

ILO GBDN Webinar

What's In a Number? Disability Data for Business Change

October 4, 2018 at 11:00am ET

Captions Rough Edit

>> Hello and welcome to the webinar of the ILO Global Business and Disability Network. What's in a number? Disability data for business change. Audiocast quality is subject to your equipment, available bandwidth and internet traffic. If you experience unsatisfactory audio quality, please use the telephone dialing option provided in your confirmation and reminder email. If you have dialed in, operator assistance is available by pressing 0#. You can ask questions at any time by using the Q&A window located to the lower left of the presentation screen. A question-and-answer session will follow the presentation. Now I will turn the call over to Stefan Tromel.

>> Thank you, Luke. And good afternoon, good morning, and depending where you are, I'm Stefan Tromel from the International Labour Organisation in charge of the secretary of the global business and international network which is the organization hosting this webinar. We are going to have a presentation from four speakers whom we have kindly asked to stick to five minutes and hopefully we will have a chance for Q&A, which as Luke mentioned, you will have time to submit via chat.

Let me briefly explain why we decided to focus on this topic and let me give the example of the ILO. The ILO is an organization that is not allowed to ask its employees whether they have a disability or not. It's subject to privacy and confidentiality. At the same time, we as an organization want to know whether, over time, we are becoming or not, a more welcoming organization, so we want to know whether the number of staff with disabilities is going up, whether new employees are coming into the organization that would [Away from mic] as having a disability and we would like to know whether those staff with disabilities, how well they are doing compared with non-disabled staff. For instance, through a staff satisfaction survey. So the purpose of the webinar today is to help us, and we have the same challenge as other global organizations and particular global companies, how to address this in a way that allows organizations to monitor programs while at the same time fully respecting the rights of people with disabilities and that is what we're trying to achieve with the webinar today.

Just a brief comment on logistics, you see closed captioning being provided at the bottom of your screen and as I mentioned, please enter comments at the text box to your left.

I will introduce each of the speakers one after the other, and after their presentation, I will probably ask each of them a short follow-up question. I will start with Angela Matthews. Angela is the head of policy and advice at the business and disability forum in the UK, which is a key active partner of the Global Business and Disability Network. BDF has been working with companies on these issues and it's great we are working with Angela today. She will explain us the reasons of doing it and how they're doing it in a way that fully respects the rights of people with disabilities Angela, the floor over to you.

>> Thank you very much, and thank you, everyone for joining. So I [Away from mic] disability forum and the issue with data monitoring, it's one of the issues that we talk about a lot. I have been at BD F5 years and it's never really dropped off the agenda. People have been talking about it in various ways, the conversation has moved quite rapidly and got more sophisticated and in our global task force, we've recently been doing some research and we'll shortly be releasing some research on how organizations across the globe approach the issue of measuring disability in their organization. So when we talk about measuring disability in our organization, the term [Away from mic] organization is easily used. When they talk about that, it's data monitoring. However in our capacity here at BDF as advisors, we actually

don't talk about data that much when we are talking about this issue. What we find ourselves talking about more is about organizing emotions about how we think about ourselves and how employers strategies and language are considerate to how we identify and how we want to talk about ourselves at work. So what that means is that we have four key things, really, that we talk about on this issue of data monitoring and interestingly, none of them include data.

So the first thing we speak to organizations about when they're approaching data monitoring is first of all, what are your motivations for this? Secondly, we'll explore the cultural climate [Away from mic] for their organization. We'll then look at language quite a lot and the fourth thing that we speak a lot about is information ethics and how employers look after these very personal stories and very personal details of employees. And what we find is if one of those four things are not considered or aren't in sync with one another, that affects the data return of employees.

So really when you're looking at those four things, what we're really talking about is changing your business and also changing about how your employees feel about being part of your business as well. This is a huge identity issue.

