

EQUAL OPPORTUNITIES & DIVERSITY PANEL**Report on the CILIP Equalities Audit 2010****Introduction for Council**

I am pleased to introduce the report of the Equalities Audit. You will find the recommendations in paragraphs 11-14. However it is not expected that Council will want to decide on each and every recommendation. Rather it is recommended that Council:

- Commends the report
- Endorses the conclusions and the general tenor and direction of the recommendations
- Authorises the Equal Opportunities & Diversity Panel and officers to proceed with those recommendations that do not have significant resource implications and comes back to Council with proposals concerning those items that do have resource implications or prove to be difficult to implement
- Comments, where it wishes, on specific recommendations, especially those it particular wants implemented and any it may not favour.

Ayub Khan
Chair
CILIP Equal Opportunities & Diversity Panel

Report of the CILIP Equalities Audit 2010**Background/context**

1. A key element within CILIP's Equal Opportunities & Diversity Strategy was the undertaking of an equalities audit. This would both describe where CILIP currently stood in regard to equality and diversity, but also establish a baseline on which future priorities could be determined and future performance measured. It had been originally planned to do the audit in 2006, but major reviews in CILIP – the New Business Model Working Party and the Governance Review especially – made this inappropriate and funding was also diverted from the Equalities Audit to the Governance Review at that time.
2. It was recognised that the Equalities Audit would have to be administered in-house without additional resourcing and a report setting out the possible parameters and methodology of an Equalities Audit was considered by the

Equal Opportunities & Diversity Panel at its meeting in November 2009. A small Task & Finish Group was established to oversee the implementation of the equalities audit and it was agreed that the audit would cover race, disability, gender, age, faith, sexual orientation and gender re-assignment. However there would be gaps which would need to be addressed at a later stage – there was no audit of the CILIP website, the services of CILIP or the buildings from which they operated. The audit would concentrate on the equalities profile of CILIP members, CILIP activists within the CILIP governance structure and CILIP staff.

3. A further dimension to this audit has been CILIP's membership of the Equally Professional Network sponsored by the EHRC which seeks to promote best practice in regard to equality issues by professional societies. Its terms of reference commit each member to pursue some overall aims and a basic framework of metrics has been established enabling comparison between different professional bodies
4. The Equalities Audit Task & Finish Group met in March and the Audit was undertaken during April, May and June 2010. Initial results were considered by the Task & Finish Group at a meeting on 30 June and the full Equal Opportunities & Diversity Panel on 9 July 2010. Ayub Khan (Chair of the Equal Opportunities & Diversity Panel) and Guy Daines (Director, Policy & Advocacy) were tasked with producing a full report on the audit together with recommendations. Once this had been vetted by the Task & Finish Group and Panel it forms the basis of this report to CILIP Council

Equality Act 2010

5. The Audit took place during a period when a new Equality Act was passed by Parliament. In the main this transferred existing responsibilities of professional bodies under various previous acts to the current Equality Act. However the obligations of professional bodies like CILIP now apply to all people with one or more of the "protected characteristics" – age, disability, gender reassignment, marriage/civil partnerships, pregnancy and maternity, race, religion/belief, sex, sexual orientation. For the purposes of the Act CILIP is regarded both as a qualifications body and a trade organisation, as well as a general service provider. Specifically it must not discriminate (including acts of harassment and victimisation) in relation to its membership and its qualifications. CILIP should therefore be able to demonstrate that it is not discriminating in such activity and, ideally, be able to point to a diverse membership and list of qualifications registrants. It is notable that equalities information is not collected at all for qualifications and only partially for membership.
6. Many of CILIP's members work in the public sector. As such they will be aware of other obligations of public bodies including the obligation of reducing inequalities of outcomes resulting from socio-economic disadvantage, and the public sector equality duty to not only work for the elimination of discrimination across its functions but also promote and advance equality of opportunity. This has resulted in work on equality impact statements, for instance, setting out the impact of proposals on those with the protected characteristics. Such activity

may inform CILIP's approach in the future but first it is important to get the basics right.

