

“ Currently, talent is everywhere, but opportunity is not. I hope this review and its recommendations will play some part in addressing this unavoidable truth. The recommendations are rightly focussed on disabled applicants, interviewees and, sometimes even, appointees. However, I believe that they could have general applicability and benefits for all in many situations, across public appointments and beyond. ”



Lord Holmes of Richmond MBE

## What's the problem?\*

3% of existing public appointees reported that they are disabled.	The disability status of <b>35%</b> of existing public appointees is unknown.	<b>6.8%</b> of candidates who reported that they were disabled made it from application to appointment, compared to <b>8.1%</b> those who reported they were not disabled.
---	---	--

## What did the review find, and what should government do about it?

### Section 1:

#### Data and transparency

##### Found:

- disability data collected only at application
- language and data collection form inconsistent
- varied reasons applicants reticent to share (overleaf)
- data too patchy for full transparency

##### What now?

- interim target: 11.3% disabled public appointees by 2022
- one-off data collection overhaul exercise, annual stocktake and transparency measures
- central application portal

### Section 2:

#### Attracting and nurturing talent

##### Found:

- self-selecting group through over-reliance on one website
- many disabled people feel public appointments “not for people like them”
- need to look further and harder for disabled talent

##### What now?

- role models
- mentoring
- multipliers and connectors
- executive search guidance
- disability network

### Section 3:

#### The application process

##### Found:

- inconsistent alternative application methods
- experience, sector and seniority-focused selection criteria
- inconsistent openness to and adjustments for disabled candidates
- mixed feedback on Guaranteed Interview Scheme and Disability Confident

##### What now?

- accessibility and openness standards for application packs
- commission pilot open recruitments
- retain Guaranteed Interview Scheme
- public bodies to achieve a Disability Confident level by summer 2019

### Section 4:

#### Interviews and beyond

##### Found:

- one-off panel interviews can embed disadvantage for disabled people
- examples of poor adjustments and interview etiquette and feedback
- lack of disability awareness

##### What now?

- innovative pilot assessments
- awareness and adjustments guidance
- disability awareness for panellists
- more disabled independent panellists



In 2018, **35%** of public appointees' disability status was unknown

## WHY DO APPLICANTS NOT WANT TO SHARE THIS DATA?

“To label yourself as disabled... there remains a big issue there.”

“I had a few cases where I informed [about disability] ... I was always unsuccessful in those interviews.”

“I don't want people to think I'm angling for a guaranteed interview.”

“It's very situational. I am 'able' in some circumstances.”

“Interviewers literally run a mile once they hear the 'D' word.”

“I'd fill it in after the appointment.”

“[There] needs to be a far greater clarity on what the purpose is.”

## WHY APPLY, OR WHY NOT APPLY?

“The challenge is reaching people who feel it's not for them.”

“More role models with disability [are] needed.”

“Mentoring as a bridge to readiness to apply.”

“Hearing word of mouth from someone was good.”

“Opportunity to have an informal discussion with the employer was very helpful.”

“Didn't think I was the right type of person.”

“Could there be a virtual tap on the shoulder?”

“Clarity and ease of finding the position and the requirements is very good.”

## APPLICATIONS

“Asking for extensive previous public appointment experience is a barrier.”

**8.1%**  
of applicants are disabled

“Online application forms can be clunky.”

“Should be made more accessible, especially for peep [sic] who have for example sensory condition.”

“Options of in-person or telephone interview really helps.”

“Says applications from disabled people welcome.”

“Brilliant ... usually there's lots of jargon ... but the packs here had the dates ... you know where you are.”

“Selection criteria [is] too general.”

“[Criteria] exclude those who may have the aptitude... without length of service.”

“Asking in advance if any adjustment is needed to participate is good.”

## INTERVIEWS

“You arrive and the adjustments aren't what you expect them to be, this is a bit of a body blow.”

“Panel can be too focused on agreed questions and not explore abilities more.”

**7.2%**  
of interviewees are disabled

“Mine was by telephone which was helpful.”

“The process was oriented to lived experience and getting the right mix of people.”

“Interview process was clear and straightforward.”

“Panel were quick to dismiss my disability because it wasn't obvious.”

“I wanted to tell them about my lived experience... but there was no opportunity to do this.”

“I was very intimidated.”

“It was a really positive experience for me.”

“I had informed them of my disability access requirements and they were all met.”

## APPOINTMENTS

“Once you've tried a few times, it's tough to keep trying.”

“There's a culture of fear around what to say [to disabled people in feedback].”

**6.9%**  
of appointees are disabled

“When I was offered the non-exec role ... it was a coup for me.”

“I find seeing the concepts come into action most rewarding.”

“I could get called to interview, do all the prep, but they never wanted to interview me anyway.”

“I was elated to be chosen for the committee. It's rewarding to be valued and considered equally able.”

“I feel privileged to be in this position.”

Negative

Positive

<sup>1</sup> All data on this page is valid for 2017/18.

<sup>2</sup> All quotations are taken from call for evidence submissions, regional workshops, email submissions and interviews.