So first of all, as I said, motivations, we speak to organizations about why do you want to do this, and there's four things usually that come up. I think the most important thing to remember here is that collecting information about disability or diversity data, as lots of organizations here in the UK would call it, is generally an output which it should be just one output but part of a wider outcome. What are you trying to do? Organizations tell us four common things. Firstly, they're trying to figure out how many people with disabilities they have in their organization. The second thing we hear quite a lot is they want to [Away from mic] disclosure and how well employees do or don't respond to that term disclosure and how that can affect how employees tell you about their disability. So increasing the disclosure, level of employees to say they have a disability. We usually see that's [Away from mic] employers who have a target or trying to meet a quota. The third thing we hear about quite a lot is I want to measure the number of [Away from mic] employees in my organization because I want to advance the inclusive culture. And then the other is to understand the extent of adjustments used in the workforce to help plan resources. So they're quite four different things and actually when we look at those things, data may not be the answer to how you achieve those things. For example, we see quite a lot in the UK, even global organizations operating who have a presence in the UK are finding that it the more inclusive their culture is, actually the less likely disabled employees are [Away from mic] the organization that they have a disability. And this is generally because when an employee makes their workplace adjustments work well and it's easy and easy to use, when communications are included, when your [Away from mic] is accessible, actually you don't need to ask for adjustments and therefore why would you tell the organization about your disability? There's some really interesting things there. What is it you're trying to achieve and is collecting data actually going to help you do that? And the other thing we see quite a lot and is very important for organizations [Away from mic] to really respect really is that collecting data is actually a whole organization action.

So [Away from mic] employee surveys, when we see organizations collecting data, we rarely see there's one department or one team involved in that. What we often see is that senior leaders are communicating that this is what we're doing, which is why we want to do it, and there's also a huge communication present, so there needs to be a [Away from mic] strategy behind this. Employee networks are usually involved as well and encouraging other employees to understand why this is being done but also to [Away from mic] disclose their disability. And of course, HR are involved and sometimes -- well, a lot of the time, if data collection is being done physically, obviously IT will be involved. So we already see actually data collection is involved in a lot of business areas, it's not just one thing that are responding to this. And that means there's a clear strategy for data collection and it also means all of those departments need to be speaking to each other.

The second thing that we see is really crucial and that we spend quite a lot of time talking to organizations about when they put in a data collection strategy together is what is your climate like? For example, if you have got a huge number of [Away from mic] harassment disability related cases, if you have got a huge issue with your absence management or performance management policies or procedures, if you're restructuring or is there a redundant piece going on at the moment, we see that that can really affect the level of response you get when you're asking these questions. And the other thing that a lot of organizations in the UK are really conscious of are survey fatigue. That's the phrase they use over here, which is we have got our employee survey, we have got the accessibility survey, we have got diversity survey, and we've also got a supply survey, so our employees are getting so many surveys, if they see another survey they are not going to bother looking at it. Similarly to that is the warmth an organization in the conversation. What we mean by that is [Away from mic] sending out a survey and asking employees to fill out the survey --

>> I'm sorry, there was a glitch on my side there. I hope you can still hear me. I was saying about the warmth of the organizational conversation. If this is the [Away from mic] disability related task or communication, then this is probably we see this is met with suspicion quite a lot and employees will probably be less likely to fill the questionnaire in. So what we see is there often needs to be a strategy for how you communicate this is going to happen and what's going to be followed up after that.

I'm not going to talk for much longer because I'm conscious I'm going over my time. I do have some more slides on this deck for me. Please let me know if you have questions.

>> Thank you, Angela. Thank you for identifying some of the challenges that organizations face when they address this issue and also the relevance of the communication that needs to surround such exercise if there is any possibility of success. And let me ask you very quick follow-up question because in the up to this webinar there was this discussion should we recommend organizations to try to monitor that or is it something that organizations should just focus on becoming more inclusive and not asking. I was wondering in the context of BDF, would you say that your members are global and local members, would you see them more and more interested in having numbers or what is the feeling in terms of companies trying to have this data or companies deciding we should not have it? What would be your assessment?

