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Note from Mr. Speaker
The House of Commons is committed to providing a positive and inclusive environment where people are valued for the essential skills and experience that they bring. We know that when people can be themselves they are happier and more motivated. Whilst we have made progress in recent years, there is still much to do to ensure that Parliament is more accessible, diverse and inclusive. We should both celebrate our success and continue to challenge ourselves to do better. Therefore, for the first time as part of the D&I Strategy 2019-2022, the House of Commons Commission has agreed targets for the representation of House staff mirroring national and London workforce figures. These targets will be monitored and will form part of the 2019 D&I Monitoring report.

Foreword
This is the 2018 annual Diversity Monitoring Report for the House of Commons and Parliamentary Digital Service, based on diversity data as at 31 March 2018. Our annual reports provide the evidence base for our D&I transformational change programme and allow us to monitor year on year our progress against our objectives. There are three key elements of the D&I transformational change programme 2019-2022, which together set the direction of travel with regards to D&I for the House Service for the next three years. These are:

- D&I Strategy 2019-2022
- The D&I Steering Group/governance and performance measures

The 2019-2022 Diversity and Inclusion Strategy underpins the strategic aim of the House of Commons to ‘support a thriving parliamentary democracy’. In supporting a thriving parliamentary democracy, it is vital that the staff of the House reflect the people we serve and that we deliver services which reflect the diversity of our democracy.

The Strategy identifies the challenges we face around:

- Underrepresentation at senior bands for BAME (Black, Asian and Minority ethnic) groups and women
- The experiences of staff with disabilities
- Harassment and bullying
- Ensuring that D&I is central to the services we provide to internal and external customers

Achievements in 2018
Leadership and Management
Delivered on the Speaker’s BAME Challenge Initiative by working with 50 external organisations on a practical toolkit to support BAME careers
Progressed 5 places in the Stonewall Workplace Equality Index to 23rd.
Named 4th within the Government sector section of the index.
Signed up to Stonewall Trans Allies programme.
The House carried out an Inter Parliamentary Union (IPU) Gender Sensitive Parliament Audit.

Achieving Representation Targets at Senior Levels

- Established the Diversifying Senior Leadership Programme to tackle the barriers for women and Black, Asian and Minority Ethnic (BAME) people moving into senior roles.
- Introduced the Press Pause process for recruitment of members of the Strategy Delivery Group.
- In June 2018, the Liaison Committee recommended that “for Committees represented on the Liaison Committee, other than in circumstances where there are compelling reasons for an all-male panel, a panel of three or more witnesses should normally include at least one woman, when the witnesses involved are not specific office-holders such as Ministers or heads of key public sector organisations falling within the remit of the Department the Committee is scrutinising. Our aim is that, by the end of this Parliament, at least 40% of discretionary witnesses should be female”.
- The EU Statutory Instruments Committee, established in July 2018, is the first select committee with a requirement for a gender-balanced membership.

Talent Management

- Further developed the Apprentices programme.
- Extended the places on the Speaker’s Parliamentary Placement Scheme for people with disabilities.
- Piloted a new social mobility work experience in CCT, offering work experience to 20 school and university students in conjunction with the Social Mobility Foundation, Villiers Park charity and the City University.
- Rolled out unconscious bias training.
- Developed a new workplace adjustments process for Members, Members’ staff and staff of the House of Commons and Digital Service.
- Piloted BSL live interpretation, conducted in Westminster Hall alongside testing of live subtitling by the broadcasting team - lessons learnt from the pilot will be taken forward.
• The Select Committee Engagement Team embedded good practice by engaging people with disabilities in the enquiries process, ensuring their voices have been heard.

Wider Organisational Culture

• The House agreed on a new Behaviour Code, Bullying and Harassment Policy and Sexual Misconduct Policy.
• The House passed a motion in February 2018 in favour of allowing Members who have had a baby or adopted a child to vote by proxy. The Procedure Committee recommended an approach and during a General Debate in September the Leader of the House promised to bring forward a substantive motion “as soon as possible”.
• Production of an accessible Guide to Procedure is underway and has been published on the website. The Procedure Committee has published proposals for gender-neutral Standing Orders.
• Key learning resources for schools have been reviewed and updated for SEND (Special Educational Needs and Disability) groups to make them more inclusive.
• We have held special SEND friendly days for schools in the Education Centre.
• The Vote 100 programme engaged communities across the UK in conversations about the gender representation and equality in public office.

Monitoring and Quality Assurance

• A breakdown of witnesses by gender is now published as part of the annual sessional return for each committee and consideration is being given to how this might be extended.
• Established a requirement for the House Service to provide D&I data on select committee witnesses at the end of each session and establish annual rolling targets for witness representation.

Thank you to all those who have shared their information and to those who compiled this report.

Jennifer Crook

Head of Diversity and Inclusion
Executive summary

Highlights

1.1: Professor Sarah Childs’ The Good Parliament report (2016) recommended that the Commons Reference Group follow the "40, 40, 20” rule.¹ The rule states that “no one sex/gender should be represented at less than 40 percent, and no one sex/gender represented at more than 60 percent (this rule also allows for those who reject binary identities)”. Following this rule as best practice, we have achieved it in almost all teams and pay bands. The only pay bands that do not meet the “40, 40, 20” rule are pay bands D and Other.

1.2: For the first time, female representation in the most senior pay band, SCS, is over 40% at 42% – a 4% point increase from 2017. This indicates the success of a concerted programme of activity, “Diversifying Senior Leadership”.

1.3: In the second year of gender pay gap reporting, both the House of Commons and Parliamentary Digital Service (PDS) reduced their gender pay gaps. The House of Commons reduced its mean gender pay gap from 1.7% in 2017 to 1.5% in 2018 while maintaining a median gender pay gap of 1%. PDS reduced its mean gender pay gap from -5.21% in 2017, a gap in favour of women, to 0.63% in favour of men in 2018. PDS reduced its median gender pay gap from -4.16% in 2017 to 2.57% in 2018.² These figures compare very favourably both with the public sector as a whole and with the Civil Service:³

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2018 Mean gender pay gap</th>
<th>2018 Median gender pay gap</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Public sector</td>
<td>17.5%</td>
<td>19.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civil Service</td>
<td>9.8%</td>
<td>12.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>House of Commons</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PDS</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1.4: The proportion of disabled staff sharing their data is significantly higher than previously believed: 77%, compared to 37% in 2017. This is due to a technical fault in the way that HAIS (House Administration Information System) disability data was reported in previous years. This fault has been corrected and we are now in a position to make recommendations to support disabled staff in the House based on more accurate evidence. However, the data used in this report includes non-House interim staff, which will be corrected for the 2019 report.

The number of staff sharing whether they have a disability is the second highest of any voluntary diversity question, following ethnicity. At 77%, this exceeds our internal benchmark of 70% and allows us to provide a disaggregated analysis by team.

1.5: The proportion of BAME staff has risen to 20% of all staff. Of those who shared their data, 23% were BAME. This compares favourably to 12% of Civil Service staff and 13% of the economically active UK population.

1.6: This is the first year in which we have conducted an intersectional analysis of the different characteristics: that is, we have looked at how they overlap with one another. This kind of analysis allows us to have a more detailed understanding of the diversity profile of the House, and to design more targeted interventions.

