**Diversity, Equity and Inclusion Survey 2022**

**Context**

In Autumn 2022, PHF carried out our now annual Diversity Survey. We have committed to collecting and will continue to monitor data on the characteristics of our employees, trustees and advisors. We believe this gives us a degree of insight into the diversity of the organisation, and as we build on data from previous years, we may start to identify trends which might not be revealed in a standalone survey. The hope is that this long view will inform our thinking and contribute to decision making.

In line with the standard set in 2021, all employees, trustees and advisors were invited to take part. Participation was optional and it’s acknowledged that that the results detailed in this report can only represent those that chose to take part. The report therefore gives an indication and a starting point for conversation but is not a complete picture. This report will show the results of this year’s survey and will draw comparisons between the data of this and previous surveys of 2021 and where possible, 2019.

**Participation**

All employees, trustees and advisors were invited to take part in the survey making a total of 75 possible respondents. Out of these there were 53 responses, of which 35 were employees, 10 were trustees and 8 were advisors (Chart 1).

Chart 1

This translated to 71% of employees, 91% of trustees and 53% of advisors took part, in comparison to 81%, 70% and 29% participation respectively for 2021 as shown below.

Chart 2

All respondents completed the survey i.e., there was no drop-off mid-survey, and all chose to declare their role within PHF.

**Methodology**

The aim of the survey is to give us good insight into the demographics and characteristics represented to increase our understanding of diversity at PHF. We endeavour to share the results as clearly and transparently as possible, however, our priority is also to protect anonymity of those taking part and therefore there are some modifications in how and what data is presented.

Where there are small numbers of responses for some questions, reporting will be adapted to ensure no one can be identified inadvertently – for example, where there are fewer than four respondents answering in a particular way, results will be reported as “3 or fewer”.  In addition, it may be necessary to collapse categories within some questions to avoid identification, for instance within the ethnicity and age question. In some cases, it is also necessary to combine the trustee and advisor groups together in order to report any data.

The results have been presented to provide as close a comparison to those of the 2021 survey. The majority of the questions remain unchanged which means this has been possible in most cases. The 2019 survey used slightly different questions so direct comparisons are more challenging, however the data is referenced where possible and where it is useful.

Given the distinct nature of the roles of those taking part, employee, trustee and advisor, we recognise it is important to reflect this when presenting the results as much as possible. However due to small group sizes and response numbers, in the majority of cases the advisor group and the trustee group results have been combined in order for data to be shared. 2022 is the second year that advisors and trustees have been invited to take part in the survey meaning this is the first year that we are able to draw year on year comparisons for this group.

**Results**

**Sex ratio**

The data for 2022 follows the trend set by previous surveys, with 74% of this year’s respondents answering Female to the sex question.

Chart 3

Due to small numbers of responses to some answer options for this question, the advisor and trustee groups have been combined. This was reported in the same format in 2021 and a comparison can be seen in chart 4 below. Note the reversed trend between 2021 and 2022, which could be attributed to the higher response rates of both the advisors and the trustees group.

Chart 4

**Gender Identity**

We are unable to report on the results of the question on Gender Identity due to low response numbers to some answer options.

**Age**

The data from this year’s survey show all respondents to be from age 30 years and upwards. There were no responses in the age ranges 16-24 or 25-29. The distribution of responses allows for a slightly greater breakdown to be shown in comparison to previous years and Chart 5 represents the results from 2022 only.

Chart 5

Chart 6 compares the age distribution from 2019, 2021 and 2022; however some of the age range options from the 2022 data have been aggregated to allow for easier comparison.

Chart 6

The trustees and advisors are much smaller in number than employees, and in combination with survey uptake rates, it can be difficult to report on age distribution in detail. However, the trustee group responses ranged between 40 years and 65+, with 50% representing the 65+ category as shown below.

Chart 7

The advisor group shows a greater distribution of ages than the trustee group, overall ranging from 35 to 65+, however the detail of the results can’t be shown in more detail for anonymity reasons.

However, the data does allow for a combined trustee and advisor group comparison to 2021 results and has been aggregated accordingly for easier comparison.

Chart 8

**Ethnicity**

The survey followed the format set in 2021 and asked two questions on ethnicity, a main and a sub-group question. The answer options were based on the 2021 Census. As was the case in 2021, several answer options for the sub-group and the main question had three or fewer responses and once again, to maintain anonymity, the data from some answer options has been combined. However, we can say that the data this year has allowed for slightly further breakdown than was seen in 2021.

Chart 9 shows the Ethnicity within the employee group for 2022. This year it was possible to separate the Black, Black British, Caribbean or African group compared to 2021, when this data was aggregated with another smaller response group for reporting.

Chart 9

\*The expanded list of diversity in this group is Asian or Asian British, Chinese, Indian, Pakistani or Other; and Mixed or Multiple Ethnic groups, White & Asian and White & Black African; and Other Ethnic groups.

For the purpose of comparison, we have combined the data in a much broader way in chart 10. Whilst this does not recognise the distinction between groups, it can be used to see a decreasing trend in the representation of white employees in comparison to those of non-white background.

Chart 10

The advisor group and trustee group have been combined to enable anonymous reporting. Chart 11 shows the results in comparison to 2021. The chart shows an increase in white representation and a decrease in representation of non-white groups. However, this could be attributed to the increased participation of the survey in both the advisor and the trustee groups in 2022 compared to 2021 and may not represent a real change.

Chart 11

\*The expanded list of diversity in this group is Asian or Asian British, Chinese, Indian, Pakistani or Other; and British or Black British, Caribbean, or African; and Mixed or Multiple Ethnic groups, White & Asian and White & Black African; and Other Ethnic groups.

