

SEXUAL ORIENTATION WORKFORCE EQUALITY STANDARD 2021/2022

	completeness of data does not include a question about CPD and non-mandatory training as the staff FFT did therefore information from the
	peen used for indicator 4.
	lating to reliability of comparisons with previous years
Total number	
	nin this organisation at the date of the report
7633 (data from	31 st March 2022)
p. Proportion of	LGB staff employed within this organisation at the date of the report
1 %	
3. Self-reporting	
3. Self-reporting	
	of total staff who have self-reported their sexual orientation
3. Self-reporting a. The proportion 90%	of total staff who have self-reported their sexual orientation
a. The proportion	of total staff who have self-reported their sexual orientation s been taken in the last reporting period to improve the level of self-reporting
a. The proportion	
a. The proportion 90% b. Have any step Yes	s been taken in the last reporting period to improve the level of self-reporting
a. The proportion 90% b. Have any step Yes	
a. The proportion 90% b. Have any step Yes c. Are any steps Yes	s been taken in the last reporting period to improve the level of self-reporting planned during the current reporting period to improve the level of self-reporting
a. The proportion 90% b. Have any step Yes c. Are any steps	s been taken in the last reporting period to improve the level of self-reporting planned during the current reporting period to improve the level of self-reporting
a. The proportion 90% b. Have any step Yes c. Are any steps Yes 4. Workforce da	s been taken in the last reporting period to improve the level of self-reporting planned during the current reporting period to improve the level of self-reporting
a. The proportion 90% b. Have any step Yes c. Are any steps Yes 4. Workforce da	s been taken in the last reporting period to improve the level of self-reporting planned during the current reporting period to improve the level of self-reporting a does the organisation's workforce data refer to

KEY:

Green = Improvement from the previous year
Amber = Remains the same or similar to previous year
Red = Decline from previous year

SEXUAL ORIENTATION WORKFORCE EQUALITY STANDARD

	Indicator	Data for reporting year 2022	Data for previous year 2021	Data for 2020, 2019, 2018, 2017	Narrative – the implications of the data and any additional background explanatory narrative	Action taken and planned including e.g. does the indicator link to EDS2 evidence and/or a corporate Equality Objective	Target date and person responsible
	For each of these four workforce indicators, compare the data for LGB staff and heterosexual staff.						
1	Percentage of staff in each of the AfC Bands 1-9 and VSM (including executive Board members) compared with the percentage of staff in the overall workforce. Organisations should undertake this calculation separately for non-	Please see appendix 1 at the end of the document for 2021/22 data.	Please see appendix 1 at the end of the document for 2020/21 data.		10% of staff have not declared their sexual orientation compared to 13% in 2021. In order to fully understand the experiences of LGB staff the organisation must continue to focus on increasing the demographic data for sexual orientation. The percentage of staff in non-clinical roles identifying as LGB is lower than in clinical roles.	Deliver a staff mid-career leadership programme for staff from protected characteristics which will include stretch/shadowing/developmental opportunities. Run a campaign to encourage staff to complete their demographic information on ESR. Analyse leavers information to identify any patterns or trends.	Q3 22/23 MB SD Q4 22/23 AH Q4 22/23 LC

	clinical and for clinical staff.						
2.	Relative likelihood of staff being appointed from shortlisting across all posts.	Heterosexual people are 1.09 times more likely to be appointed compared to LGB people.	Heterosexual people and LGB people and LGB people are equally likely to be appointed compared to LGB people.	2020 Heterosexual people and LGB people are equally likely to be appointed compared to LGB people. 2019 Heterosexual staff are 1.05 times more likely to be appointed from shortlisted posts than LGB staff.	The data shows a similar picture of the previous years. There is little difference in the likelihood of heterosexual people being appointed from shortlisting compared to LBG people.	Pilot a virtual interview platform (AYMMI), removing bias from the recruitment process. Run a pilot project exploring age bias in recruitment, identify learning for bias for other protected characteristic groups such as sexual orientation. Compare recruitment data to the 2021 Census data to identify if the organisation is recruiting a diverse workforce that reflects the local communities.	Q4 22/23 LH SD Q4 22/23 LH SD Q3 22/23 LC
3.	Relative likelihood of staff entering the formal disciplinary process, as measured by entry into a formal disciplinary investigation. This indicator will be based on data from last two year rolling average of the	LGB staff are 1.68 times more likely to enter disciplinary than heterosexual.	LGB staff are 1.11 times more likely to enter disciplinary than heterosexual.	2020 LGB staff are 1.49 times more likely to enter disciplinary than heterosexual 2019 LGB staff are 2.5 times more likely to enter the formal disciplinary	This indicator has worsened from last year, with LGB staff being 1.68 times more likely to enter disciplinary processes.	Work with the rainbow network to try and understand this data further. Analyse the disciplinary data.	Q3 22/23 AH LC Q3 22/23 LC