1.7: Due to sufficiently high rates of staff sharing their information we have been able to conduct intersectional analyses of the following: age and gender, gender and ethnicity, gender and ethnicity by pay band, ethnicity and sexual identity, and caring responsibilities, gender and working pattern.

1.7.1: Female and male minority ethnic staff have broadly equal representation in the highest pay bands (4% in SCS and A and 8% in B), though representation is low. White female and male staff have broadly equal representation in the highest pay bands (39% versus 40% in SCS and A, and 32% versus 33% in pay band B).

1.7.2: Of BAME staff who shared their sexual identity with us, 2% identified as lesbian, gay, bisexual or another sexual identity (LGB+), compared to 6% of White staff. With the exception of Christianity, which has high staff representation at 30.6%, LGB+ disclosure is too low in any religion to be able to report anonymously.

1.7.3: At the House male and female staff disclose equal caring responsibilities. This compares to 53% of informal carers aged 16-
64 being female. However, 27% of female staff work part-time compared to 11% of male staff.

1.8: Diversity data: response rates by length of service:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Length of service</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Caring responsibilities</th>
<th>Disability</th>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Gender identity</th>
<th>Religion or belief</th>
<th>Sexual identity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&gt;1</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-5</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>82%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-9</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-19</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20+</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>51%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1.8.1: For the first time, we have provided the rates of staff sharing their diversity data by length of service. The groups within “length of service” are devised according to staff numbers in order to maintain confidentiality. The majority of staff have completed 2 or fewer years of service.

1.8.2: Response rates for age and gender are 100% because this data is collected for pension purposes. Disability data is taken from the raw data report, which includes non-House interim staff.

We refer to “gender”, instead of “sex”, because for the purposes of diversity and inclusion it is important to give staff the opportunity to share the gender with which they identify. The gender data that we collect from EPPS (Employee Pay and Pensions Service) offers a binary choice of male or female, for pension purposes. The category “gender identity” refers to the monitoring question on whether staff identify with the same gender that was assigned to them at birth.

1.8.3: On the whole, staff with 10+ years of service do not share their diversity data as much as staff with fewer than 10 years of service. An exception to this is in the Ethnicity category, where 95% of staff with 10-19 years of service and 92% of staff with 20+ years of service have shared their data. Additionally, more staff with 3-5 and 6-9 years of service share whether they have a disability (85% and 88%) than staff with 2 or fewer years of service (78% or lower).

1.8.4: Staff with 2 years of service have anomalously low response rates for caring responsibilities (38%), gender identity (35%) and sexual identity (38%). Further investigation is required to understand this.

---

1.8.5: Staff with fewer than 12 months of service share their diversity data less than staff with 1 year of service.

**Lowlights**

2.1: While the gender pay gaps of both the House of Commons and PDS are very low in comparison with public sector benchmarks, both have significant bonus gender pay gaps. The House of Commons has a mean bonus gender pay gap of 21.6% and a median bonus gender pay gap of 5.7%. PDS’ bonus pay gap favours female staff, with a mean gender bonus pay gap of -66.3% and a median bonus gender pay gap of -0.8%.

2.2: Not all teams have achieved the best practice rule that no gender should make up more than 60% of the work force. Male staff make up more than 60% of In-House Services, the Parliamentary Digital Service and Parliamentary Security Department and female staff make up more than 60% of Corporate Services.

2.3: Although the proportion of staff identifying as Black, Asian or Minority Ethnic (BAME) has increased by 1% point each year since 2016 and is now at 20% overall, BAME staff make up a much higher proportion of the lower pay bands than the higher pay bands: 74% of pay band E compared to 7.5% of pay bands SCS and A. Of those who shared their ethnicity in pay bands SCS and A (86%), 9% identify as BAME and 91% identify as White. This compares to 29% BAME and 71% White of all staff who shared their ethnicity (85%).

2.4: Rates of staff sharing their data: year on year comparison:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Protected Characteristic</th>
<th>Shared %</th>
<th>% point Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dependants</td>
<td>60.0%</td>
<td>60.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disability</td>
<td>37.0%</td>
<td>76.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnicity</td>
<td>85.4%</td>
<td>84.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender identity</td>
<td>56.7%</td>
<td>57.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religion or belief</td>
<td>59.6%</td>
<td>60.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual identity</td>
<td>57.4%</td>
<td>58.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Sharing rates are calculated by measuring the response rate to each question, excluding those who select “Prefer not to say”. EPPS hold data on the gender and age of all staff members, and so the rates for gender and age are always 100%.

Rates of sharing caring responsibilities, gender identity, religion or belief and sexual identity are all 60% or lower, well below our internal benchmark of 70%. Due to low sharing rates, our ability to conduct intersectional analysis is limited.

2.5: Rates of sharing caring responsibilities, gender identity, religion or belief and sexual identity increased by only 1 percentage point since 2017. The sharp increase in staff sharing whether they have a disability is due to a previous fault in the way this data was reported being corrected.

2.6: There is a gap in caring responsibilities between the pay bands. The lower the pay band, the fewer staff have shared that they have dependants: 8% in pay band D compared to 42% in pay band SCS. Research shows that caring has a high financial cost and many caregivers leave the workforce entirely.

2.7: In recruitment, rates of application withdrawal vary between the protected characteristics. For ethnicity, disability, sexual identity and caring responsibilities, a higher proportion of candidates from minorities in these groups withdrew their applications compared to the proportion of total applications coming from minority groups.
Recommendations
Teams and groups with responsibility for these recommendations are highlighted in **bold**.

3.1: **Continue gender pay gap monitoring, with targeted action to reduce the bonus gender pay gaps that favour male staff in the House of Commons and female staff in PDS.** There is a specific action in the D&I Strategy and Corporate Action Plan 2019-2022 for **HR** to continue to work to address the gender pay gap overall, including the SCS bonus pay gap. To begin this work all staff were awarded a bonus of £250 irrespective of hours or pay band in March 2019, with more radical changes to senior bonuses planned for 2019-20.

3.2: **In-House Services, PDS, Security and Corporate Services, and teams recruiting for roles in pay bands D and Other, should aim to recruit a more gender-balanced workforce,** such as by implementing the Press Pause guidance (see Recommendation 3.1). On 1st April 2019, Corporate Services became two separate teams – “Finance” and “HR and Diversity” – and so continued monitoring of the gender balance of these new teams is required.

3.3: **Increase the representation of BAME staff in senior pay bands.** The Diversifying Senior Leadership programme was more successful in increasing female representation than in increasing BAME representation at senior levels. There is an action in the D&I Corporate Action Plan 2019-2022 for **D&I and HR** to ensure that the new leadership development programme has ring-fenced spaces for BAME staff as well as for women. There is a target in the D&I Strategy 2019-2022 to increase BAME representation in ‘mobile’ pay bands to represent the national population. For ‘non-mobile’ pay bands the target is to reflect the London population. To develop the talent pipeline and make Parliament more inclusive of ethnic minorities **D&I** will continue to deliver and develop the BAME internship programme, and the **Participation** team has a programme of activity within the D&I Corporate Action Plan 2019-2022 to develop and monitor Parliament’s reach to BAME audiences, develop a BAME tour of Parliament and work with relevant teams across Parliament to deliver a joint approach to Black History Month.

