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Winning equality is at the heart of our cause to change the world of work for good. That’s why the TUC’s annual equality audit matters. It helps us track our collective progress and spurs us on to do even better.

This year marks the TUC’s 150th birthday and is a chance to celebrate equalities victories we have won through our history.

Fifty years ago the Dagenham and Halewood Ford women’s strikes led to the introduction of the 1970 Equal Pay Act. For the first time, employers had to treat men and women who were doing the same job equally in their pay and conditions. Thanks to unions, millions of working women won the right to equal pay for the first time.

It is also 50 years since the Race Relations Act, which the TUC and unions campaigned for. But let’s remember that sometimes we had to fight on two fronts. Racist attitudes and discrimination in the 1950s were not confined to the bosses. We also had to overcome prejudice within our own ranks and across wider society. The 1963 Bristol bus boycott and ‘colour bars’ in nursing are also part of our equalities history.

Tackling the root causes of discrimination, strengthening membership and spreading collective bargaining all go hand-in-hand, and are as urgent today as ever.

Our equality audits are not just a paper exercise. They shine a light on union action on equality – recognising the progress we have won together but also what more we need to do to make real change in the workplace.

This year’s report showcases practical examples of how unions are working hard to achieve equality. It highlights union action to combat all forms of harassment, discrimination and prejudice within union structures and as employers. We report on important areas of real progress. For example, nearly all union members are now protected by robust rules or procedures on harassment and discrimination. And the number of unions now offering training specifically aimed at BME, LGBT+, disabled and young workers continues to grow.

But the audit also highlights where more work is still needed. We need to boost equality monitoring, for example. And while there have been some breakthroughs, it is still the case that women, BME workers and young workers are under-represented in union positions.

Let’s redouble our efforts to offer personal encouragement and practical support so that leadership at every level of our movement looks more like the workforce we champion. We know there is real strength through diversity.

I hope unions will use this audit as a tool to benchmark how far they have come, but also to identify new challenges and priorities. We should all be proud of how much unions have achieved. But we are not content. We aim to win that New Deal for all working people. Let’s get to it.

Frances O’Grady
TUC General Secretary
The Equality Audit 2018 looks at the practical steps trade unions are taking to ensure they reflect the diversity of the workforce.

It provides examples of how unions are recruiting and supporting under-represented groups into membership and activism. It also looks at what unions are doing to give these groups a voice in their internal union structures.

Questionnaires were sent to 50 unions who were affiliated to the TUC in November 2017 for completion by the middle of February 2018. Completed questionnaires were received from 38 unions – 76 per cent of affiliates. This is a higher response rate than for the last equivalent audit in 2014. The unions responding in 2018 represent 97 per cent of all TUC-affiliated union members.

Key findings

Labour market diversity and trade union membership

- Women are more likely than men, and disabled workers are more likely than non-disabled workers, to be union members.
- BME workers are under-represented among union members, and young workers are particularly unlikely to be in a union.
- As there are no reliable official statistics on the size of the LGBT+ workforce, it is not possible to assess the representativeness of trade union membership rates among this group.

Rules

- Three-quarters of the unions responding to the audit have adopted the TUC model equality clause – the same proportion as in 2014.
- Nearly all members of unions that responded to the audit are covered by rules or procedures for allegations of discrimination and harassment.

Monitoring membership and union structures

- Most unions collect data on the number of women members, but fewer monitor the number of members in other equalities groups. This is true for some large unions as well as for some unions which are smaller.
- In general, there has been a lack of progress on disaggregated monitoring and in some cases the number of unions collecting disaggregated data has fallen.
- Women, BME workers and young workers are all under-represented in union positions, although disabled members are well represented in such roles.
- Good practice examples show how unions are trying to shift these trends.

Equality officers and reps

- There has been a reduction in the number of unions employing equality officers for specific equality strands, with officers also now more likely to have other responsibilities. But 71 per cent of unions do have at least one member of staff with equality responsibilities at a national level.
- In total, 84 per cent of members of unions responding to the audit were in a union with a rule or practice on overall workplace equality reps.
- In total, 66 per cent of members of unions responding to the audit were in unions with women’s reps, 62 per cent with BME reps, 59 per cent with disabled members’ reps, 65 per cent with LGBT+ reps and the same for young worker reps.

---

1 Meaning data broken down by women, BME, disabled, LGBT+ and young workers
Equality committees, conferences and campaigns

- 57 per cent of the unions completing the main questionnaire have a formal national overall equality committee.
- Increasingly union members are creating less formal networks, but these are not necessarily replacements for formal committees. In many cases unions have both.
- There has been a noticeable drop in the number of individual national conferences held for each equality strand.