The Audit

7. For the most part the Audit was based on existing data obtained from the Care database (CILIP members) and staff records held by the Human Resources & Facilities Department at Ridgmount Street. In addition a quick and short survey was undertaken of activists within the CILIP Governance structure. As this was a new venture it covered equality areas not covered by the other data sources – notably faith, sexual orientation and gender reassignment
8. The Audit has the following elements:
 - a. Statistical profile of the CILIP membership – this covers age, gender, ethnicity and disability but does not cover sexual orientation, gender identity, or religion/faith adherence. The ethnicity classification used is dated. The information comes from CILIP's Care database.
 - b. Statistical profile of staff - this covers age, gender, ethnicity and disability but does not cover sexual orientation, gender identity, or religion/faith adherence. The information has been provided by the Human Resources & Facilities Department within CILIP.
 - c. Statistical profile of activists within CILIP Governance – This was done by a special survey of relevant activists. It provides information on age, gender, ethnicity, disability, sexual orientation, gender identity, and religion/faith adherence. The modern ethnicity classification is used.
 - d. Assessments of CILIP performance against the Equally Professional Metrics Monitoring Framework, the Equally Professional Terms of Reference and CILIP's own Equal Opportunities & Diversity Statement
9. The appendices to this report contain:
 - a. An overall CILIP statistical profile of equalities bringing together all results [Appendix A]
 - b. The response to the Equally Professional Monitoring Framework [Appendix B]
 - c. A draft Response to an Equalities checklist – this was drawn up from a number of other checklists (e.g. Arts Council in England, MLA). [Appendix C]
 - d. The Equally Professional Network's Terms of Reference [Appendix D]
 - e. CILIP's Equal Opportunities & Diversity Statement [Appendix E]

Conclusions

10. There is perhaps little in the results that will surprise, But at least we now know with certainty what we may have long expected.
11. From the statistics (Appendix A) it is clear that:

- a. The CILIP membership is significantly weighted towards the older end of the age spectrum – this is not the case with staff and less so with governance activists
 - b. We have proportionately fewer disabled members than the national proportion of the UK population. However the figure for CILIP membership generally may be too low – it reflects information when people join and many people may become disabled later in life, even if only as a result of aging.
 - c. We have significantly too few men in CILIP. The information to hand does not reveal whether women still suffer from a glass ceiling and don't attain senior and leadership positions in proportion to their numbers. There is evidence to suggest there are many more Heads of Service in public and academic libraries who are women but no recent research on the position of women generally in the profession.
 - d. Sexual orientation – this is the first time this information has been collected by CILIP and then only as part of the governance survey. Perhaps not too much can be read into a single set of figures. But it is important to flag up that CILIP is interested in this issue and genuinely wants to be inclusive of gay, lesbian and bisexual members and potential members. The same can be said, perhaps even more firmly, in regard to members dealing with trans-gender and trans-sexual issues.
 - e. Ethnicity – the results confirm that CILIP still has much to do if its membership is to reflect UK society in its ethnic make-up. It is good to see that more governance activists come from minority ethnic groups but it still falls short of the national figure. In the case of staff it is perhaps more appropriate to assess them against the London population mix rather than the national (only 7 staff are based in the devolved nations) – with a London figure of over 31% from a non-white background, the profile of CILIP staff still fall well short of that benchmark.
 - f. Religion – on the face of it perhaps the most surprising difference from the national picture is the high percentage of CILIP activists (35%), compared to the national figure, who openly state they have no faith or religious affiliation.
12. In looking at the Checklist of Equalities (Appendix C) it can be seen that CILIP:
- a. Has most of the necessary policies in place but needs to be more overt in promotion of them and expectations of staff, members and activists in embracing them
 - b. There are no measurable goals or aims in place – perhaps some general ones would be worthwhile
 - c. We make no demands of our contractors in regard to equality issues
 - d. It is not clear how effective line managers are in promoting equalities

- e. We know very little about the equalities profile of our customers (including those registered for CILIP qualifications)
 - f. We have not done a web or buildings audit
 - g. We know very little about the profile of the LIS workforce generally
13. In assessing CILIP's performance against the Terms of Reference of the Equally Professional Network (Appendix D) it is clear that CILIP has much to do. Under most of the terms of reference it has a story to tell but it is partial, not sufficiently high profile and lacking in an overall coherence and direction.