>> Yeah, really a good question. And actually that's a nuance there that we find. In the UK we have something called the public sector equality duty. For the public sector organizations there is duty for them to be transparent with their diversity and inclusion activity particularly around reporting numbers. So it's not a quota that they have to fill or a target, but there's public sector equality which sets under our [Away from mic] actually requires public sector organizations to report on how things are in their organization, which often is good practice would include that you report the number of people who have a disability in your organization. But we see for other organizations that they really don't want to get bogged down with data and counting the number of employees because they recognize how difficult this can be and in terms of logistics and how you spend your resources and if some people are not going to fill in the survey, all you're ever going to get is the number of employees who tell you. You're not going to actually get a specific accurate picture of how many disabled employees there actually are.

We see in the private sector are generally more focused on being inclusive and sorting out processes and policies. There is also that good practice in the public sector as well, but [Away from mic].

>> Thank you, Angela. Colleagues, we have now people have been joining the webinar gradually. We have a bit over 80 participants. We had 260 persons that had expressed their interest and preregistered. Just as it was mentioned at the beginning, the webinar is being recorded for those who cannot follow it or cannot follow it fully, you can then listen to it later on and we will provide the link. Reminder of the logistics, you have the Q&A box at the left side of your screen to which you can send us questions which we will try to field back to the panel towards the end of the webinar. Now moving on to our next speaker, Andrea Hall, diversity leader at DXC Technology, a company that became a member

of the global disability network in June of this year. DXC has a presence in 70 countries, 170 [Away from mic] and DXC has just started a global campaign on [Away from mic] identification of its staff. And Andrea is here joining us to share with us the first feedback from this ambitious campaign. Andrea, the floor over to you.

>> Hi, everyone. Great. Thank you so much for the introduction. My name is Andrea and I'm with DXC and I do want to quickly share that we at DXC just became a company in April of 2017. We are a recent merger of [Away from mic] and Hewlett-Packard enterprise services. In my role leading diversity recruiting, my role was just created for the company. As we started this journey of diversity recruitment and outreach and I really needed to understand where we were before I could decide where we needed to go.

So I started with taking a look at all of the countries where we do business, of those 70 countries and really identifying where we had requirements. And you can see hereby this visual representation that demonstrated in black, all of the countries where we currently do business that there are governmental driven requirements by departments of labor or ministries of labor, et cetera, where there are either penalties for not meeting goals around hiring people with disabilities or where there are benefits in meeting those.

And the goals are different from country to country, so I've sort of given you some information over to the left of the percentages required in those countries. So pretty significant that 25 of our 70 countries has some sort of a requirement.

Next I had to ask myself how well are we doing with hiring and retention in those countries? So what I discovered is some countries were doing fantastic, they had great programs with outreach and recruitment and community partners, et cetera. And then other countries weren't doing so well. As I continued the conversation, what I soon discovered was there was not a single tool to track data globally. Countries were collecting data in different ways and a variety of tools. The first step really in our journey was to create a single source of truth. So for the better part of 2017, we worked with a company called workday to create a place where employees could safely enter their appropriate diversity demographics into a tool throughout the world.

And we had to make sure that in each country we used appropriate language, that we used appropriate definitions of what it means to have a disability, that we entered into it that there's an understanding that this is voluntary and there was an option to choose to not disclose information, and that employees understood that none of this information would be shared about them, that this information is only being used in the aggregate.

So in April of 2018 we kicked off our go live, starting with our new hires, and gave them an opportunity to update their demographic information.

And then in July of 2018, a couple months later, we kicked off a global self-identification campaign. How did we do that? We did that with a host of communications, the first starting with our CHRO, our chief human resource officer, it went out to them to let them know these self-identification campaigns were going to be going on. We have been reaching out to the HR [Away from mic] for that country to self-identify using the workday tool. We used a series of WIIFMs to help them understand why we were interested in collecting data and help them understand that they were helping us to improve on our inclusion and diversity programs in their countries by helping us demonstrate how many people we have in that country with disability, how many people are willing to disclose and helping us understand that in those countries maybe we needed to invest more deeply.

So as we rolled out the program, we had to understand and be mindful that this is very culturally sensitive and there's a lot of time sensitivity. Some countries have requirements, like Canada had a requirement in August. We also understood that our worker council implications in some countries. We took very granular involvement from teams with labor relations and human resources, also with our

legal and workday subject matter experts to make sure that we were successful in each country as we rolled the program out.

