Sussex Research Online

The NHS England Fundamental Information Standard for Monitoring Sexual Orientation

Article (Accepted Version)

Pollard, Alex, Bradley, Jasmin, Cooper, Maxwell, Sadhwani, Shanu, Northam, Antonia and Llewellyn, Carrie (2019) The NHS England Fundamental Information Standard for Monitoring Sexual Orientation. British Journal of General Practice, 69 (679). pp. 94-95. ISSN 0960-1643

This version is available from Sussex Research Online: http://sro.sussex.ac.uk/id/eprint/80272/

This document is made available in accordance with publisher policies and may differ from the published version or from the version of record. If you wish to cite this item you are advised to consult the publisher's version. Please see the URL above for details on accessing the published version.

Copyright and reuse:
Sussex Research Online is a digital repository of the research output of the University.

Copyright and all moral rights to the version of the paper presented here belong to the individual author(s) and/or other copyright owners. To the extent reasonable and practicable, the material made available in SRO has been checked for eligibility before being made available.

Copies of full text items generally can be reproduced, displayed or performed and given to third parties in any format or medium for personal research or study, educational, or not-for-profit purposes without prior permission or charge, provided that the authors, title and full bibliographic details are credited, a hyperlink and/or URL is given for the original metadata page and the content is not changed in any way.

http://sro.sussex.ac.uk

BJGP British Journal of General Practice

The NHS England Fundamental Information Standard for Monitoring Sexual Orientation: context and evidence of feasibility

Journal:	*The British Journal of General Practice*
Manuscript ID	BJGP-2018-0043.R1
Manuscript Type:	Debate & Analysis
Date Submitted by the Author:	n/a

Complete List of Authors:	Pollard, Alex; Brighton & Sussex Medcial School , Primary Care & Public Health Bradley, Jasmin; Brighton & Sussex Medcial School , Primary Care & Public Health Cooper, Maxwell; Brighton & Sussex Medcial School , Primary Care & Public Health Sadhwani, Shanu; Brighton & Sussex Medcial School , Primary Care & Public Health Northam, Antonia; Brighton & Sussex Medcial School , Primary Care & Public Health Llewellyn, Carrie; Brighton & Sussex Medcial School , Primary Care & Public Health

Keywords:	Patient groups, Inequalities < Patient groups, Practice organisation < Service organisation

SCHOLARONE™
Manuscripts

SO Monitoring Standard Alex BJGP D&A 20180724

Debate & Analysis

The NHS England Fundamental Information Standard for Monitoring Sexual Orientation: context and evidence of feasibility

Alex Pollard[1], Jasmin Bradley[1], Max Cooper[1], Shanu Sadhwani[1], Antonia Northam[1], Carrie Llewellyn[1]

[1] Brighton & Sussex Medical School, Mayfield House, Falmer, Brighton BN1 9PH, UK

For Review Only

INTRODUCTION

In October 2017 NHS England launched the Fundamental Information Standard for Monitoring the Sexual Orientation of patients/service users (16+) in all health services and Local Authorities with responsibilities for adult social care. This acts as a pilot for a unified information standard and is being shared with other UK home nations(1).

This announcement has been misreported in the media and prompted objections from the Family Doctors Association, but extensive research has shown that negative reactions are typically based on uncontextualised assumptions about the process and feasibility of monitoring patient sexual orientation(2,3,4) See Box 1.

This paper contextualises the introduction of the information standard and reports unpublished data from a survey exploring the attitudes of General Practice staff in England towards monitoring sexual orientation.

Context and rationale for monitoring sexual orientation.

News coverage has reported challenges to the value and purpose of such monitoring, but it has been consistently shown that significant and unaddressed health inequities exist among Lesbian, Gay and Bisexual (LGB) people compared to the general population, including: self-harm and suicide, smoking, alcohol and drug use, eating disorders, domestic abuse, some cancers, and increased isolation/vulnerability in old age, as well as men's sexual health(5,6,7). UK research has also shown lower rates of LGB access to health services, avoidance of screening programmes and higher rates of service dissatisfaction(8,9).

Explanations for these health inequities include LGB peoples' use of maladaptive coping strategies to deal with stigma and 'minority stress' (e.g. substance use, self-harm); the avoidance of healthcare services due to vulnerability to hostile judgement, assumptions of heterosexuality; and consequently elevated confidentiality concerns(5,10,11).

Public Health England (PHE) reported in 2017 that between 1.2 and 3.2million of the English population (16+) identify as LGB in surveys. PHE acknowledge however that these estimates are likely to underrepresent actual figures, as marginalisation, stigma and negative experiences are barriers to disclosure.