Recommendations

11. The recommendations of the Equal Opportunities & Diversity Panel cover the strategic and more detailed recommendations relating to the data and its collection

The Strategic

12. As a professional membership body CILIP must:
- b) Ensure it can show compliance with its obligations under the Equality Act (2010) and aspire to advance and promote equality within CILIP itself and the profession more broadly
 - c) Work to attract more young members building on the enthusiasm of CDG's New Professional Network and other initiatives
 - d) Work to attract more men into CILIP and the profession.
 - e) Continue to monitor the career progression of its women members and help ensure that the more senior and better remunerated jobs are not only open to them but that there are plenty of role models for the newer woman professional to aspire to.
 - f) Work with relevant SIGS and other partners to increase the number of people within CILIP from black minority ethnic backgrounds.
 - g) Work to extend the Encompass programme and help equip black members with the knowledge and skills necessary to attain office within CILIP and senior posts within the profession
 - h) Work to ensure that it covers all parts of society when inviting nominations for its own awards, or recommending people for external awards
13. As an organisation and profession based on ethics and values CILIP must:
- b) Promote the values of diversity and equality within the overall values espoused by CILIP at every opportunity.
 - c) Provide positive messages in regard to sexual orientation and gender identity – areas where there may still be reticence and fear in “coming out”

- to provide greater confidence for the individuals concerned to join and participate in CILIP affairs
- d) Take action to look at the accessibility of its website, the services it provides (to customers as well as members) and the buildings it operates from
- e) Ensure its contractors embrace equal opportunities and encourage partners to do likewise
- f) Work with partners to advocate the importance of inclusivity in the provision of library and information services, and to help build an LIS workforce that is more reflective of UK society

Operational Recommendations

14. CILIP should:

- b) As a matter of urgency start to collect equalities data on candidates registered for CILIP qualifications - CILIP has a legal responsibility to ensure that its membership and its qualification structure is accessible to people from all parts of UK society
- c) Find ways of reaching the 30% of CILIP members who have not filled in an equalities form
- d) Investigate the possibility of using the current ethnicity classification system for the CILIP membership and explore how data already collected using an older classification could be integrated
- e) When members have access to their own personal data on the CILIP website to look at the opportunity this will bring to improve coverage of equalities information – especially when some areas are likely to change over time (e.g. information relating to disability)

Ayub Khan
Chair, Equal Opportunities & Diversity Panel

Guy Daines
Director, Policy & Advocacy

CILIP
August 2010

APPENDIX A Comparative Statistical Tables

Comparison tables for CILIP governance, CILIP membership, CILIP staff and England & Wales**Introduction****What the tables show**

The six tables below give percentages (where available) for age, disability, gender, sexual orientation, ethnicity and religion for CILIP's governance structure, CILIP's membership, CILIP staff and the UK national population.

Respondents

The tables show the respondent number for each of the categories. The number of CILIP members used is 16,529. However, in the tables the number of *respondents* in the CILIP members category varies because for some categories (for example, disability) members did not answer the question and therefore did not respond and these people have been excluded from the data.

Sources

The data for Governance was collected in May/June 2010 via an online questionnaire. The data on CILIP members was extracted from the CARE database in April 2010. The CILIP staff data was collated in June 2010. The UK data is from the Office for National Statistics 2001 census or later official statistics.

Unavailable data

Where there is a dash in the table this indicates that data is not available in that category (in the case of CILIP, because members and staff have not been asked to provide it).

Data collection differences

In some categories, the data has been collected in a different way and the italic notes next to the data explain the differences.