So we wanted to make sure that you understand that if you consider going into something like this, you need to understand that you need to create a timeline. We were conscious that the workday tool, we could not roll this out globally at once. We would risk shutting the tool down. We had experience in the past with a U.S.-based campaign. And we also wanted to encourage you to understand that you needed to understand your baseline so we wanted to see baseline metrics to see whether or not we experienced improvement. As of today, we've completed our self-identification campaigns in the United States and Canada and we're currently rolling out in the UK and Brazil. Just some quick success metrics, weaving from 2.5% to 6.55% self-identified people with disabilities in the United States and remarkably in Canada weaving from 2.8 to 13.5. In North America, we've made some great strides but we have more work to do. The last slide is my contact information. If you have questions or comments or would like to contact me, I encourage you to do so. I'm trying to be conscious of time. Back over to you.

>> Andrea, thank you very much for the presentation. It's very interesting, especially since I anticipate many other global companies members of our network will be interested in following your path and learning from how you did this, what were the challenges and how you over came those challenges. I have a quick follow-up question. As you know and as you can see the different percentages [Away from mic] countries use different definitions of disability. There are many countries that have disability certification systems and other process. But was just wondering are you using exactly the same questions and definition of disability at a global level or are you taking into account the variations around the understanding of who is considered or not a person with a disability?

>> That's a great question. So actually for the better part of 2017, we virtually traveled from country to country understanding what is the definition of disability, how in that country do you self-identify as a person with a disability, and what documentation is required? So the system actually defines disability differently depending where you access it in the world. When I look at it from a U.S. posture, I'll see the Department of Labor's definition of disability, whereas if you enter it somewhere else in the world, you'll see your country's definition. Also where there's documentation required, there's an allowance in the tool to upload that document if you choose to do so.

>> Excellent.

>> The one thing I did make clear across the countries where there is not a requirement, we simply asked disability status and then we invited people to understand that this information is voluntary and if you choose not to disclose, that's also an option.

>> Thanks. Very important consideration. Moving now to the third speaker of our panel, Susanne, Susanne is the director of [Away from mic] at Cornell University in the U.S., also a member of the Global Business and Disability Network and Susanne will share with us some research done by the institute asking companies on how they deal with issues around self-identification. Susanne, the floor over to you.

>> Thank you very much, Stefan, and thanks to each of you who are joining us today. It's a good size group, which I'm delighted about. As seven says, I'm going to talk about disability disclosure from several different sources of Cornell research and workplace disability inclusion. I'm going to work quickly so I can interact with you and respond to questions. The points I'm going to hit are why disability disclosure is of interest, which we've pretty much covered, what individuals are telling us that their reasons are to disclose or not from a study of 600 individuals with disability, a few elements about the importance of building climate for inclusion which our first speaker Angela spoke a little bit about, and specifically from our research, the importance of the supervisor which has crystallized very critical for us in building climate for inclusion, and I'll leave you, we won't go over but you can know there's quite a bit

of references and resources about our research which you can find online which I included at the end of the slides.

I think we've covered pretty well why disclose. Many of us, as Andrea so well pointed out, have regulatory frameworks that innocent employers to -- that's true for about a quarter or more of our own American workforce because of the federal contractor requirements under section 503 rehab act as well as our [Away from mic] for the percentage of workforce being people with disabilities. But it's also important because many individuals, especially if you have an aging workforce do need accommodations, so being able to confidently come forward is important to be productive in the workforce. Beyond that we know when people are able to be who they are, they enjoy their job better and more likely to be productive and stay in their jobs. There are many reasons why this is a really important topic for us today. One of the things I wanted to share because I think most often we identify accommodations with disability, so people become even more hesitant to ask and I believe Angela made this point as well, that if accommodates requests are a common part of good practice in the organization and everybody can comfortably ask for them and they are not seen as extraordinary but rather [Away from mic] tools makes it easier for people with disabilities to ask. And we know from national census data in the United States from the current populations survey and a disability summit from 2012, that the majority of accommodation requests come from people without disabilities. In fact, 95% of people in this survey who said they had made an accommodation request in the last year were people without disabilities. So I think we're doing it all the time, we don't need to make it as special as we do, and by sending that message within our companies, then we are probably facilitating comfort for disclosure for people with disabilities and a need to ask for accommodation.