	current year and the previous year.			process than heterosexual staff.			
4.	Relative likelihood of staff accessing non-mandatory training and CPD.	LGB staff and heterosexual people are equally likely to report that they have access to the right learning and development opportunities when they need to.	LGB staff and heterosexual people are equally likely to respond positively on the staff FFT question on the question: I am able to access job relevant nonmandatory training and/or Continuing Professional Development opportunities	2020 LGB staff and heterosexual people are equally likely to respond positively on the staff FFT question on the question: I am able to access job relevant nonmandatory training and/or Continuing Professional Development opportunities 2019 Heterosexual staff and LGB staff are equally likely to access nonmandatory training and CPD.	This indicator has been taken from a response to the staff survey Q20e due to the new Pulse survey not including a relevant question.	Explore developing a more robust way to gather this data including exploring the information available on Workpal.	Q4 22/23 LC KA
	National NHS Staff Survey indicators (or equivalent). For each of the four staff survey indicators, compare						

	the outcomes of the responses for LGB and heterosexual staff.						
5.	KF 25. Percentage of staff experiencing harassment, bullying or abuse from patients, relatives or the public in last 12 months.	2021 Gay Man or Gay Woman (Lesbian) 33% Bisexual 33.3% Heterosexual (straight) 23.4%	2020 Gay Man or Gay Woman (Lesbian) 32.4% Bisexual 33.3% Heterosexual (straight) 23.7%	2019 Gay Man 38.2% Gay Woman (Lesbian) 33.3% Bisexual 26.7% Heterosexual (straight) 28.9% 2018 Gay Man 36% Gay Woman (Lesbian) 26% Bisexual 40% Heterosexual (straight) 26%	LGB staff continue to report higher levels of harassment and bullying from patients, relatives or the public compared to heterosexual staff.	Relaunch the hate campaign. Having a specific focus on homophobia. Launch and promote the hate crime checklist to improve prosecution rates. Analyse Datix information related to SO to understand the experiences of staff and trends.	Q3 22/23 AH Q2 22/23 SD Q3 22/23 AH LC
6.	KF 26. Percentage of staff experiencing harassment, bullying or abuse from staff in the last 12 months.	2021 Gay Man or Gay Woman (Lesbian) 16.2% Bisexual 20.8% Heterosexual (straight) 13.6%	2020 Gay Man or Gay Woman (Lesbian) 17.6% Bisexual 30% Heterosexual (straight) 15.2%	2019 Gay Man 23.5% Gay Woman (Lesbian) 20.9% Bisexual 20% Heterosexual (straight) 14.8% 2018 Gay Man 18%	LGB staff report higher levels of harassment, bullying or abuse from staff than heterosexual staff. Bisexual staff report the highest levels. The percentages for LGB and Heterosexual staff have reduced this year.	Run 4 LGBTQ+ training sessions for staff. Work with the Rainbow network to understand the experiences of LGB staff also to include the experiences of trans and non-binary staff.	Q4 22/23 AH LC Q3 22/23 AH LC

				Gay Woman (Lesbian) 16% Bisexual 17% Heterosexual (straight) 15%			
7.	KF 21. Percentage believing that Trust provides equal opportunities for career progression or promotion.	Gay Man or Gay Woman (Lesbian) 66.4% Bisexual 49.1% Heterosexual (straight) 62.3%	2020 Gay Man or Gay Woman (Lesbian) 62.2% Bisexual 56.7% Heterosexual (straight) 64.9%	2019 Gay Man or Gay Woman (Lesbian) 67.5% Bisexual 56.7% Heterosexual (straight) 63.8% 2018 Gay Man or Gay Woman (Lesbian) 80.9% Bisexual 66.7% Heterosexual (straight) 69.3%	Bisexual staff are less likely than gay men, gay women and heterosexual staff to believe that the Trust provides equal opportunities for career progression or promotion. The percentage of gay men and gay women has improved whist bisexual staff worsened.	Analyse the LGBTQ+ leadership programme pilot feedback to understand staff's experiences. Explore the demand for a second LGBTQ+ leadership programme	Q2 22/23 AH Q3 22/23 AH
8.	Q17. In the last 12 months have you personally	2021 Gay Man or	2020 Gay Man or	2019 Gay Man 8.8%	Bisexual staff continue to be more likely to report experiencing	Explore with the psychology department running a survey to understand experiences of	Q3 22/23 AH