Table 1: Age

Age	Governance	Members	Staff	UK (ONS 2008)
Over 35	80 %	86 %	66 % <i>(Over 39)</i>	62.5% <i>(over 30)</i>
Under 35	18 %	14 %	34 % <i>(39 and under)</i>	20% <i>(includes 15-29 year olds only)</i>
Prefer not to say	2 %	-	-	-
Number of respondents	285	16,529	77	61.383 million

Table 2: Disability

Disability	Governance	Members	Staff	UK CENSUS 2001 ¹
No	90 %	98.7 %	91 %	91.5 %
Yes	7 %	1.3 %	9 %	18.5%
Prefer not to say/unknowns	3 %	-	-	-
Number of Respondents	285	13, 768 ²	77	58.789 million

Table 3: Gender

Gender	Governance	Members	Staff	UK (ONS 2008)
Female	70 %	76 %	69 %	50.7 %
Male	28 %	24 %	31 %	49.1 %
Prefer not to say	2 %	-	-	-
Number of Respondents	285	16,529	77	61.383 million

4: Sexual orientation

¹ **Table 2** - The UK Census figure relates to number reporting a “long-term illness, health problem or disability that limited their daily activities or work”

² **Table 2** - There were 2,761 unknowns so they have been removed from the number of respondents, thus reducing the number of respondents to 13, 768

Sexual orientation	Governance	Members	Staff	UK
Heterosexual/straight	84 %	-	-	93-95 %
Prefer not to say	7.5 %	-	-	-
Gay man	4.5 %	-	-	5-7 % ³
Bisexual	2 %	-	-	-
Gay woman/lesbian	2 %	-	-	5-7* %
Number of Respondents	285	-	77	

Table 5: Ethnicity

Ethnicity	Governance	Members	Staff	UK (ONS 2007)
White	94.5 %	93.32%	85.7 %	86.41 %
Black or Black British	2 %	1.27%	6.5 %	2.53%
Mixed	1 %	-	1.3 %	1.12 %
Asian or Asian British	0.5 %	0.97%	1.3 %	5.13 %
Chinese	0.5 %	0.62%	1.3 %	0.42%
Prefer not to say	1 %	-	-	-
Did not answer question	0.5 %	-	-	-
Other	-	1.3% ⁴	3.9 %	1.49%
All minority ethnic	4 %	2.86 %	14.3 %	10.69 %
Number of Respondents	285	12,105	77	60.554 million

Table 6: Religion

³ **Table 4** - ONS percentage estimate for UK of gay men and lesbians is between 5 and 7%

⁴ **Table 5** - 150 respondents used terms that were not on the form. Many recorded "mixed" race which was not included as a category (CILIP uses a very old form of the CRE classification). Perhaps 90 of these "other" responses could be classified as non-white, so making a total ethnic minority count of 435 or 3.6% of the total respondents. There are 4,973 CILIP members for whom we have no detail of ethnicity.

Religion	Governance	Members	Staff	GB Census 2001
Christian	52 %	-	-	71.8 %
None	35 %	-	-	15.5 %
Prefer not to say	5.5 %	-	-	-
Other	3 %	-	-	1.9 %
Did not answer question	1.5 %	-	-	7.3 %
Muslim	1 %	-	-	2.8 %
Hindu	-	-	-	1%
Sikh	-	-	-	0.6%
Jewish	1 %	-	-	0.5 %
Buddhist	1 %	-	-	0.3 %
Number of Respondents	285	-	77	57.104 Million

This statistical summary compiled by:

Jill Howard
 Policy Support Officer
 CILIP
 October 2010

APPENDIX B

EQUALLY PROFESSIONAL MONITORING FRAMEWORK

Contextual Information

1. **What is our geographical constituency**

- a) UK X
- b) GB wide
- c) England and Wales
- d) England only
- e) Other

2. **What do we monitor?**

- a) Membership X
- b) Students on accredited courses NO
- c) National governance X
- d) Regional governance X
- e) Other governance X
- f) Training delegates NO
- g) Staff X

3. **How do we break down our information about under-represented groups?**

- Age: Census class.* Equally Professional
- Disability: DDA Definition** Self Classification
- Gender:

Race: Census class.- Census (but membership stats use early CRE classification)

Religion & Belief: Census class. - Census

Sexual Orientation: Stonewall Stonewall

Other:

4. How do we break down our information?

- a) By country X
- b) By branch (Possible for Membership/Governance statistics)
- c) By membership grade(Possible for Membership/Governance statistics)
- d) Other

5 Who do we report our performance to?

.