3.4: **Establish soft targets for individual teams for gender and BAME representation.** The D&I strategy 2019-2022 sets targets for the first time to mirror the local population for “non-mobile” pay bands and the national population for “mobile” pay bands with regards to gender and ethnicity. For the 2019 Diversity Monitoring report we will set out “soft targets” for individual teams in order to help reach these House-wide targets.
3.5: Help BAME and religious staff feel comfortable being “out” in the workplace. This includes improving the visibility of BAME and religious allies of the LGB+ community. D&I has learned best practice at the Stonewall Workplace Conference 2019 and will work with ParliOUT and ParliREACH.

3.6: Targeted interventions to increase the number of staff sharing their diversity data. Disaggregated analysis of response rates indicates that sharing varies across teams, length of service and by gender and age. On the whole, more female staff share their data than male staff. Response rates for caring responsibilities, disability, gender identity, religion or belief and sexual identity are highest among staff aged 16-25 and decrease with each age band, with the lowest rates among staff over the age of 56. Staff with less than one year of service share their data less than staff with one year of service. Response rates across teams can be compared in the last section of this report.

There is a specific action in the new D&I strategy for 2019-2022 that all House teams and managing directors need to ensure that they positively encourage staff to share their diversity data on HAIS, by outlining the benefits of doing so. HR should encourage new-starters to fill out their data on HAIS through a leaflet in their starter pack and through the induction training. Line managers should remind new-starters after they have passed the probation process of the benefits of sharing their data. Managing directors should consult the “Diversity Profile by Teams” section of this report to identify areas that they specifically need to target.

The benefits of sharing include creating an accurate and detailed evidence base on which to base actions in the D&I strategy, so that we can target specific issues relating to the information that staff share. For example, the Diversifying Senior Leadership programme was created partly because the data indicated that female staff were underrepresented at senior levels, with the result that women now make up 42% of the most senior pay band. As another example, if the rates of staff sharing their ethnicity increase to as close to 100% as possible, the House will be able to report an accurate ethnicity pay gap figure and tailor interventions to target any gaps that are identified.

3.7: Targeted action to improve the representation of disabled staff across the House. While the proportion of disabled staff is higher than previously believed, at 4% of all staff (or 6% as a proportion of those who shared their data), in all teams this falls short of estimates of the economically active population nationally which is around 13%.

---

5 The one exception is that more staff aged 36-45 shared whether they have a disability (80%) than staff aged 26-35 (78%).
The House signed up to the Disability Confident scheme in September 2018, which includes guaranteeing interviews to candidates with disabilities if they meet the minimum criteria for the position. Within less than a year we have progressed to Level 2 of the Disability Confident scheme, becoming a Disability Confident Employer in March 2019.6 Within the D&I Corporate Action Plan 2019-2022 there are targeted actions for D&I and HR to focus on staff with disabilities by completing feasibility work with ParliABLE, developing a SMART action plan and working towards Level 3 accreditation of the Disability Confident scheme to become a Disability Confident Leader. Additionally there is a specific action for HR, the Workplace Equality Networks, the Trade Union Side and the Parliamentary Health and Wellbeing Service to jointly develop the action plan on mental health awareness.

3.8: **Continue intersectional analysis within diversity reporting.** As response rates hopefully improve, so will our ability to analyse how the different characteristics overlap with each other. Understanding these intersections will help D&I to identify areas where we need more targeted interventions and to update the D&I Strategy and Corporate Plan 2019-2022.

3.9: **Begin reporting on numbers of staff who identify with a gender other than male or female.** We use the gender data held for pension purposes, which includes the binary options male and female. Since 2017 we have reported on the proportion of staff who identify with a gender other than the one they were assigned at birth. Subject to the number of staff sharing their gender identity being sufficiently high to maintain confidentiality, D&I intends to additionally report on the proportion of staff who identify with a gender other than male or female, so that these members of staff are included in our diversity monitoring reporting. Within the D&I Corporate Action Plan there is a programme of activity for D&I, HR, the Parliamentary Security Department and In-House services to build awareness of gender identity, including building on our Trans Allies work, developing work on security search points in relation to non-binary people and actively promoting gender-neutral language, symbols and facilities.

3.10: **Introduce socio-economic background monitoring.** Work is progressing between ParliION, EPPS and D&I, and new questions on HAIS are planned to be launched in Autumn 2019 for analysis in the 2020 Diversity Monitoring report. This will help the House to understand if it is

---

recruiting from a variety of socio-economic backgrounds, and to develop interventions if it is not.

3.11: **Raise awareness among job applicants and employees in lower pay bands of the ways in which the House supports staff with caring responsibilities.** Recruitment teams and line managers should make job applicants and employees aware of the House of Commons’ new partnership with My Family Care, a specialist provider of family friendly employee benefits, which provides the Work+Family Space service. The launch of a new workplace equality network to provide support with family issues, ParliLIFE, should also help to raise awareness; the WEN should make efforts to target and include staff from lower pay bands.

3.12: **Understand if there are reasons why BAME, disabled, LGB+ candidates and candidates with caring responsibilities withdraw job applications.** Understanding if there are reasons specific to the protected characteristics as to why this may be the case could help to retain candidates. Within the D&I Corporate Action plan 2019-2022 there is a detailed programme of activity for **D&I and HR** teams to develop learnings from the Diversifying Senior Leadership programme regarding recruitment processes. This includes extending the Press Pause guidance and communicating it to Commons Leadership Forum and Strategic Delivery Group members, business partners and hiring agencies, producing quarterly reports on Press Pause and recruitment at senior levels to the D&I Steering Group, and annually assessing progress against targets to improve diversity at senior levels.

---

7 https://www.myfamilycare.co.uk/ukparliament.
Background

4.1: This report covers all House of Commons and Parliamentary Digital Service employees. It excludes agency staff, contractors and those seconded into the House of Commons Service.

4.2: This report provides a high-level analysis of the overall diversity profile of the House of Commons and Parliamentary Digital Service and covers all Teams within the House Service. All House of Commons and Parliamentary Digital Service figures in this report were collated from the House Administration and Information System (HAIS) based on data as at 31 March 2018, 2017 and 2016.

4.3: We report on the diversity categories in alphabetical order: Age, Caring Responsibilities, Disability, Ethnic Background, Gender, Gender Identity, Religion or belief, Sexual Identity.\(^8\)

4.4: Comparison between teams in previous years is available only between 2017 and 2018, due to an organisation restructure in 2017. Comparison between pay bands is provided for three years.

4.5: Where data is publicly available, we benchmark our data against the Civil Service in March 2018, the London population and the UK population using data from the relevant time period from the Labour Force Survey and Annual Population Survey. Throughout the report we indicate whether the available data represents the total population or the economically active population.

4.6: Access to diversity data is strictly limited. D&I take confidentiality very seriously and have access measures in place so that an extremely restricted number of House staff, and only those who work with the data, can access it.

4.7: All data is reported anonymously. Where groups are so small that individuals may be identified, we either do not report, or we combine groups so that individuals cannot be identified.