In our experience and also by the requirements of our federal subcontractor regulations, we can ask about disability status at application, during a job interview, once the individual is hired when an accommodation is needed, and also within defined time periods on a regular basis. And I've included the forms that we use for that process for federal subcontractors for your reference at the end of the slides.

So it can be ongoing depending on the regulatory requirements of your -- and allowances of your particular organization. Another thing we get asked quite frequently is what's the difference between confidentiality of data versus anonymity. And I think it's really important to get clear about that within our respective organizations so we can convey to the people we may be asking for this information, the parameters within which the data is collected. If data is collected and held anonymously, it means that there's no identifying values that can link the data to the individual sharing the information. The organization collecting the data should not be able to identify a specific respondent. And an example of that is perhaps a climate survey or engagement survey where you might do which can include a disability variable and we might find out there's many more people who confidently respond and identify as a person with a disability on that kind of survey than when the data is collected and held with identifiers. In that case, the data should still be confidential and the individual needs to be notified that their identifying data is held with their response about disability identification or accommodation request, that that data is being kept confidentially, which can heighten the comfort level of the individual. Being clear about these two distinctions is very important and you may get very different responses because of how you're characterizing how the data is being held and whether or not the identifiers of [Away from mic] indicate their checkbox about disability. As I mentioned, we've done a survey of 600 individuals with disabilities. We've done many surveys with companies working with HR [Away from mic] human resource management. This is a survey of 600 individuals with disabilities and we asked them for the factors within their organization and within themselves that would facilitate or [Away from mic] disclosure. And what we found is that people were more likely to disclose if they needed an accommodation. 68%, also if they had a good relationship with their supervisor, about 63%. A little less but still significant, over half if they saw an active disability workplace or active disability

recruiting and disability statements or [Away from mic] come forward either to request an accommodation or just to identify as the person with a disability and had a good experience. They also, interesting, signals like disability and diversity statements, about half of them said that would be a reason to come forward because it was clear that the organization really were interested in having people with disabilities within their workplace. Only two out of five said, but this is still important, that it was a belief in new opportunities, that somehow the organization was signaling if they came forward, they would be advantaged. Reasons why they would not disclosed would be a risk of being fired or not hired. Around two-thirds said a concern about the employer focusing on disability or in the U.S., a risk of losing healthcare, which continues to be an issue with us since we don't have full coverage for everyone in our country. Two-thirds felt a limiting of their opportunities or the supervisor might not be supportive, around half. Risk of being viewed or treated differently was an area of concern or if there was no impact on job ability, around two out of five. And only about a quarter said it was a desire for privacy. So it's more a risk of being viewed or treated differently.

It's also important to note the importance of the supervisor in these processes because that is much more likely in our experience, in our research, to be where disclosure occurs. In separate surveys that we've done within organizations and across organizations, we find that employees with disabilities are at least 60% more likely to disclose their disability to a supervisor than to an HR professional in the more formal system. So educating our supervisors is absolutely critical if we want to facilitate disability disclosure.

The conditions people told us that they were more likely to disclose, the perception of disability climate is positive, if they work in what they would describe inclusive climates, if they perceive HR practices to be fairly implemented within the organization more broadly and they previous the organization to be genuinely [Away from mic] I gave you examples what they're looking at. Also I just mentioned they have a trusting and close relationship with their supervisor, that helps a lot. In summary, I would like to say employers may have regulatory requirements or affirmative hiring initiatives that increase their interests in having individuals with disabilities disclose those disabilities and enable employers to count them. That's a fact for many of us across many countries now. Individuals with disabilities are more likely to be able to get needed accommodations and maintain being productive in their workforce and make meaningful contributions if they're comfortable disclosing. And we are all advantage of being able to bring our whole selves to work and contribute our diverse abilities in the workplace. That is a reason we want people to feel comfortable. Finally, it's important for us to acknowledge and recognize that the managers' role is critical to workplace inclusion and we need to educate our managers to be able to respond in a way that's supportive to individuals when they want to disclose. And with that, I do have, as you can see here, six other slides. I'm going to leave them as resources to you and I will move this back to Stefan. Stefan, I am not hearing you so your mute may be on.