- a) Governing Body X
- b) Equality and Diversity Group X
- c) Other Management Team

6. What do we set targets for?

- a) Membership NO
- b) Students NO
- c) National Governing Body NO
- d) Regional committees NO
- e) Staff NO
- f) Other NO

(NOTE: General feeling that members/activists/staff should mirror make-up of society but no specific targets set for any group)

7. How do we assess our performance?

- a) Against ourselves over time X
- b) Against the Census X
- c) Against other professional bodies X
- d) Other

Performance Benchmarking

8. How much information do we have about the diversity of our members (enter %)?

Age	100%
Disability	84%
Gender	100%
Race	69%
Religion & Belief	Not known
Sexual orientation	Not Known

9. How representative is our membership?

Our organisation has ? % of members :

Age (under 35)	14%
DDA Disabled	1.3%
Gender (F)	76%
Non White British	2.9% (of respondents)
Religion & Belief*	Not Known
LGBT	Not Known

10 How representative is our Governing Body?

a) ? % of our Governing Body is

(Includes CILIP Council & Presidential Team – 13 respondents from 15)

Age (under 35)	8% (12 answers)
DDA Disabled	31% (13 answers)
Gender (F)	39% (12 answers)
Non White British	8% (11 answers)
Religion & Belief* (None 38%; Christian 8%; Muslim 8%; Other 8%: 8 answers)	
LGBT (Heterosexual/straight 62%) (13 answers, 5 prefer not to say)	

b) ? % of our national/regional committees is

(Includes National and English Branches – 75 respondents)

Age (under/over 35)	24% (74 answers)
DDA Disabled	7% (74 answers)
Gender (F)	76% (74 answers)
Non White British	6% (74 answers)
Religion & Belief* (Christian 60%; None 31%; Muslim 1%; Other 3%)	
	(72 answers)
LGBT (Heterosexual/straight 88%; Gay woman/lesbian 4%; Gay man 4%)	
	(72 answers)

APPENDIX C

CHECKLIST ON EQUALITIES (DRAFT)

HOW DOES CILIP FARE?

A: Ethos, Vision and Culture of CILIP

Does CILIP have an ethos that demonstrates respect, understanding and sensitivity towards the diverse needs of members, staff and other stakeholders in CILIP.

1. Does CILIP have a mission/vision statement agreed by the governing body which specifically mentions commitment to access, diversity and inclusion

YES/NO

2. Does CILIP have a culture where equality and diversity issues are seen as part of everyone's day to day work
*[e.g. mission/vision statement✓ ; values statement✓ ; HR policy statements✓ ; Job Descriptions✓ ; training✓ ; *appraisals]**

Score on a scale 1-5 (where 1 is Very poor; 2 is Poor; 3 is Fair; 4 is Good; and 5 is excellent) **score: 4 (Has most things in place)**

3. How effective is CILIP in communicating of its mission and goals, and its commitment to equality and diversity
[e.g. accessibility of statements; induction; training; appraisals]

Score on a scale 1-5 **score: 3 (perhaps not consistent or focused enough in communication)**

B: Policy & Planning

Does CILIP have a policy and planning process which outlines aims, objectives and practices relating to equal access? In particular:

1. A working definition of equality, diversity and what it means for the organisation
[Definition and contextual information]

YES/NO

2. A policy outlining aims and objectives relating to equality of access
[Equal Opportunities & Diversity Policy; Business Plan]

YES/NO But the current Corporate Plan does not feature equality issues

3. An Action Plan to implement and effect the policy
YES/NO The current workplan not well publicised – focuses on the profession rather than CILIP as an organisation

4. Research/evidence underpinning the policy and associated action plan
[e.g. Statistical information, survey results, consultations, priorities of related organisations, other research underpinning action on equal opportunities & diversity]

Score on a scale 1-5 **score 3 – Recent equalities audit good but very little evidence relating to broader workforce/profession**

5. An equalities audit has been undertaken
[Outcomes of audit]

YES/NO – The audit is partial but very welcome. More needs to be done e.g. building accessibility audit, website accessibility audit

6. A set of measurable goals relating to equality and diversity issues
[Known goals and achievement against those goals]

YES/NO There is an equal opportunities & diversity workplan but no firm targets for the workplan or relating to statistical benchmarks – broad idea that CILIP should reflect UK society in its membership, activists and staff

Please comment further if necessary:

7. A policy whereby a commitment to equality and diversity issues is explicitly required from contractors and consultants used by CILIP
[policy relating to commissioning of contactors; contracts]

YES/NO

Please comment if necessary: **This would be a useful extension of equal opportunities – it is occasionally asked of us (eg MLA contracts)**

8. Identified resources to put programme into effect
[budget]

YES/NO

Please comment further if necessary

9. A policy of building relationships with minority or under-represented groups to encourage participation in its activities
[evidence of partnership working with minority communities]

YES/NO Evidenced mainly by the work of specialist interest groups, notably CSG, CDG and Diversity groups

How effective is the above?