---

\(^8\) We refer to “gender”, instead of “sex”, because for the purposes of diversity and inclusion it is important to give staff the opportunity to disclose the gender with which they identify. The gender data that we collect from EPPS offers a binary choice of male or female, for pension purposes. The category “gender identity” refers to the monitoring question on whether staff identify with the same gender that was assigned to them at birth. See further Recommendation 3.9.
Overall Diversity Profile

The following section looks at the House of Commons and Parliamentary Digital Service diversity data as a whole for March 2016, 2017 and 2018.

Summary of Overall Diversity Profile

- A higher proportion of staff are aged 50-64 compared to the economically active UK and London populations.
- A lower proportion of staff are aged 16-25 compared to the economically active UK and London populations.
- Among staff aged 45 and under, the House employs more female than male staff. Among staff aged 46 and over the House employs more male than female staff.
- Female and male staff disclose similar levels of caring responsibilities, compared to a UK trend of more informal carers being female than male. However, 27% of female staff work part-time in the House, compared to 11% of male staff.
- The proportion of staff identifying as disabled is higher than previously believed (6% of those who shared their data) but is still lower than the economically active UK population (13%).
- The House employs a higher proportion of BAME staff compared to the UK public sector.
- Representation of Asian staff is lower than the total London population and the Civil Service in London.
- The House of Commons and Parliamentary Digital Service have lower gender pay gaps than the Civil Service and the public sector more broadly.
- White men are the largest group in the House (43%) and BAME women are the smallest group in the House (11%).
- Of those who shared their gender identity, 1.3% identify with a gender different to that which they were assigned at birth.
- The proportion of staff identifying as lesbian, gay, bisexual or another sexual identity is higher than the total UK or London populations.
5.1: The age profile of the House remains very consistent year-on-year. In March 2018, 13% of the economically active UK population were aged 16-24, 17% were aged 25-34, 24% were aged 35-49, 23% were aged 50-64 and 22% were aged 65+. The economically active London population is younger than the rest of the UK as a whole: 14% aged 16-24, 24% aged 25-34, 29% aged 35-49, 20% aged 50-64 and 14% aged 65+ (Annual Population Survey estimates).

5.2: In 2018, 31% of House staff are aged 50-64 and 4% are aged 65+, so a higher proportion of staff are aged 50-64 compared to both the UK and London population. Although our age groupings are different to those of this Annual Population Survey data, we can infer that a lower proportion of staff are aged 16-25 compared to the UK and London populations.
5.3: An intersectional analysis of age and gender shows that among staff aged 45 and under there are more female staff than male staff, and among staff aged 46 and over there are more male staff than female staff. Continued monitoring is required to ensure that as younger cohorts age, we maintain a gender-balanced workforce.
Caring responsibilities

6.1: More staff have shared that they do not have caring responsibilities than that they do have them. According to the 2011 Census, 11% of people in employment in England provide unpaid care. As a proportion of staff who shared their caregiving status with us, 28% identified as having caring responsibilities. The future launch of a new workplace equality network focusing on family issues, ParliLIFE, will help to support staff members with caring duties. The new Work+Family Space service, provided in partnership with My Family Care, will also help employees manage their caring responsibilities.

6.2: In the U.K. more carers are female than male. The Department for Work and Pensions (DWP) estimates that in 2016/17, 59% of informal carers across the UK were female. Of informal carers aged 16-64, the DWP estimates that 53% were female in 2016/17. In the House, an equal proportion of male and female staff said that they had dependants in 2018, at 17% of both male and female staff. Adjusting for different response rates between male and female staff, it is the case that more male staff identified as having caring responsibilities – 29% of men compared to 26% of women.

6.3: Although female staff have declared similar levels of caring responsibilities compared to male staff, a greater proportion of female staff work part-time than male staff. In 2018 27% of female staff work part-time compared to 11% of male staff. The DWP estimates that in 2016/17 25% of all women who provide informal care work part-time compared to

8% of men.\textsuperscript{10} The main recipients of informal care that the DWP identified were parents, followed by spouses/civil partners/cohabitees, sons/daughters, other relatives and non-relatives.

Disability

7.1: Of all staff, 4% identify as disabled and 72% do not identify as disabled. As a proportion of staff who shared whether they have a disability, 6% identify as disabled and 94% do not. This compares with 10% at the Civil Service (as a proportion of staff who shared their data) and 13% of economically active 16-64-year-olds in the UK in the period Jan-Mar 2018 (Labour Force Survey estimates). According to Annual Population Survey estimates, 15% of economically active 16-64-year-olds in the UK were disabled and 12% of economically active 16-64-year-olds in London were disabled in the period April 2017-March 2018.

7.2: Since this data was collected, the House has taken steps to improve representation and inclusion of disabled staff, including the introduction of a new workplace adjustments process to make it quicker and easier for disabled staff to access workplace adjustments, and signing up to the Disability Confident Scheme in September 2018. As a result, the House has introduced a guaranteed interviews scheme to disabled candidates if they meet the minimum criteria for the position. Within less than a year we have progressed to Level 2 of the Disability Confident Scheme, becoming a Disability Confident Employer in March 2019.

7.3: Within the D&I Corporate Action Plan 2019-2022 there are targeted actions for D&I and HR to focus on staff with disabilities by completing feasibility work with ParliABLE, developing a SMART action plan and working towards Level 3 accreditation of the Disability Confident scheme to become a Disability Confident Leader. Additionally, there is a specific action for HR, the Workplace Equality Networks, the Trade Union Side and the Parliamentary Health and Wellbeing Service to jointly develop the action plan on mental health awareness.
Ethnic background

8.1: The proportion of Black, Asian and Minority Ethnic (BAME) staff is steadily increasing, reaching 20% in 2018. The Annual Population Survey estimates that 13% of economically active 16-64-year-olds in the UK were BAME in the 12 months to March 2018. The same survey estimates that 37% of economically active 16-64-year-olds in London were BAME in the 12 months to March 2018. As a proportion of those who shared their ethnicity, 23% of House staff identify as BAME.

Percentages include those where ethnicity is not shared
8.2: The Government publishes the latest data on the ethnic diversity of government departments and public services.\textsuperscript{11} The figures are as a proportion of staff who share their ethnic identity. Compared to other public sector organisations, the House has a higher proportion of BAME staff. This reflects the wider diversity of roles in the House which other public sector organisations either do not have or outsource. However, our 23\% figure for those who share their ethnicity is 14 percentage points lower than the proportion of BAME economically active 16-64-year-olds in London (37\%, according to Annual Population Survey estimates in Mar 2018).

\begin{center}
\begin{figure}
\centering
\includegraphics[width=\textwidth]{house_of_commons_bame_breakdown}
\caption{House of Commons and PDS and Civil Service BAME breakdown}
\end{figure}
\end{center}

*Percentages exclude those where ethnicity is not shared*

8.3: Of staff who shared their ethnic identity with us, 7\% are Asian, 10\% are Black, 0.7\% are Chinese, 3\% are Mixed, 77\% are White and 2\% identify with another ethnic background. This compares to 6\% Asian, 3\% Black, 0.3\% Chinese, 1.5\% Mixed, 88\% White and 0.5\% Other at the Civil Service in the same period. The figures for Civil Service in London are: 17\% Asian, 12\% Black, 0.7\% Chinese, 3\% Mixed, 66\% White and 1.3\% other.