>> Thank you, Susanne. I think we're listening to Angela and now to you, it seems quite clear that there's a difference between disclosure information that is then held confidentially and self-identification which is much more about an anonymous survey and all that. Would I be wrong in assuming that if a company [Away from mic] usually have a higher rate of people with self-identification as disabled compared to people who disclose their disability? Would you have any analysis made of that in the context of the obligations that we saw from the U.S. legislation?

>> Yes, Stefan, that's absolutely right and that's a terrific question. Why we encourage companies to do both, to do what is appropriate direct inquiries with identifiers where they can, but also to do anonymous kinds of inquiries on regular routine surveys like engagement surveys include a disability variable so that they can see how close the self-disclosed confidential base file where a person may choose to identify is that more broad anonymous survey. In our experience, it can be anywhere from three to 10 times higher in the anonymous survey, which gives us a litmus which tells us that many

individuals are not comfortable having themselves identified for purposes of the formal system, but may, in an anonymous survey. So think it's a great idea to be able to do that. Also if you keep that data, you can compare the perceptions of individuals and turnover to the supervisor the job satisfaction and engagement on that survey with people on a minority presentation or your general population and your workforce, and it can also be a telling factor whether or not you're having climate problems among those different populations. So I do enthusiastically encourage people to attempt to get that data in two ways.

>> Excellent, Susanne. That is very useful and very clear. Let me now pass to our last speaker, Ruth Warick. Ruth is the first Vice President of the International Disability Alliance and we are asking her about the perspective of people with disabilities. We've heard so far about the point of view of organizations, of companies, and I've seen also in the questions we received from our participants, that definitely at least one of the participants is very keen about trying to understand what is the perspective, the point of view of persons with disabilities in this regard. So Ruth, thanks for being with us in the webinar and the floor is over to you.

>> Thank you very much, Stefan. Are you able to hear me okay?

>> Yes, indeed.

>> Okay. Wonderful. So it's my pleasure to be here and I found that the preceding three presentations very interesting and excellent points have been made.

So disclosure is a topic that is very sensitive. There is a lot of stigma attached to disclosing that one has a disability in many parts of the world. There are actually taboos around disclosing because of the disadvantages that people experience. So it's not surprising that many individuals with disabilities will be somewhat wary and suspicious of disclosing, especially if they need to disclose for job purposes.

However, we also recognize that disclosing brings benefits and it is part of our process to encourage individuals to disclose in order to get the adjustments and accommodations and to help create an inclusive workplace. So when we talk of disclosure, we are talking about disclosing at many different levels and it's often very situational. Individuals in applying for jobs probably would not disclose if they felt there was no benefit to doing so. Once having gotten a position, then there may be benefits to disclosing in order to get the needed adjustments in accommodations.

And what we need to do is create workplaces where people feel that confident and comfortable in doing so, recognizing that the individuals they're disclosing to have much more influence and are in a position of power.

It is recognized, however, as well that overall data surveys serve a useful purpose. From the point of view of the International Disability Alliance, we have been very supportive of having measures to measure progress and having data collected for the sustainable development goals or to measure the achievements as a result of the convention on the rights of people with disabilities.

So when we talk about collecting data in organizations in the workplace, that also translates into something that would be useful and viewed as useful as long as the purpose of the data collection is clear. So that purpose, from my personal point of view, should not just be to make government regulations, but should be to actually improve the workplace, make it more inclusive, ensure that the necessary adjustments are in place, ensure that we're doing the things that we need that change the numbers from a low 2% to as high as 13%, as has been mentioned by a previous speaker for a situation in Canada.

I think that we need to consult with people with disabilities in this process, employees within a specific company need to know exactly what is the purpose of a survey and have buy in through that participation they themselves will be able to convey their support and bring more people alongside in order to support people's participation in conducting surveys in the workplace.

Now, I want to touch on accommodations regarding surveys. So we need to ensure that people can actually participate in the survey. For Deaf people, it might be that the survey is in sign language. It

might be that it needs to be in sign language or if there are videos to be captioned. We can't underestimate the message we send to people when we ensure the actual instrument itself is accessible to people with disabilities.