Training

- Most unions provide training on equality or diversity awareness for lay officials and members, and the proportion doing so has increased from 79 per cent in 2014 to 89 per cent in 2018.
- But the proportion of unions encouraging participation in mainstream training by members of equalities groups has fallen since 2014.
- A higher proportion of unions are now offering trade union training specifically aimed at BME, LGBT+, disabled and young workers than four years ago.

Unions as employers

- In total, 87 per cent of unions responding to the audit have an equal opportunities or non-discrimination policy relating to their own employees, an increase since 2014.
- 82 per cent of unions responding to the audit have an explicit reference to dealing with harassment and discrimination in their internal complaints, disciplinary or grievance procedures.
- 83 per cent of unions provide staff with equality and diversity (E&D) training.
- Union monitoring of staff diversity has fallen since 2014. Monitoring rates are highest for women (71 per cent of unions monitor for this group) and BME groups (55 per cent).
- Half of unions have equality action plans in place.
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The TUC Equality Audit 2018 considers the steps unions are taking to promote equality in their membership, structures and processes, and to ensure they reflect the diversity of their membership.

It also looks at the extent to which unions as employers provide equal opportunities for their own staff. It is complementary to the TUC Equality Audit 2016, which looked at unions’ efforts to promote equality through collective bargaining.

Questionnaires were sent to the 50 unions affiliated to the TUC in November 2017, with a completion deadline of the middle of February 2018. Completed questionnaires were received from 38 unions, which is 76 per cent of TUC affiliates. This is a higher response rate than for the last equivalent audit in 2014 when 36 out of 54 TUC affiliates participated (67 per cent). Two of the unions not responding in 2018 were shortly to merge into other unions.

The unions responding in 2018 represent 97 per cent of all TUC-affiliated union members.

The audit data was collected and analysed by the Labour Research Department on behalf of the TUC.
SECTION A
Labour market diversity and trade union membership

The following section discusses recently published data relating to trade union membership among women, BME workers, disabled workers, LGBT+ workers and young workers.

The data shows that women are better represented in union membership than men, white employees are better represented than BME employees and older workers are better represented than young workers. Disabled employees are better represented among union members than are non-disabled employees.

As was the case in 2014, there are no reliable official statistics on the size of the LGBT+ workforce, so accurate assessments of trade union representation are not possible.

Women

Women make up 49.5 per cent of UK employees. Since 2002, union density has been higher among female employees than male employees and in 2017 it was 25.6 per cent compared with 20.9 per cent for men. As Chart 1 shows, in 2017, 54.6 per cent of union members were women, despite accounting for just 49.5 per cent of employees.

In part these trends reflect higher female employment rates in the public sector. UK union density is much higher in the public sector, where 51.8 per cent of employees are union members, than it is in the private sector, where the figure is only 13.5 per cent.

Trade union density among women is highest for those in professional occupations. Fifty-three per cent of women in professional occupations are union members compared with 29 per cent of men. Teachers, midwives and nurses are female-dominated professions that are highly unionised, which contributes to the high proportion of female union members.

Some women are under-represented as union members.

Women are more likely than men to work part-time (73 per cent of part-time workers are women) and part-time workers are under-represented in trade unions. Those working part-time form 25.7 per cent of employees but just 21.5 per cent of union members.

Just one in seven (14.5 per cent) women in temporary jobs are union members. Although this is higher than for men in temporary jobs, 11.6 per cent of whom are union members, it is still well below the 25.6 per cent of women who are union members overall.

While 24.7 per cent of women in caring, leisure and other service occupations are union members, this is the case for just 14.2 per cent of women in sales and customer service jobs and 11.7 per cent of women in ‘elementary occupations’.

BME workers

BME employees are under-represented in union membership. While they account for 11.7 per cent of all employees, they make up just nine per cent of union members. This is the case for employees from all groups other than white. While 5.6 per cent of all employees identify...
as Asian or Asian British, this group accounts for only 4.3 per cent of union members. Black or Black British people constitute 2.9 per cent of employees and 2.8 per cent of union members. Those identifying as Chinese or from another ethnic group form 2.1 per cent of the employee population but just one per cent of union members.

Employees from a mixed ethnic background are more likely to be union members than they were four years ago (20.4 per cent compared with 17.1 per cent) but, as they form only a small proportion of employees, this has not had much effect on overall union density. Density among Black or Black British employees has fallen substantially (to 24.1 per cent compared with 29.3 per cent), as has density among Chinese and other ethnic group employees (to 11.5 per cent from 17.6 per cent).