Score on a scale 1-5 **Score 4**

10. Periodic review of the policy and action plan
[Review documentation and proposals for change resulting]

YES/NO But not as frequently as desirable

C: Leadership and Staff

In CILIP:

1. Does the leadership encourage a focus on equality and diversity issues?
*[e.g. **Identifiable member of Management Team**✓ and **Senior Member overseeing work on equal opportunities and diversity**✓ ; **evidence of commitment and promotion**✓]*

Score on a scale 1-5 **Score 4**

2. Are managers accountable for their contribution to achieving equality and diversity targets?
*[Expectations of managers; **job descriptions**✓ ; **appraisals**✓]*

YES/NO Expectations of line managers currently being reviewed across all areas and important to include equalities in this

3. Are diversity and equality objectives relevant at all levels of the organisation – from the top to team and individual levels?

[Departmental Plans; job descriptions; appraisals]

YES/NO/ Don't know – in JDs and should be looked at in appraisals but whether reflected in departmental/unit plans open to question

4. Have all staff undertaken training in equal opportunities?

[Record of training]

YES/NO – Not recently but it should be included in induction

5. Are the employment and recruitment practices of CILIP inclusive?

/relevant HR documentation on employment and recruitment practice✓ ; statistics on recruitment; statistics on grievance/disciplinary procedures✓]

YES/NO HR & Facilities Department have been monitoring and advising on these matters for many years and continue to do so

6. Is there a well-publicised policy against discrimination, harassment and bullying?

[Harassment/bullying policy; training; accessibility]

YES/NO They exist but perhaps could be publicised more

D: Marketing

Does CILIP:

1. Have an accurate profile of the LIS community?

[profile and/our source data]

YES/NO

Expand if necessary: **It is a major cause of concern that we have no authoritative information on the size and make-up of the LIS workforce – in part this can be seen as a failure of the sector skills body - LLUK**

2. Have an accurate profile of its:

- a. membership,

YES/NO

- b. activists,

YES/NO

- c. trustees

YES/NO

- d. and staff?

YES/NO

This information refreshed in the recent Equalities Audit – the information about activists and trustees collected for the first time

3. Know who uses it services and whether there are differences in take-up by minority groups?
[Analysis of use of CILIP services]

YES/**NO**

Expand if necessary – **We do have marketing knowledge about CILIP’s customers but it does not extend to equality and diversity elements**

E: Technology

In CILIP:

1. Technology is used to improve access especially for members and others from minority groups
[Types of adaptive technology available; evidence of its use]

Score on a scale 1-5

Area for future audit

2. CILIP’s website meets Level AA of world web accessibility standards or a plan is in place for reaching this standard
[web audit results or plans to do web audit]

Score on a scale 1-5

Area for future audit

[F: Buildings

Area for future audit

Does Ridgmount Street have:

1. Accessible toilets
YES/NO
2. Designated parking spaces for disabled people
YES/NO
3. Emergency procedures (regularly tested) to assist disabled people
YES/NO
4. Obstacle free walkways, aisles and corridors
YES/NO
5. Handrails on walls and on both sides of staircases
YES/NO
6. Easy access to all levels and parts of the building
YES/NO

7. Colour or tone contrast to enhance orientation and visibility
YES/NO
8. Induction loops or other sound enhancement systems
YES/NO

9. Clear signs using giant print, Braille and symbols
YES/NO
10. Optimal lighting for visibility
YES/NO

A similar building audit to be undertaken at the Hamilton and Aberystwyth offices]

APPENDIX D: Equally Professional Terms of Reference (with observations on CILIP Performance)

Equally Professional

Equally Professional is a network of professional bodies that subscribes to the precept that, in order to deliver the highest professional standards in a diverse society, professional bodies themselves must reflect that diversity in their membership. The network recognises that as the British demographic changes, the future of the professions depends on their ability to attract and retain entrants from all sections of the community. It seeks to inspire and equip the professions so that they in turn will inspire and equip people from under-represented groups to join them. By sharing experiences and working together towards continually improving diversity in membership, professional bodies will benefit from the knowledge and experience of others, wherever they are on the journey.