	experienced discrimination at work from any of the following? b) Manager/team leader or other colleagues.	Gay Woman (Lesbian) 6.8% Bisexual 12.7% Heterosexual (straight) 5.8%	Gay Woman (Lesbian) 5.4% Bisexual 23.3% Heterosexual (straight) 6%	Gay Woman (Lesbian) 11.6% Bisexual 6.9% Heterosexual (straight) 5.1% 2018 Gay Man 4% Gay Woman (Lesbian) 0% Bisexual 17% Heterosexual (straight) 5%	discrimination at work. This has decreased to 12.7% from 23.3% last year.	bisexual staff. This information would be included in relevant training.	
	Board representation indicator: For this indicator, compare the difference for LGB staff and heterosexual staff						
9.	Percentage difference between (i) the organisations' Board voting membership and its overall workforce and (ii) the organisations' Board executive membership and its overall workforce	2022 Percentage difference between organisations boards voting membership and its overall workforce = - 3.9% Percentage difference between organisations board executive membership and its overall	2021 Percentage difference between organisations boards voting membership and its overall workforce = +5% Percentage difference between organisations board executive membership and its overall	2020 Percentage difference between organisations boards voting membership and its overall workforce = +5% Percentage difference between organisations board executive membership and its overall	There is no one on the board who has identified as LGB. 7 board members have not declared their sexual orientation (asked but declined to provide a response or blank)	Request all board members update their demographic data on ESR.	Q3 22/23 SDS

		workforce = -	workforce =	workforce =			
		3.9%	+11%	+11%			
				2019 Percentage difference between organisations boards voting membership and its overall workforce = +8%			
				Percentage difference between organisations board executive membership and its overall workforce = +12.5%			
10.	The staff engagement score on the National Staff Survey for LGB staff, compared to heterosexual staff and the overall engagement score for the organisation. (out of 10)	2021 Gay Man or Gay Woman (Lesbian) 6.5 Bisexual 6.4 Heterosexual (straight) 6.9	2020 Gay Man or Gay Woman (Lesbian) 7 Bisexual 6.7 Heterosexual (straight) 7.2	2019 Gay Man 7 Gay Woman (Lesbian) 7.2 Bisexual 7.5 Heterosexual (straight) 7.1 2018 Gay Man 7.3 Gay Woman (Lesbian) 7.7 Bisexual 7	LGB staff have lower engagement scores than heterosexual staff, engagement scores have decreased for LGB and heterosexual staff.	Undertake consultation on what staff want from the Rainbow network.	Q3 22/23 AH

Heterosexual (straight) 7.3	
-----------------------------	--

APPENDIX 1

STAFF BREAKDOWN SEXUAL ORIENTATION 31st March 2022

		Clinical Staff %	
Band	Heterosexual	LGB	Not Declared
1-4	84% (1516)	5% (86)	11% (193)
5-7	88% (2844)	4% (144)	8% (294)
8ab	85% (283)	5% (17)	9% (30)
8cd	86% (96)	5% (5)	9% (10)
9	100% (1)	0%	0%
VSM	75% (15)	0%	25% (5)
Medics	61% (161)	4% (10)	35% (91)
	No	on-clinical staff %	6
Band	Heterosexual	LGB	Not Declared
1-4	86% (1182)	2% (22)	12% (169)
5-7	91% (336)	2% (9)	7% (24)
8ab	90% (82)	1% (1)	8% (7)
8cd	75% (18)	0%	25% (6)
9	0	0	0
VSM	0	0	0

STAFF BREAKDOWN SEXUAL ORIENTATION 31st March 2021

		Clinical Staff %					
Band	Heterosexual	LGB	Not Declared				
1-4	83%	4%	13%				
5-7	86%	4%	12%				
8ab	84%	5%	11%				
8cd	87%	3%	10%				
9	100%	0%	0%				
VSM	100%	0%	0%				
Medics	63%	2%	35%				
		Non-clinical staff %	' 0				
Band	Heterosexual	LGB	Not Declared				
1-4	85%	1%	14%				
5-7	89%	2%	9%				
8ab	92%	1%	7%				
8cd	82%	0%	18%				
9	0	0	0				
VSM	42%	0	58%				