Across all non-white groups, women are more likely to be union members than men. However, union density has fallen for each group of women other than mixed race women compared with four years ago.

As the recent government Race Disparity Audit\(^3\) showed, employment rates are higher for white workers than for Black workers. TUC analysis has shown that Black workers are far more likely than white counterparts to be in insecure jobs, with those in temporary work less likely to be in unions.\(^4\)

**Disabled workers**

According to the Labour Force Survey, disabled employees are more likely to be union members than non-disabled employees – 16.4 per cent of union members in 2017 were disabled compared to 14 per cent of all employees, as Chart 2 shows. To some extent, this may reflect the higher chance of people becoming disabled as they age, and the higher average age of trade union members, as well as the higher employment rates of disabled people in the public sector (discussed in further detail below).

The TUC report *Disability Employment and Pay Gaps*\(^5\) shows that disabled people have significantly lower employment rates than non-disabled people, and for some disabled people employment rates are as low as 20 per cent. Disabled people are more likely to be in part-time jobs and lower-paid occupations, and it is likely that these workers are under-represented as union members.

**LGBT+ workers**

The Annual Population Survey (APS) published by the Office for National Statistics found that two per cent of people older than 16 in the UK identified as lesbian, gay or bisexual in 2016.\(^6\)
However, there are no reliable official statistics on the size of the LGBT+ workforce.

**Young workers**

There is a large gap in union density between young workers and older workers.

Older groups are over-represented in union membership – just 29 per cent of all employees are aged 50 plus whereas 40 per cent of union members are. Only four per cent of union members are aged under 25 compared to 13 per cent of employees.

As a recent TUC report\(^7\) showed, young workers face major barriers in the workplace, with too many concentrated in low-paid jobs with a lack of access to skills development at work and no workplace voice. The need for increased trade union membership among this group is clear.

\(^7\) www.tuc.org.uk/sites/default/files/Stuck%20at%20the%20start-%20young%20workers%20progress%20and%20pay.pdf
TUC rules require unions to show a clear commitment to equality for all and to eliminate all forms of harassment and discrimination within their own union structures and through all activities.

In total, 78 per cent of members of unions responding to the audit are covered by the model TUC equality clause. Ninety-eight per cent of members responding to the audit are covered by rules or procedures concerning discrimination or harassment.

### TUC model equality clause

**The objects of the union shall include:**

(a) The promotion of equality for all including through:

(i) collective bargaining, publicity material and campaigning, representation, union organisation and structures, education and training, organising and recruitment, the provision of all other services and benefits and all other activities

(ii) the union’s own employment practices.

(b) To oppose actively all forms of harassment, prejudice and unfair discrimination whether on the grounds of sex, race, ethnic or national origin, religion, colour, class, caring responsibilities, marital status, sexuality, disability, age or other status or personal characteristic.

Three-quarters of the unions responding to the audit (74 per cent) have adopted the TUC model equality clause – the same proportion as in 2014. Small unions are slightly more likely to have adopted the clause than other unions; 80 per cent have done so compared with 67 per cent of both large and medium unions. Overall, 78 per cent of members of unions responding to the audit are covered by the clause.

The four large unions\(^8\) with such a clause are the GMB, NASUWT, UNISON and Unite. Eight medium unions have adopted the clause, namely the CSP, Equity, FBU, NUJ, NUT (ATL section), PCS, RMT and UCU. And 16 small unions have adopted it: Accord, Advance, AEP, ASLEF, BSU, Napo, NARS, Nautilus, NGSU, PFA, SCP, SOR, TSSA, UCAC, URTU and WGGB.

Seventy-one per cent of unions responding to the audit have other national rules on equality, including all the large unions, 67 per cent of medium-sized unions and 65 per cent of small unions. Overall, 94 per cent of members of unions responding to the audit are covered by such rules.

In addition, the CSP, which has no rulebook, has an equal opportunities statement and a code of professional values and behaviour that includes statements on respect and non-discriminatory behaviour. The SCP has equality and diversity statements embedded within its code of conduct and staff policies.

Half of the unions responding to the audit have a rule related to membership of far-right or racist political parties. The large unions are much more likely to have such a rule than the smaller and medium-size unions. Eighty-three per cent of all members of unions responding to the audit are covered by such rules.

### The law on unions and members of far-right parties

In February 2007, the European Court of Human Rights held that UK law, which prevented ASLEF from expelling a member of the British National Party (BNP), violated the union’s right to freedom of association. The Trade Union and Labour Relations Act 1992 was subsequently amended to allow a union to expel a member of a political party if membership of that party is contrary to a rule or an objective of the trade union.
The unions with rules in this area include: five large unions (83 per cent) – GMB, NASUWT, NEU (NUT section), UNISON and Unite; six medium unions (50 per cent) – CWU, FBU, NEU (ATL section), NUJ, PCS and UCU; and eight small unions (40 per cent) – Accord, AFA-CWA, ASLEF, BDA, Napo, Nautilus, PFA and TSSA.