"Asian" includes Chinese ethnic background in these figures

8.4: Compared to the whole London population, the House has a lower proportion of staff of all ethnic minorities (data taken from Annual Population Survey, Dec 2017).\(^{12}\) When we examine the figures as a proportion of staff who share their ethnic identity, the percentage of Black staff is roughly in line with the London population, the proportion of Asian staff is 11 percentage points lower than the London population (8% versus 19%) and the proportion of White staff is 18 percentage points higher than the London population (77% versus 59%).\(^{13}\) The Civil Service workforce in London is closer to the local population, with 18% of staff identifying as Asian (including Chinese) and 66% identifying as White.

\(^{12}\) An up-to-date breakdown by individual ethnic groups of economically active 16-64-year-olds in London was not available.

\(^{13}\) The Greater London Authority estimates that in 2017, of the whole London population, 20% were Asian, 13% were Black, 6% were Mixed, 4% identified with another ethnic background and 57% were White (https://data.london.gov.uk/dataset/equality--diversity-and-inclusion-evidence-base).
9.1: 44% of staff are female, compared to 47% of economically active 16-64-year-olds in the UK and 46% of economically active 16-64-year-olds in London in the twelve months to March 2018 (Annual Population Survey estimates).

9.2: The gender profile of the House is unchanged since 2017. Female representation reduced by 2 percentage points between 2016 and 2017, resulting from the TUPE transfer of mostly male staff into the Parliamentary Security Department.

9.3: In March 2018 female representation was 10 percentage points lower than the Civil Service, which reported 54% female staff in the same period.

9.4: Gender pay gap reporting in the public sector, Civil Service, House of Commons and PDS 2017-18:14

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mean gender pay gap</th>
<th>Year-on-year change</th>
<th>Median gender pay gap</th>
<th>Year-on-year change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>2018</td>
<td>Point</td>
<td>2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public sector</td>
<td>17.7%</td>
<td>17.5%</td>
<td>-0.2%</td>
<td>19.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civil Service</td>
<td>10.6%</td>
<td>9.8%</td>
<td>-0.8%</td>
<td>12.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>House of Commons</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>-0.2%</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PDS</td>
<td>-5.2%</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>+5.8%</td>
<td>-4.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Our gender pay gaps in both the House of Commons and Parliamentary Digital Service compare favourably to both the public sector and the Civil Service. The House of Commons had a mean gender pay gap of 1.5% in 2018, compared to 17.5% in the public sector and 9.8% in the Civil Service. The House of Commons had a median gender pay gap of 1.0% in 2018, compared to 19.0% in the public sector and 12.2% in the Civil Service.

The Parliamentary Digital Service has reversed its gender pay gap, which in 2017 favoured women. In 2018 PDS had a mean gender pay gap of 0.6% and a median gender pay gap of 2.6%.

While the gender pay gaps of both the House of Commons and PDS are low in comparison with public sector benchmarks, both have large bonus gender pay gaps. The House of Commons has a mean bonus gender pay gap of 21.6% and a median bonus gender pay gap of 5.7%. PDS’ bonus pay gap favours female staff, with a mean gender bonus pay gap of -66.3% and a median bonus gender pay gap of -0.8%. See Recommendation 3.1 for targeted action to address the bonus gender pay gaps.

**Figures exclude those where ethnicity is not shared**

9.5: An intersectional analysis of gender and ethnicity indicates that White men are the largest group in the House, at 43% of all staff who have shared their ethnic identity. The next largest group is White women at 34%. There is a roughly even proportion of male and female staff from minority ethnic backgrounds (12% and 11% respectively).
Gender identity

10.1: Last year was the first year in which response rates were high enough for us to share the proportion of staff whose gender identity is not the same as that which they were assigned at birth. This trend continued in 2018, and the proportion of staff who identify with a different gender to that which they were assigned at birth has risen from 0.5% in 2017 to 0.7% in 2018.

10.2: As a proportion of staff who shared their gender identity with us, 1.3% identify with a different gender to that which they were assigned at birth. It is difficult to obtain accurate estimates of trans individuals in the UK and therefore difficult to know whether the House is representative of the population it serves. According to Stonewall, the best current estimate is 1% of the population, which would imply that the House is broadly representative; however, low response rates necessitate caution. We will be able to provide more accurate comparisons after the 2021 Census is published, since it will ask a voluntary question on gender identity.

---

15 Here “trans” is defined as: “An umbrella term to describe people whose gender is not the same as, or does not sit comfortably with, the sex they were assigned at birth” (https://www.stonewall.org.uk/help-advice/glossary-terms).

Religion or belief

Declared religion or belief includes agnosticism, atheism and (from 2017) no religion.

11.1: The rate of staff sharing their religion or belief has stabilised over the past year, and so efforts should be made to increase the proportion of staff sharing their religious beliefs towards our target of 70%.

11.2: Christianity continues to be the religion or belief with the highest representation, which is in line with the UK as a whole. As a proportion of the 60% of staff who shared their religious identity, 51% of staff identify as Christian. This compares to 54% of the Civil Service (Mar 2018), 55%

11.3: The religion or belief that has seen the largest increase is “no religion”. The proportion of staff identifying as having no religion increased from 0.5% to 1.7%, which suggests that we should continue to include the option despite low numbers when we first introduced it in 2017.

11.4: As a proportion of those who shared their religious identity, 36% of staff identified as agnostic, atheist, or having no religion. This compares to 36% of the Civil Service (Mar 2018), 37% of England, Scotland and Wales, and 28% of the whole London population (Annual Population Survey, 2017).

11.5: The proportion of Muslim staff is slowly increasing, from 2.2% in 2016, to 2.8% in 2017, to 3.2% in 2018. As a proportion of those who shared their religious identity, 5% of staff are Muslim. This compares to 4% of the Civil Service (Mar 2018), 5% across England, Scotland and Wales, and 14% of the whole London population (Annual Population Survey, 2017).

11.6: Of female staff who shared their religious belief, 5% identify as Muslim compared to 6% of male staff. This compares to a 6 percentage point difference between male and female staff for Christianity and Atheism: 54% of female staff identify as Christian compared to 48% of male staff, and 18% of female staff identify as Atheist compared to 24% of male staff.

---

17 Up-to-date estimates of the religious breakdown of economically active 16-64-year-olds were not available. Benchmark data is taken from https://data.london.gov.uk/dataset/percentage-population-religion-borough.
12.1: The proportion staff identifying as lesbian, gay, bisexual or another sexual identity (LGB+) rose from 3.8% in 2017 to 4.4% in 2018. This is higher than the UK population: the Annual Population Survey estimates that 2.6% of the UK identified as LGB+ in 2017 (latest release). The proportion of LGB+ staff is also higher than in the London population, which the latest Annual Population Survey figures estimate to be 3.2%. However, the charity Stonewall suggests that the proportion of LGB+ people is more likely to be between 5% and 7% in the UK and higher in London. We will be able to make more accurate comparisons when the 2021 Census is published, which will include a voluntary question on sexual identity.

