are equally likely to be appointed from shortlisting as non-disabled staff as there is no statistical difference in the likelihood of disabled staff being appointed from a shortlist compared to non-disabled staff. This a small decline on the metric from last year but it is still statistically insignificant.

**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.**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Relative likelihood in 2024 | Relative likelihood in 2025 | Difference +/- |
| Relative likelihood of Disabled staff compared to non-disabled staff entering the formal capability process, as measured by entry into the formal capability procedure | 9 | 13.9 | +4.9 |

There has been a significant increase in the relative ratio of disabled staff entering the capability procedure, compared to the previous 12 months. **It should be noted that the figures represent 1 disabled people and 1 non disabled people entering the process. When numbers are this small, it demonstrates the mathematical limitations of this metric.**

**Indicator 4: a) Percentage of disabled staff compared to non-disabled staff experiencing harassment, bullying or abuse from:**

**i. Patients/Service users, their relatives or other members of the public**

**ii. Managers**

**iii. Other colleagues**

**b) Percentage of disabled staff compared to non-disabled staff saying that the last time they experienced harassment, bullying or abuse at work, they or a colleague reported it.**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|   | 2023 | 2024 | Change |
|   | Disabled staff | Non-disabled staff | Disabled staff | Non-disabled staff | Disabled staff | Non-disabled staff |
| Percentage of staff experiencing harassment, bullying or abuse from patients, relatives or the public in last 12 months | 26.03% | 20.47% | 26.42% | 20.44% | +0.39% | -0.03% |
| Percentage of staff experiencing harassment, bullying or abuse from managers in last 12 months | 14.78% | 6.60% | 16.81% | 7.18% | +2.03% | +0.58% |
| Percentage of staff experiencing harassment, bullying or abuse from other colleagues in last 12 months | 19.15% | 10.77% | 23.34% | 14.01% | +4.19% | +3.24% |
|   |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Percentage of staff saying that the last time they experienced harassment, bullying or abuse at work, they or a colleague reported it | 44.26% | 45.72% | 49.65% | 46.96% |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| +5.39% | -0.02% |

 | +1.24% |

There has been a small increase in the proportion of disabled staff experiencing harassment, bullying or abuse from either patients/relatives (0.39%), but a larger increase in the proportion reporting harassment from managers (2.03%). The largest increase is the proportion of disabled staff experiencing harassment, bullying or abuse from colleagues (4.19%). Similarly, there was an increase in the proportion of non-disabled staff experiencing this treatment from colleagues (3.24%). The increases are larger for disabled staff across all questions.

There has been a large increase in the proportion of disabled staff reporting any abusive treatment when it had occurred (5.39%).

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

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|   | 2023 | 2024 | Change |
|   | Disabled staff | Non-disabled staff | Disabled staff | Non-disabled staff | Disabled staff | Non-disabled staff |
| Percentage of Disabled staff compared to non-disabled staff believing that the Trust provides equal opportunities for career progression or promotion. | 51.10% | 60.19% | 52.12% | 58.79% | +1.02% | -1.40% |

Disabled staff are still positive than non-disabled staff in relation to believing that the Trust provides equal opportunities for career progression or promotion. The score for disabled staff has increased slightly in the last 12 months, whereas the score for non-disabled staff has decrease by 1.40%.

**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.**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|   | 2023 | 2024 | Change |
|   | Disabled staff | Non-disabled staff | Disabled staff | Non-disabled staff | Disabled staff | Non-disabled staff |
| 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 | 25.45% | 16.74% | 26.15% | 17.40% | +0.70% | +0.66% |

Disabled staff are less positive than 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. There has been a small increase in this metric for both disabled and non-disabled staff.

**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.**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|   | 2023 | 2024 | Change |
|   | Disabled staff | Non-disabled staff | Disabled staff | Non-disabled staff | Disabled staff | Non-disabled staff |
| Percentage of Disabled staff compared to non-disabled staff saying that they are satisfied with the extent to which their organisation values their work. | 36.19% | 47.54% | 37.25% | 47.96% | +1.06% | +0.42% |

Disabled staff are less positive than non-disabled staff when asked if they are satisfied with the extent to which their organisation values their work. There has been an improvement in this score for both disabled staff and non disabled staff in the last 12 months, particularly for disabled staff.

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

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | 2023 | 2024 | Change |
| Percentage of Disabled staff saying that their employer has made adequate adjustment(s) to enable them to carry out their work. | 79.70% | 78.05% | -1.65% |

78.05% of disabled staff say that the organisation has made adequate adjustments to enable them to carry out their work. This is a decrease of 1.65% in the previous 12 months.

**Indicator 9: a) The staff engagement score for disabled staff, compared to non-disabled staff. b) Has your Trust taken action to facilitate the voices of disabled staff in your organisation to be heard? (Yes) or (No)**

(a) Staff Engagement Scores of Disabled Staff v Non-Disabled Staff

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Trust Score** | **Not disabled staff** | **Disabled staff** |
| Engagement Score | 6.87 | 7.00 | 6.50 |

The engagement score for disabled staff is lower than that of non-disabled staff (7.00 compared to 6.50 respectively).

b) Has your Trust taken action to facilitate the voices of Disabled staff in your organisation to be heard? **Yes**

The Trust has an established network for disabled staff (DAWN). The network is represented on the trust Staff Side Partnership Forum (SPF). In the last 12 months, the network and its members have been instrumental in:

1. Development of a DAWN information Pack.
2. Launch of a Trust wide Disability Survey.
3. Delivery of Workplace Adjustment Training for Managers.
4. Promotion and use of the Reasonable Adjustment Guidance Documents.
5. Celebration of Disability History Month and International Day of Disabled People.
6. Celebration of National Day of Staff networks.

**Indicator 10: Percentage difference between the organisation’s Board voting membership and its organisation’s overall workforce, disaggregated:**

* **By voting membership of the Board**
* **By Executive membership of the Board**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Disabled | Not Disabled | Unknown |
| Board Membership | 0 | 13 | 0 |
| Of which;  Voting Board Members | 0 | 12 | 0 |
| Non-voting Board Members | 0 | 1 | 0 |
|  |  |  |  |
| Board Membership | 0 | 13 | 0 |
| Of which;Exec Board Members | 0 | 7 | 0 |
| Non-Exec Board Members | 0 | 6 | 0 |
|  |  |  |  |
| Number of staff in overall workforce | 401 | 4930 | 77 |
| Overall Workforce % by disability | 6.24% | 86.74% | 7.03% |
|  |  |  |  |
| Total Board members by disability (%) | 0% | 100% | 0% |
|  |  |  |  |
| Difference Board membership to overall workforce | -6% | 13% | -7% |