And then we should also talk about what happens with the results. Often people with disabilities are asked to give input without results being also something that they have an opportunity to share and help shape. So I think that is a necessary result.

Through some positive examples, I think we will see more support for people to do surveys and certainly organizations with people with disabilities are very happy to work with employers in order to bring about inclusive policies and to help them do surveys where people with disabilities are identifying their needs and as a result we can see improvements for them. Thank you.

>> Thank you, Ruth. Thank you for this very important comments from the perspective of persons with disabilities. I will now pass the floor over to Peter, who has been filtering the questions we received from a distance and now pass them on to the panel in the 10 minutes that are left for the webinar. Peter, the floor over to you.

>> Thank you very much, Stefan. Thank you for all the speakers for really provoking interventions. We don't have so much time left and we've already had quite a few questions coming in, so I'm afraid we couldn't respond -- we won't be able to respond to everyone, but the speakers have given their contact details in their presentations and we can share any of those further if you want to make contact after the webinar. So I'm going to go around each of the speakers, highlight a couple of things that have been raised and ask the speakers to respond to those and give final remarks, all in a very brief one or two minutes each. As you see, we really challenge these speakers on these webinars. But especially thanks to [Away from mic] they've given a lot of comments and a lot of questions for the speakers, which I'm sure will continue discussion.

Angela, I want to turn the focus to you for any final remarks from you and a couple of questions that have come up, which is how to kind of bridge these gaps between conversations in different places that need data and that data might be more important in one area and not in another, and how that links in the journey for inclusion.

>> Yeah, really interesting. So in terms of bridging conversations and how that might look in terms of data, I think what we need to be careful of is that viewing data election or disclosure for want of a better term as a [Away from mic]. Actually, what we see and particularly here in the UK, we have as you know, quite a large disability employment gap, that one of the things we see is that disabled people are falling out of work when they don't get adjustments. And one of the things we've seen in some of our research is this thing of ongoing disclosure. For an employee who says I have a disability or I might have a hearing impairment, for example, and I need an interpreter, that might then be given there, but then the need for that adjustment, not that the person has a disability, but that the adjustment is forwarded, sometimes that doesn't happen. So for the next meeting, they need to say again I have a hearing impairment and I need an interpreter and that's given there and the adjustment has not been recorded as an adjustment and not a disability, they're finding they have to repeatedly disclose. That's one issue. And I think the second thing is some disclosure is quite technical term, that not all employees suddenly in the UK know that they're doing it when they do it. And particularly the difference between a line manager or supervisor understands to be disclosure and what an employee understands to be disclosure is quite different. So we might see an employee saying I [Away from mic] my blood sugars have been higher and an uneducated line manager might think, and they have things going off in their head like do I need to have a discussion about disclosure and that might start [Away from mic] where the employee thinks they're just having a conversation. I think what we see in the UK as well is also the repeated disclosures that happen through processes as well. For example, at [Away from mic] you would disclose again when you are selected for a role and then again on day one as well. We see repeated disclosures happening quite a lot and they are not always recorded or sometimes the disability

is recorded and the reason for having the conversation, IE, I need an adjustment is not always recorded, so what that tells us is that collecting data doesn't make you a good employer. Recording the adjustments and making sure that employees don't need to repeatedly disclose, that's what's making the most inclusive employers here in the UK.

>> Thanks, Angela, for the advice and both the technical details and the way to go forward on this important journey. Andrea, a few questions came in for you as we have one or two minutes for your intervention. One question that was [Away from mic] retention, I don't know if you have been able to measure that at all and any final remarks.

>> Yeah, I actually addressed that directly. I think what I was trying to say on that slide is when we look at government requirements around people with disabilities in the workplace, we're asked to look at two sets of demographics. We're asked to look at new hires, so how are you reaching out to the external community to attract people with disabilities into the workplace, so you're measured on how many people you're hiring in the workplace. And then where I mentioned retention of people with disabilities, that is where countries are measuring you then by how many people you have in your workforce. So what are you doing internally to create inclusivity to make people feel comfortable to bring their whole selves to work and then being able to measure your entire workforce demographic to say this is where we are and are we where we want to be, and if not, what do we need to do to make improvements. That was my comment around retention. It's really more around the workforce.