12.2: The percentage of staff identifying as heterosexual or straight rose by 3 percentage points to 54%, which falls short of the 93.2% estimated by the Annual Population Survey. However, response rates for the Annual Population Survey were 96% in 2017, compared to 58% in the House in 2018 (response rates are lower in the Civil Service, at 47% in 2018). Of those who shared their sexual identity with us, 92% identified as heterosexual or straight and 8% as LGB+. This compares to 4.6% of civil servants who disclosed their sexual identity identifying as LGB+.

---

18 A breakdown by sexual identity of the economically active population was not available.

Diversity by Team and Pay Band

Pay band monitoring includes data from 2016 and 2017. Due to an organisational restructure comparison of data for each team is only available from 2017.

Due to low response rates, it is not possible to provide an analysis of gender identity in this section.

When data sets are small due to low numbers in some teams or pay bands, they have been combined to preserve staff anonymity: for example pay bands SCS and A, or Communications, Governance Office and Speaker’s Office.
Summary of Diversity by Team and Pay band

- More staff share that they have caregiving duties in the higher pay bands than the lower pay bands.
- Strategic Estates has the highest proportion of disabled staff. Communications, Governance Office and Speaker’s Office, In-House Services and Research and Information have the lowest proportion of disabled staff.
- BAME staff are underrepresented at senior levels and White staff are underrepresented in pay bands E and Catering.
- BAME representation is not even across teams.
- In all pay bands except D and Other, no gender has more than 60% representation.
- Gender representation is not even across teams.
- LGB+ representation is lower among BAME and religious staff compared to White and non-religious staff.
- The number of staff sharing their gender identity is too low to disaggregate by team or pay band.
Most age groups have either remained consistent or shifted by one or two percentage points in 2018 in each pay band. The Catering and Other pay bands have become slightly more age diverse, with the proportion of
16-25-year-olds increasing by 4 percentage points and the proportion of staff aged 56+ reducing by 2 percentage points.

13.2: The numbers of staff working above the age of 65 are too low to report separately by pay band. Across the House 4% of staff are over the age of 65.
Caring responsibilities

Declared dependants by payband

Percentages include those where caring responsibilities are not shared

14.1: Those in the SCS pay band have the highest proportion of staff with dependants by far, although this reduced by 3 percentage points in 2018 to 42%.

14.2: Pay band D has the fewest caregivers but also has the lowest response rates at 46% (compared with 59-73% for the other pay bands). As a proportion of those who shared their caregiving duties with us, 18% of pay band D have dependants, which is still the lowest of any pay band.

14.3: The significant drop in staff sharing their caring responsibilities in pay bands E and Other from 24% in 2016 to 11% in 2017 was corrected slightly this year by rising to 15%.

14.4: Research shows that caring can have a high financial cost and that many carers leave the workforce entirely.\(^2\) Staff and job applicants, particularly those in lower pay bands, should be made aware of the support provided by Parliament to help them stay in employment if they wish to do so, such as Work+Family Space, and should be encouraged to join the new workplace equality network, ParliLIFE (see Recommendation 3.11).

Disability

Figures include staff who did not share their data

15.1: In all teams the proportion of disabled staff is below that of the UK economically active population (13%, according to Labour Force Survey estimates, Jan-Mar 2018). The Parliamentary Digital Service had the lowest response rates at 57%, while more than 75% of staff in all other teams shared their data.

In all teams the proportion of disabled staff is below that of the national population.
Figures exclude staff who did not share their data

15.2: This chart shows disabled staff as a proportion of those who shared their data. For example, in Corporate Services 87% of staff shared their data, and of this total 7% were disabled.

15.3: Adjusting for different response rates from each team, Strategic Estates comes closest to reflecting the proportion of disabled people in the UK, with 9% of staff who shared their data identifying as disabled. Communications, Governance Office and Speaker’s Office, In-House Services and Research and Information have the lowest proportion of staff who are disabled, at 4%.

15.4: Due to the way disability data was reported, it is not possible to provide a breakdown of disabled staff by pay band. This is will be corrected for the 2019 report.
Ethnic background

Figures include those where ethnicity is not shared

16.1: 2018 has shown a small increase in staff identifying as Black, Asian and minority ethnic at the most senior levels: up 1 percentage point from 2017 in the SCS, A and B pay bands. The proportion of staff identifying as BAME in pay band E has increased by 5 percentage points to 74% in 2018, which is very high compared to economically active 16-64-year-olds in the UK and London (13% and 37% respectively, Annual Population Survey estimates, Dec 2017).

16.2: As a proportion of those who shared their ethnicity, 9% of staff in pay bands SCS and A identified as BAME in 2018. As a proportion of those who shared their ethnicity, 67% of staff in pay bands E and Catering identified as BAME and 16% in the Other pay band identified as BAME.

16.3: In order to reach the targets in the D&I Strategy 2019-2022 for “mobile” pay bands to reflect the ethnic diversity of the national population and “non-mobile” pay bands to reflect the ethnic diversity of the London population, efforts should be made to increase BAME representation at senior levels and to increase White representation in the lower pay bands. See Recommendation 3.3 for actions in the D&I Strategy and Corporate Action Plan 2019-2022.
Figures include those where ethnicity is not shared

16.4: BAME staff are not represented evenly across teams. Corporate Services, In-House Services and Security have the highest proportion of BAME staff (≥27%) while Chamber and Committees and Research and Information have the lowest (≤10%). The figures for the Parliamentary Digital Service may be skewed by comparatively low response rates, with 59% sharing their ethnic identity compared with 90% across House of Commons teams excluding PDS.
17.1: The representation of female staff at the highest level, SCS, continues to increase, reaching 42% in 2018 (compared to 43% at the Civil Service). In almost all pay bands we have achieved the best practice “40, 40, 20” rule: “that no one sex/gender should be represented at less than 40 percent, and no one sex/gender represented at more than 60 percent”.21

17.2: Female representation in pay band D continues to fall and action should be taken here to bring female representation back to at least 40%. Female representation is lowest in the “Other” pay band, which includes highly specialised, often male-dominated roles such as Fire Officers and Security Officers. It is pleasing to see that female representation here has increased by 6 percentage points since 2017, but continued monitoring is required to ensure that this develops into a trend. See Recommendation 3.2.

17.3: Gender representation is not even across teams. In-House Services, the Parliamentary Digital Service and the Parliamentary Security Department have less than 40% female representation, however of these teams the Digital Service has seen a 3 percentage point increase in the past year. Corporate Services has less than 40% male representation. As a group, the Communications team and Speaker’s Office have brought their gender balance within the “40, 40, 20” rule in the past year. However, due to low headcount, small changes in personnel have a large impact on these figures and so continued monitoring is required. See Recommendation 3.2.
Figures include those where ethnicity is not shared

17.4: Female and male minority ethnic staff have broadly equal representation at the SCS and A (4%) and B pay bands (8%), although representation is low. Similarly, White female and male staff have broadly equal representation at SCS and A level (39% and 40%) and difference in the B pay band (32% and 33%).

17.5: White men are the largest group in almost every pay band, which is to be expected since they are the largest group in the House (9.5).

17.6: Irrespective of gender, White staff are ten times as likely as BAME staff to be in the highest pay bands, SCS and A.
Religion or belief

Religion or belief by payband

Percentages include staff whose religion or belief is not shared
A combined percentage for D&E pay bands in 2016 is unavailable
"No religion" was introduced as an option in 2017

18.1: The biggest change is the 11 percentage point increase in staff in the "Other" pay band identifying with a religion or belief, from 39% in 2017 to 50% in 2018.