In 2010 the UK Equality Act introduced the Public Sector Equality Duty (PSED) obliging all public bodies (and contracted services) to consider the equitable treatment of service-users and requires due regard to the 'protected characteristics': age, disability, pregnancy &

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

maternity, race, religion or belief, sex, sexual orientation, and gender reassignment. Knowing how individuals do, or do not, interact with services is a vital first step towards meeting these obligations. In 2012 the NHS Mandate stated the need to *"tackle ingrained inequalities and consider the needs to LGB&T communities. […] it is vital the NHS Commissioning Board consider how best to address this lack of research and data*".

Policy v Practice – The challenges of monitoring.

Despite the increased morbidity of LGB people and extensive policy commitment to address inequities, data collection that could help identify and address these inequities remains inadequate in health services. In the first report on the PSED from the Equality & Human Rights Commission (EHRC), health commissioners and primary care services were among the three worst performing sectors: *"Data collectors are not committed to collecting the data and, when they do, the practice is inconsistent. This is partly because they do not see the case for doing this, are reluctant to do so, or believe that some LGB people are reluctant to report their sexual orientation. This then leads to public bodies claiming they lack evidence and so do not see the case for taking action on LGB issues, meaning that action to tackle inequalities is weak or non-existent".*

In 'Beyond Tolerance: making sexual orientation a public matter' (2009), the EHRC found that LGB organisations advocated monitoring, while objections to monitoring most frequently lay with staff in services. In addition, the Office for National Statistics (ONS) found that the vast majority of the general public considered sexual orientation questions both understandable and acceptable, but despite this, "*some interviewers were nervous asking the question [and] if individual interviewers are concerned about this questions, this may be passed onto respondents".*

For Review Only

LGB engagement with monitoring.

LGB community groups have supported sexual orientation monitoring and produced comprehensive guides and campaigns advocating LGB participation in monitoring. The LGBT Foundation found that 90% of LGB respondents were willing to disclose sexual orientation on a GP registration form, and a further 7% would be encouraged to do so if they had trust in practices' confidentiality and/or that the data would be used to improve services(12).

In partnership with the Royal College of General Practitioners and NHS North West, the LGBT Foundation developed the '*Pride in Practice'* toolkit that supported monitoring; and LGB lobby group 'Stonewall' were commissioned by the Department of Health to develop Primary Care guides on monitoring(13). A recent systematic review found that monitoring questions are a welcome facilitator of LGB disclosure and are typically interpreted as indicating affirmative practices, which increased trust in services(9).

What we found.

Despite official policy, extensive research, and the support of LGB groups, health service staff have continued to express objections to the introduction of sexual orientation monitoring. In order to explore these barriers in general practice we surveyed GP practice staff in Clinical Commissioning Groups (CCGs) across Kent, Surrey & Sussex (615 practices), assessing knowledge levels about LGB health inequities, and attitudes and comfort levels with administering sexual orientation monitoring at new-patient registration.

This survey is the first to explore the attitudes towards sexual orientation monitoring among a wide range of General Practice staff (especially reception/admin who typically administer monitoring).

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Staff from 133 GP practices (from 19 of 20 CCGs) responded: 39% receptionists/administrators; 30% practice managers; 8% practice nurses; 7% GPs; 16% other. We found that of the nine protected characteristics, sexual orientation was the least likely to be monitored, with only fourteen practices (11%) systematically recording. Respondents did not generally recognise an association between LGB sexual orientation and poorer health or barriers to services. Staff perception of patients' comfort with sexual orientation monitoring was dramatically lower than comfort levels reported in research(2,3,4). And staff discomfort with explaining sexual orientation questions almost exactly mirrored their assumption of patient discomfort with answering such questions, suggesting that staff may be projecting their anxieties about monitoring onto patients.

Practices in areas with smaller LGB populations were least likely to have implemented sexual orientation monitoring, resulting in the health needs of the most marginalised LGB populations being least likely to be recognised.

Conclusion

The legacy of prejudice and on-going social stigma towards non-heterosexual people has contributed to significant health inequities and low levels of awareness about these inequities. Reactions to the new information standard indicate a continuing lack of engagement with these issues, and a reluctance to amend monitoring forms, which could inform future awareness.

Our findings on the attitudes of practice staff towards conducting these monitoring questions differ significantly from substantial research reporting the public's more relaxed attitude towards answering the questions (2,3,4), which suggests staff have exaggerated anxieties about monitoring sexual orientation.

The new NHS England information standard presents an opportunity to recognise and improve understanding of LGB health inequities, develop health data, and to equitably address the needs of all patients. The administration of monitoring may benefit if staff in all roles recognise the existence of LGB health inequities, understand the purpose and value of monitoring, and avoid projecting untested assumptions onto patients' comfort with tick-box monitoring questions.

For Review Only

BOX 1. STANDARDISED MONITORING QUESTION, RESPONSE ITEMS AND CODING

Sexual orientation:

Which of the following options best describes how you think of yourself?