Disability

This question asked whether respondents consider themselves to be disabled and the results for the employee group are given in the table below. There is a slight upward trend in the proportion of employees who consider themselves to be disabled.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Employee group | | | |
| Identified as disabled? | **2022** | **2021** | **2019** |
| Yes | 9% or fewer | 8% or fewer | 6% or fewer |
| No | 89% or fewer | 90% or fewer | 91% or fewer |

The results for the advisor group and trustee group have been combined for anonymity. The results show that up to 23% of respondents consider themselves to have a disability. This is a large increase against 2021 when all respondents considered that they did not have a disability.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Combined advisor and trustee group | | |
| Identified as disabled? | **2022** | **2021** |
| Yes | 23% or fewer | 0 |
| No | 78% or fewer | 100% or fewer |

Sexual Orientation

The question on sexual orientation resulted in small response numbers to some answer options which are not possible to break down entirely here.

The responses to some categories have been grouped together although not all answers featured as a given response for each year.

However, we can see that by far the largest group represented was Heterosexual/Straight across each survey since 2019.

Chart 12

The trustee group and the advisor group follow a similar trend: A large majority of the trustee group identified as heterosexual and 100% of the advisor group also identified as straight.

Religion

The majority of employees identified as having no religion or belief according to 2022 results. Other faiths were represented in small numbers and have therefore been aggregated as shown in chart 13 with the respective 2021 data shown.

In 2021 we were able to separate Christian from this aggregated group and the 36% total was made up of 15% Christian and 21% the remaining religions. Note that No religion or belief is consistently the largest response (similarly in 2019 this was 66%).

Chart 13

Although more responses were received overall across the advisor group and trustee group, the results are too distributed across the answer options to be able to report on. However, 50% of the combined advisor and trustee group identified as having no religion or belief and 50% identified as one of the following: Christian, Hindu, Humanist (self-described) or Muslim.

Social mobility

In 2022, a question looking at social mobility was reintroduced to the diversity data survey. PHF have attempted to gather data in this area in previous years, but the questions asked were imperfect and we recognised there were issues around them. However, Social class is a relevant metric for PHF to consider and so in 2022 we looked to the [Social Mobility Commission](https://socialmobilityworks.org/) and specifically their online [toolkit](https://socialmobilityworks.org/toolkit/measurement/) to inform the question used for this year’s survey. The social mobility question related to the occupation of the householder’s main earner when the respondent was about aged 14 and had nine broad answer options (Appendix A).

The table below shows the results. The quantity of answer options has resulted in a broad spread of results and therefore small response numbers per answer. The results were therefore combined to present the data and to do this we once again looked to the Social Mobility Commission for guidance on groupings. Guidance around reporting on this question can be found [here](https://socialmobilityworks.org/wp-content/uploads/2021/05/Summary-report-on-measurement-changes_FINAL-Updated-May-2021.pdf), but for ease the answers were reduced to three categories. We recognise that that again this may be an imperfect solution, but it does mean that precise figures can be given for most categories which is arguably more useful. Any answer option with less than 4 respondents is quantified as ‘3 or fewer’. Once again, the advisor group and trustee group have been combined.

Professional background or higher socio-economic backgrounds made up the largest response for both the employee group and the combined advisor and trustee group. Overall, the Employees had a broad representation across the nine answer options with at least one response to each. Responses from trustees were also broad and advisors were the least diverse in their responses.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Social Mobility: 2022 | | |
|  | Employees | Combined advisor and trustee group |
| Professional background or higher socio-economic background | 24 | 12 |
| Intermediate background | 4 | 5 |
| Working class background or lower socio-economic background | 8 | 3 or fewer |

**Summary**

The results of the 2022 survey have provided some insight into diversity at PHF. The usefulness of which is ever increased with each new set of data and as we start to see trends emerge.

Participation is and will remain optional. This is important to us, and we recognise there may be many reasons for and against taking part. However, a high participation rate does lead to more useful data which can then be shared more widely, and so our appreciation goes out to those who chose to take part.

We feel the results do show a staff group which is generally increasing in its diversity in several areas with some progress of note in ethnicity, disability, and sexual orientation. We recognise that there is still work to do and hope that with increased data, building year-on-year, we can build on this insight to continue to inform our thinking, our practices and decision making.

**Appendix A.**

Q. 13

What was the occupation of your main household earner when you were about aged 14?

|  |
| --- |
| **Modern professional & traditional professional occupations**such as: teacher, nurse, physiotherapist, social worker, musician, police officer (sergeant or above), software designer, accountant, solicitor, medical practitioner, scientist, civil / mechanical engineer. |
| **Senior, middle or junior managers or administrators** such as: finance manager, chief executive, large business owner, office manager, retail manager, bank manager, restaurant manager, warehouse manager. |
| **Clerical and intermediate occupations** such as: secretary, personal assistant, call centre agent, clerical worker, nursery nurse |
| **Technical and craft occupations** such as: motor mechanic, plumber, printer, electrician, gardener, train driver |
| **Routine, semi-routine manual and service occupations** such as: postal worker, machine operative, security guard, caretaker, farm worker, catering assistant, sales assistant, HGV driver, cleaner, porter, packer, labourer, waiter/waitress, bar staff |
| **Long-term unemployed** (claimed Jobseeker’s Allowance or earlier unemployment benefit for more than a year) |
| **Small business owners** who employed less than 25 people such as: corner shop owners, small plumbing companies, retail shop owner, single restaurant or cafe owner, taxi owner, garage owner |
| **Other** such as: retired, this question does not apply to me, I don’t know |
| **I prefer not to say** |