18.2: A greater proportion of staff in higher pay bands identify as agnostic, atheist or having no religion, and a higher proportion of staff in lower pay bands identify as religious compared to staff in higher pay bands.
bands identify with a religion or belief. This has remained the case for the past three years.

18.3: There have been some small changes in the religious breakdown of the House teams in the past year, but the overall picture is similar year-on-year.

18.4: Strategic Estates, In-House Services and Security have the highest proportion of staff members identifying with a religion or belief (50%, 48% and 47%). Communications, Governance Office and Speaker’s Office and Research and Information have the highest proportion of staff members identifying as agnostic, atheist or having no religion (37% and 36%).
19.1: The LGB+ population either remained the same or increased by 1 percentage point in all pay bands in the past year. LGB+ representation is highest in the SCS and A pay bands (6%).

19.2: Of BAME staff, 2% identify as LGB+ in 2018 compared to 6% of White staff. With the exception of Christianity, which has high staff representation, numbers of staff identifying as LGB+ are too low in any religion to be able to report anonymously. Steps should be taken to help BAME and religious staff feel comfortable being “out” in the workplace, including improving the visibility of BAME and religious allies of the LGB+ community. See Recommendation 3.5.

19.3: Response rates are lower in the D&E pay bands than the others, with 55% either selecting “Prefer not to say” or not answering the question (compared to below 40% in the other pay bands), although this has reduced by 2 percentage points since 2017. This leads to the proportion of staff sharing that they are heterosexual being lower in the D&E pay bands compared with the other pay bands (40% versus 58% in all other pay bands in 2018).
19.4: LGB+ representation is not even across teams. It is highest in Participation and Research and Information (7%) and lowest in Security (1%), however the Security Department (PSD) also has the lowest response rates of any team, with over two thirds either preferring not to say or not answering the question. As a proportion of those who shared their sexual identity, 4% of PSD identify as LGB+. 
Recruitment Diversity Data

This section provides the diversity data for applicants throughout the recruitment process: Total applications, Regret after sift/test, Regret after interview, Application Withdrawn and Appointed.

Data was collected between 1\textsuperscript{st} April 2017 and 31\textsuperscript{st} March 2018.

This is the first year that recruitment data is included from the Parliamentary Digital Service.

Due to a change in system in 2018, a year-on-year comparison is not available.
Summary of Recruitment Diversity Data

- A higher proportion of candidates with caring responsibilities were appointed compared to the overall candidate pool.
- A lower proportion of candidates identifying as disabled were appointed compared to the overall candidate pool.
- A slightly lower proportion of BAME candidates were appointed compared to the overall candidate pool.
- A higher proportion of women were appointed compared to the overall candidate pool.
- A slightly lower proportion of LGB+ candidates were appointed compared to the overall candidate pool.
- Certain minority groups withdrew applications at higher rates than the overall candidate pool: carers, disabled candidates, BAME candidates and LGB+ candidates.
20.1: Some caution should be taken when interpreting the recruitment data. The system used is a dynamic one i.e. it is used to track candidates. For example, there will be some applications that are still active (open) because the job they have applied for has only just closed. In time they will either be rejected or offered the job. Therefore, if the report was run again at a later stage the data might change. However, there are sufficient applicants that the percentages would not be too affected by subsequent changes. The recruitment data is therefore used to give a high-level overview of the application and selection process throughout the recruitment process. The definitions of each stage of the recruitment process are outlined in the Appendix.

20.2: A high proportion of candidates share their diversity data (>85% for each characteristic). To adjust for varying response rates at different parts of the application process, percentages are given as a proportion of those who shared their information.

20.3: Data is given as a proportion of total applications received rather than total candidates. This is because some candidates apply for more than one position.

20.4: Of the total applications, 83% were unsuccessful after the sift or test, 6% were unsuccessful after interview, 4% withdrew their application at any stage in the process, 2% were reserve candidates and 5% were appointed. Discrepancies between percentages at different application stages are partially explained by the small size of groups in comparison to the total applicant pool (except “Regret after sift/test”).

20.5: Due to low numbers in all application stages after “Regret after sift/test”, it is not possible to provide a break down by pay band or team.

20.6: Data has not been supplied on the age of candidates.

20.7: Due to a change in systems, a like-for-like comparison with previous years is not possible.
Caring responsibilities

Overall response rate: 97%

21.1: Of those who shared whether they had dependants, 9% of applications were from candidates with caring responsibilities. 16% of candidates who were unsuccessful at interview had caring responsibilities. Of appointed candidates, 12% have caring responsibilities.

Overall, and candidates with and without caring responsibilities

21.2: 74% of candidates with caring responsibilities did not pass the sift/test stage compared with 83% of candidates overall. 10% of candidates with caring responsibilities did not pass the interview stage compared with
6% of candidates overall. 7% of candidates with caring responsibilities were appointed compared with 5% of candidates overall.

**Disability**

Overall response rate: 89%

22.1: Of those who shared whether they have a disability, 6% of total applications came from disabled candidates. This compares to 3% of appointed candidates being disabled, 9% of candidates not passing the interview stage being disabled and 11% of applications withdrawn coming from disabled candidates.
22.2: 2% of disabled candidates were appointed, compared to 5% of candidates overall and 6% of non-disabled candidates. 7% of disabled candidates withdrew their applications, compared to 4% of candidates overall and 4% of non-disabled candidates.

**Ethnic background**

![Ethnicity recruitment data chart]

**Overall response rate**: 95%

23.1: Of all the applications received, 32% were from minority ethnic candidates and 68% were from White applicants. Of staff appointed, 29% are from ethnic minorities and 71% are White. A lower proportion of BAME applicants were unsuccessful at interview compared to the total applications: 28%. A higher proportion of BAME applicants withdrew their applications compared to the total applications: 37%.

![Overall, BAME and White recruitment data chart]
23.2: 84% of BAME candidates did not pass the sift/test compared to 83% overall and 82% of White candidates. 4.3% of BAME candidates withdrew their applications compared to 3.6% of candidates overall and 3.5% of White candidates. 4.7% of BAME candidates were appointed compared to 5.4% of candidates overall and 5.5% of White candidates.

**Gender**

**Gender recruitment data**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Male</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regret after sift/test</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regret after interview</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Application withdrawn</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reserve</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appointed</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>58%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Overall response rate:** 96%

*Excludes genders other than male and female due to low numbers*

24.1: A roughly equal proportion of applications were received from female and male candidates (51% versus 49%), and a higher proportion of women were appointed or placed on reserve lists (58% versus 42%).
24.2: 82% of female candidates did not pass the sift/test compared to 83% of candidates overall and 84% of male candidates. 6% of female candidates were appointed compared to 5.4% of candidates overall and 4.5% of male candidates.

**Gender identity**

25.1: Of total applications received, 97% shared with us whether they identify with the same gender assigned to them at birth. Of these, 0.5% did not identify with the same gender assigned to them at birth.