1. Heterosexual or Straight
2. Gay or Lesbian
3. Bisexual
4. Other sexual orientation not listed

U. Person was asked and does not know or is not sure
Z. Not stated (person was asked but declined to provide a response)
9. Not known (not recorded)

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Funding
No funding was specifically allocated to this study.

Ethical approval
This study received ethical approval from the Brighton & Sussex Medical School (BSMS) Ethics Committee (RGEC 14/043/POL).

Competing interests
The authors have declared no competing interests.

All authors have completed the ICMJE uniform disclosure form at http://www.icmje.org/coi_disclosure.pdf and declare: no support from any organisation for the submitted work; no financial relationships with any organisations that might have an interest in the submitted work in the previous three years, no other relationships or activities that could appear to have influenced the submitted work.

Acknowledgements
The authors wish to thank survey respondents in 133 GP practices across Kent, Surrey and Sussex for their part in this work.

For Review Only

REFERENCES

1. NHS England Equality and Health Inequalities Unit. Sexual Orientation Monitoring: Full Specification. London: NHS England; 2017 Oct p. 20. Report No.: 07267. Available from: http://content.digital.nhs.uk/media/25302/2094512105spec/pdf/2094512105spec.pdf

2. Creegan C, Keating M. Improving sexual orientation monitoring. London: Equality and Human Rights Commission; 2010 [cited 2017 Sep 11] p. 30. Report No.: 978 1 84206 333 0. Available from: https://www.equalityhumanrights.com/sites/default/files/research-paper-improving-sexual-orientation-monitoring.pdf

3. Census Customer Services (ONS). Sexual Identity: update on research and testing. London: Office for National Statistics; 2017 Jul [cited 2017 Aug 11] p. 17. Available from: https://www.slideshare.net/secret/HwBiX0XCGQSAGN

4. Equality and Human Rights Commission. Beyond Tolerance Making sexual orientation a public matter. UK: Equality and Human Rights Commission; 2009 [cited 2017 Nov 8]. 44 p. (Policy Report). Available from: http://www.equality-ne.co.uk/downloads/463_beyond_tolerance.pdf

5. Meads C, Carmona C, Kelly M. Lesbian, gay and bisexual people’s health in the UK: a theoretical critique and systematic review. Divers Equal Health Care. 2012;9(1):19–32.

6. Elliott MN, Kanouse DE, Burkhart Q, Abel GA, Lyratzopoulos G, Beckett MK, et al. Sexual Minorities in England Have Poorer Health and Worse Health Care Experiences: A National Survey. J Gen Intern Med. 2015 Jan;30(1):9–16.

7. Hagger-Johnson G, Taibjee R, Semlyen J, Fitchie I, Fish J, Meads C, et al. Sexual orientation identity in relation to smoking history and alcohol use at age 18/19: cross-sectional associations from the Longitudinal Study of Young People in England (LSYPE). BMJ Open. 2013 Aug;3(8):e002810.

8. Urwin S, Whittaker W. Inequalities in family practitioner use by sexual orientation: evidence from the English General Practice Patient Survey. BMJ Open. 2016 May;6(5):e011633.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

9. Brooks H, Llewellyn C, Castilho Pelloso F, De Souza Guilherme F, A Pollard, Jones C. Brooks, H., Llewellyn, C.D., Nadarzynski, T., Castilho Pelloso, F., De Souza Guilherme, F., Pollard, A., & Jones, C.J. (2018). Sexual orientation disclosure in healthcare: systematic review. British Journal of General Practice. Br J Gen Pract Press. 2018 Mar;68(668):e187-e196. Epub 2018 Jan 29

10. Fish J. Conceptualising social exclusion and lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender people: the implications for promoting equity in nursing policy and practice. J Res Nurs. 2010 Jul;15(4):303–12.

11. Bränström R, Hatzenbuehler ML, Pachankis JE, Link BG. Sexual Orientation Disparities in Preventable Disease: A Fundamental Cause Perspective. Am J Public Health. 2016 Jun;106(6):1109–15.

12. Lesbian and Gay Foundation. Lesbian, gay and bisexual patients' experiences of their GP: Greater Manchester findings. Manchester: Lesbian and Gay Foundation; 2014 [cited 2017 Aug 11] p. 14. Available from: https://lgbt.foundation/downloads/291

13. Good Practice Guide to Monitoring Sexual Orientation (updated). Manchester: LGBT Foundation; 2017 Oct [cited 2017 Aug 11] p. 38. Available from: https://s3-eu-west-1.amazonaws.com/lgbt-media/Files/b577e0cd-041a-4b10-89b6-f0f5f3384961/LGBTF%2520SOM%2520Report.pdf

For Review Only