Common principles (Terms of Reference)

The professional organisations within the network share a commitment to a number of common principles:

- Professional organisations will seek to maximise their members' awareness of and competence in managing diversity issues appropriate to their disciplines.

In the case of CILIP this includes the work of a number of Groups including the Diversity group, Career Development Group and the Community Services Group. In addition the work of CILIP's Devolved Nations is important in recognising diversity and the different political and cultural contexts in which we operate. The Equal Opportunities and Diversity Panel endeavours to keep equality issues alive and debated within CILIP – the equalities audit is the latest vehicle that will allow for such debate and advancement of understanding

- Effective diversity monitoring by organisations is necessary to inform work towards and progress on improving diversity.

The recent Equalities Audit is a major initiative in collecting the necessary data. It has revealed areas that need improved data collection as well as areas where further work on equality and diversity is needed. One area for improvement is the collecting of diversity information in regard to registration candidates for CILIP qualifications

- Professional organisational leaders and staff need to be aware of the implications of diversity in their membership, and to continuously improve their practice in managing diversity.

The Management Team – especially the CEO, Director of Policy & Advocacy (policy lead) and Head of Personnel and Facilities – are responsible for promoting this. It should form an important dimension of the major change initiative – Defining our Professional Futures – that is

currently being undertaken by CILIP. Trustees will also need to play a leading role – at the moment a trustee chairs the Equal Opportunities & Diversity Panel.

- Professional bodies should work to understand and, where possible, address low diversity in entrance and retention of members.

This is a difficult area to address effectively but CILIP has engaged with broader initiatives led by Equally Professional and UKIPG. Its single biggest investment has been in Encompass focusing on enabling people from minority ethnic communities to enter the profession in trainee posts. The recession has made sustaining this project challenging but it is hoped to extend it to other minority groups in the future. CILIP has also issued the Encompass Toolkit providing information for employers considering positive action programmes

- Professional organisations should look to maximise, as far as is practicable, their potential to contribute to equality of opportunity and inclusion across all under-represented groups in the UK.

The Community Services Group, Career Development Group and the Diversity Group all work to improve standards of library and information services to minority communities. CILIP also works on the international stage to further this agenda especially through IFLA (eg work on the Multi-cultural Services section) and EBLIDA. Also high profile events such as the Libraries Change Lives awards focus attention of the broader media on the social role of libraries. The more recent Diversity awards celebrate both personal and corporate best practice in promoting diversity in all its aspects.

APPENDIX E : CILIP'S Equal Opportunities & Diversity Statement

Our vision is an informed society in which everyone has ready access to the knowledge, information and works of imagination appropriate to their needs, wants and aspirations. This is the distinctive contribution of library and information professionals to developing a society where:

- All groups are empowered;
- Attitudes and prejudices that hinder the progress of individuals and groups are confronted and tackled;
- Cultural, racial, and societal diversity is respected and celebrated;
- Individuals and communities live together in mutual respect and tolerance;
- Discrimination is challenged and tackled robustly.

In affirming this vision CILIP will seek:

- To achieve recognisable excellence as an organisation that values and puts into practice equal opportunities and diversity;
- To work towards establishing an LIS workforce that is representative of the diversity within UK society;
- To facilitate an awareness and appreciation of the value and importance of diversity and equal opportunities to LIS work amongst our members and staff;
- To collaborate with other interested parties in the encouragement and mainstreaming of best practice in service delivery so that the values of diversity and equal opportunities are embodied in the services provided by our members;
- To tackle prejudice wherever it is found in the LIS domain.

CILIP recognises and accepts the commitment which the policy demands and will take all necessary action to ensure its full implementation and continuing development.