25.2: Due to low numbers, we cannot provide an analysis broken down by application stage.
Religion or belief

Overall response rate: 84%
"No religion" is not an option in recruitment diversity monitoring

26.1: Of those who shared their religion or belief, 41% of total applications were from candidates who identify as agnostic or atheist and 59% were from candidates who identify with a religion or belief. This compares to 43% of appointed candidates identifying as agnostic or atheist and 57% identifying with a religion or belief.

26.2: A lower proportion of applications from religious candidates were withdrawn compared to total applications (53%) and a higher proportion of religious candidates were unsuccessful at the interview stage compared to total applications (62%).

Overall and religion or belief recruitment data
26.3: 4.3% of agnostic and atheist candidates withdrew their applications compared to 3.6% of candidates overall and 3.3% of religious candidates. 5% of religious candidates were appointed compared to 5.4% of agnostic and atheist candidates and 5.4% of candidates overall.

**Sexual identity**

**Overall response rate: 89%**

27.1: Of those who shared their sexual identity with us, 12% of applications came from candidates who identify as lesbian, gay, bisexual or another sexual identity. This compares to 11% of appointed candidates identifying as LGB+.
27.2: 4.6% of LGB+ candidates withdrew their applications compared to 3.6% of candidates overall and 3.6% of heterosexual candidates. 4.6% of LGB+ were appointed compared to 5.4% of candidates overall and 5.4% of heterosexual candidates.
Diversity Profile by Teams

This section provides a breakdown of protected characteristics by teams. It also allows for a comparison between teams of the proportion of staff sharing their data, by comparing the proportion of “Prefer not to say” and “Unknown”.

Due to low numbers, disability figures are not provided for Communications, Governance Office and Speaker’s Office.

The data does not include data for agency staff, contractors and those seconded into the House of Commons service.
Chamber and Committees

**GENDER**
- Male, 48%
- Female, 52%

**ETHNIC BACKGROUND**
- Unknown, 9%
- BAME, 10%
- White, 79%

**RELIGION OR BELIEF**
- Unknown, 28%
- Agnostic/Atheist/No religion, 29%
- Prefer not to say, 10%
- Religion or belief, 33%

**AGE**
- 56+, 15%
- 46-55, 26%
- 36-45, 24%
- 26-35, 28%
- 16-25, 7%

**CARING RESPONSIBILITIES**
- Unknown, 29%
- Yes, 21%
- Prefer not to say, 1%
- No, 48%

**DISABILITY**
- Unknown, 16%
- Yes, 4%
- Prefer not to say, 2%
- No, 78%

**SEXUAL ORIENTATION**
- Unknown, 28%
- LGB+, 4%
- Prefer not to say, 8%
- Heterosexual, 59%
In-House Services

GENDER
- Male, 65%
- Female, 35%

ETHNIC BACKGROUND
- BAME, 27%
- Prefer not to say, 2%
- White, 1%
- Unknown, 10%

RELIGION OR BELIEF
- Agnostic/Atheist/No religion, 12%
- Religion or belief, 48%
- Prefer not to say, 5%
- Unknown, 35%

AGE
- 56-65, 28%
- 66+, 6%
- 16-25, 6%
- 26-35, 15%
- 36-45, 17%

CARING RESPONSIBILITIES
- Yes, 17%
- No, 46%
- Prefer not to say, 2%
- Unknown, 36%

DISABILITY
- Yes, 3%
- Prefer not to say, 2%
- Unknown, 21%
- No, 73%

SEXUAL ORIENTATION
- Heterosexual, 57%
- LGB+, 4%
- Prefer not to say, 4%
- Unknown, 35%
**Participation**

**GENDER**
- Male, 43%
- Female, 57%

**ETHNIC BACKGROUND**
- White, 67%
- BAME, 12%
- Prefer not to say, 0.4%
- Unknown, 20%

**RELIGION OR BELIEF**
- Religion or belief, 37%
- Agnostic/Atheist /No religion, 28%
- Prefer not to say, 7%
- Unknown, 28%

**AGE**
- 26-35, 30%
- 36-45, 17%
- 46-55, 12%
- 56-65, 13%
- 66+, 10%
- 16-25, 17%

**CARING RESPONSIBILITIES**
- Yes, 8%
- No, 62%
- Prefer not to say, 1%

**DISABILITY**
- Unknown, 18%
- Yes, 6%
- Prefer not to say, 1%
- No, 74%

**SEXUAL ORIENTATION**
- Heterosexual, 59%
- LGB+, 7%
- Prefer not to say, 5%
- Unknown, 29%
Strategic Estates

GENDER
Male, 51%
Female, 49%

ETHNIC BACKGROUND
Unknown, 5%
BAME, 24%
White, 68%

RELIGION OR BELIEF
Unknown, 11%
Agnostic/Atheist /No religion, 31%
Religion or belief, 50%

AGE
56+, 13%
16-25, 8%
46-55, 24%
36-45, 24%
26-35, 31%

CARING RESPONSIBILITIES
Unknown, 12%
Yes, 27%
No, 60%

DISABILITY
Unknown, 22%
Yes, 7%
Prefer not to say, 5%

SEXUAL ORIENTATION
Unknown, 13%
LGB+, 5%
Heterosexual, 78%
Prefer not to say, 4%
Prefer not to say, 3%
Communications, Governance Office and Speaker’s Office

**Gender**
- Male, 45%
- Female, 55%

**Ethnic Background**
- BAME, 14%
- White, 80%
- Unknown, 6%
- Prefer not to say, 0%

**Religion or Belief**
- Unknown, 18%
- Prefer not to say, 8%
- Religion or belief, 37%
- Agnostic/Atheist/No religion, 37%

**Age**
- 26-35, 31%
- 36-45, 18%
- 46-55, 29%
- 56+, 12%

**Caring Responsibilities**
- Unknown, 22%
- Prefer not to say, 0%
- Yes, 20%
- No, 58%

**Sexual Orientation**
- Unknown, 18%
- LGB+, 9%
- Prefer not to say, 8%
- Heterosexual, 65%
Appendices

Appendix 1: Pay band definitions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SCS</td>
<td>Includes pay bands SCS1, SCS1A, SCS2, SCS3 and Clerk of the House</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Includes pay bands A1, A2 and A3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Includes pay bands B1, B2, B1H1, B2J1, MPSC and MPSD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Includes pay band C, CPT, MPSE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>Includes pay bands D1 and D2, PD1A, PD1B, PD2S and MPST</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>Includes pay bands E1, E2 and E2NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catering</td>
<td>Includes all pay bands prefixed CG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>Includes craft grades CL1, fire service grades FSD, FST and FSV, PAPP and sandwich students (SSTU)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Appendix 2: Recruitment process terms

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Application stage</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regret after sift/test</td>
<td>Not invited to test/interview, or invited to test but did not pass the test stage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regret after interview</td>
<td>Invited to interview but not offered the position</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Application withdrawn</td>
<td>Candidates who withdrew their application at any time in the process, including candidates who were offered the position but did not accept or did not pass security clearance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reserve</td>
<td>Candidates who were not offered the position after interview but were added to the reserve list</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appointed</td>
<td>Candidates offered a role within the House of Commons or Digital Service and passed security clearance.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In some cases, the vacancy itself was withdrawn. Due to very low numbers, these have not been included.