>> Thanks, Andrea, I think that echoes what Angela was saying about how these conversations are a journey. Susanne, coming quickly to you. People raised mental health and psychosocial issues and whether that might influence disclosure or that might be different. Also any final comments from your side.

>> Thank you, Peter, and that's a terrific question, because indeed we do find that around the area of mental health, both employers feel not well prepared to deal with these issues, I'm afraid, often. And individuals are far more hesitant because of the historical stigma around mental health-related issues. So it is more challenging and I think at the same time workplaces and just in sheer prevalence it's become a bigger issue. There is much more anxiety, much more depression evident among our workplaces and our labor force, so it is an issue we should be on top of, and then people's willingness to come forward and acknowledge that they need support in this area has a lot to do with the workplace climate. So proactive company initiatives around mental health and raising awareness without identifying individuals can really help to build a culture around these issues that make people more comfortable coming forward. And I just want to again thank you to you and the ILO for helping us to put this together. It was, I think, a really timely, for many of us, a timely topic. So thank you for that.

>> Thank you, Susanne. I think you've brought out another side of the journey in response to that specific question. Ruth, just coming to you, maybe I won't ask you a specific question. Feel free to pick up anything specific or any final remarks from your side.

>> Yes, I wanted to pick up on the issue of anonymity and the distinction between confidentiality and anonymity, which I think is very important. So it will depend on the nature of the disclosure. If it's a more almost census-like survey, information will be aggregated and individuals need to know that their input is anonymous and that it will be dealt with in a broader system wide way, because if you then deal with it only by the unit in which a person works, that helps the individual and deals with the results not being anonymous. So it's not just guaranteeing anonymity in terms of how the data is collected, but also how it's displayed and how it's shared that is really important. Obviously, at the level of dealing with adjustments, then you're going to have a different type of disclosure that is much more individually-based than a survey-based approach. And there the confidentiality of a situation is important for the individual to feel that they can share it with their supervisor or HR person. And that information is not then shared with other individuals without their consent. And I also wanted to

emphasize the point that all of this is voluntary. That the individual should never be coerced into taking part in a survey or having to disclose a disability.

>> Thank you. Thank you very much, Ruth, for the important reminder to finish on. Thanks to everyone whose input questions, we couldn't get to them all. Some of them were on much, much bigger issues beyond the scope of this webinar, the website [Away from mic] for the materials to explore for these issues. That's all from me. Thanks to the speakers from my side and Stefan, if you can close off the webinar for us.

>> Yes, sure. Thank you, Peter. We've had around 80 participants at the webinar and the good news is that almost all of them stayed throughout the webinar, which I think shows the level of interest that the issue has brought and the quality of the presentations. From my side, I can only thank the panel and the participants because I think the discussion has brought our knowledge to a higher level. We are planning to come up with a short fact sheet that identifies some of the key issues that we have been discussing. We will also be looking carefully into the questions that we have not been able to address and which were related to the topic. I think we can use some of them as part of a frequently asked questions part of that fact sheet. I also want to mention that one of the questions we got, as I mentioned before, the seminar is being recorded and people can listen to it and watch the slides at your own pace and in the future, it will be included also on our website as one of the resources that is available to all companies and other organizations working on this.

Just a final plea to all of you, if you have two more minutes, I think an evaluation form will pop up in a second. It will take you two minutes to sort of give us a very quick feedback on things that you liked or disliked in our webinar and that information will definitely allow us to improve even more the webinars that we are planning to hold in the coming months. So again, thank you to all of you. Particular thanks to the panel, thanks also to Peter who has been helping us to set this webinar up and special thanks to all of you who have been participating at the meeting and with the questions that you've asked. Special thanks also to the team that has been providing the captioning to make this webinar also accessible from that point of view. Thank you to all of you and have a good rest of the day.

>> This concludes the ILO Global Business Disability Network webinar. Thanks for attending.