Other unions said their rules would indirectly prohibit such activity, which would be likely to contravene the aims and objectives of the union and therefore could lead to disciplinary proceedings and possible expulsion.

Accord’s biennial delegate conference in April 2018 agreed a new rule that would allow a membership application to be rejected because of misconduct or being a member of an organisation with objectives against the union’s (such as far-right groups).

### Discrimination and harassment rules and procedures

Unions promote equal rights for all members, staff and activists. A new section that has been included in the Audit for 2018 is a question on union rules and procedures covering allegations of discrimination or harassment made against its lay activists, officers and full-time officials. (In some cases these overlap with union-as-employer policies designed to protect union staff, which are covered on p26.)

Overall, 31 of the unions responding (82 per cent) said they had such rules or procedures. All the large unions had such rules, as well as 10 (83 per cent) of the medium unions responding to the audit and 15 (75 per cent) of the small unions. A very high proportion (98 per cent) of the members of unions responding to the audit are covered by rules or procedures concerning discrimination or harassment allegations of this sort.

UNISON’s national delegate conference 2017 approved a new regulation for dealing with misconduct by members in relation to the union’s employees. It gives a non-exhaustive definition of misconduct as:

- verbal or physical abuse
- disrespectful, threatening or intimidating behaviour
- conduct which may expose a member of staff to ridicule, embarrassment or contempt
- conduct which violates the dignity of the member of staff concerned
- bullying or harassment
- discrimination (which includes discrimination, harassment or victimisation on grounds of race, gender, marital status or civil partnership, sexuality, gender identity, disability, age, creed or social class, or any other discriminatory conduct).

If, after investigation, the allegation is found to be proven, there are a range of penalties ranging from censure to expulsion from the union.

Unite has a rule on membership discipline covering bullying and harassment, including cyber bullying, by members. The union has also issued a document, “Policy on harassment, dignity and respect”, to all members who are elected to constitutional committees or attend conferences on behalf of the union. It sets out what is expected of such members, and what to do if discrimination or harassment takes place. It also covers harassment of Unite employees (see p26).
For a union to determine whether its structures are representative of the diversity of its membership, it needs statistics.

To collect such data, unions need to monitor their composition with statistics broken down by equality strand (disaggregation) for their membership and their various democratic structures. This section looks at the number of unions that monitor the diversity of their membership and union structures (such as union reps, health and safety reps, branch officers etc).

**Monitoring membership**

Many unions continue to collect data on women in their membership, including 89 per cent (34) of those responding to the audit, and 68 per cent (26) of unions provided actual figures. Among those unions providing data, the proportion of women in their membership ranged from 4 per cent to 81 per cent.

More than half of the 38 unions responding to the audit (22 unions) said they collected data on the proportion of people from a BME background in their membership. Among these unions, the BME population made up between 0.3 per cent and 17 per cent of their membership. This largely reflects the proportions in the sectors and occupations where unions organise.

Monitoring disability can be more difficult than monitoring by gender, age or ethnicity. Some individuals, for example, may not want to disclose a disability. The audit found that 42 per cent of unions (16) responding carry out disability monitoring of their membership, and 10 unions (26 per cent) provided figures.

Among the unions that provided data in the audit, the proportion of members who considered themselves disabled varied from less than one per cent to 10 per cent. This is some way behind the proportion of disabled union members according to the Labour Force Survey. However, the unions’ figures may be imprecise as the information has only been collected for a small proportion of the membership.

There has been an increase in the proportion of unions monitoring the LGBT+ status of their members, to 39 per cent. But only seven (18 per cent) unions responding provided actual figures on LGBT+ membership. Among these unions, the proportion of the membership identifying as LGBT+ varied from less than one per cent to 4 per cent. Again, these figures are often imprecise as the information has only been collected for a small proportion of the membership.

More than half of unions responding to the audit (22 unions) said they kept statistics on the number of young people in their membership (each by their own definition of “young”). Unions’ cut-off age for ‘young’ ranges between 17 and 35. Sixteen unions (42 per cent of audit respondents) provided figures on young membership, and the proportion ranged from 2 per cent to 31 per cent.

These trends are all shown in Chart 4.

Whether unions use disaggregated monitoring of their membership mainly depends on the size of the union: while just 85 per cent of small unions monitor membership by gender, for
example, 92 per cent of medium unions and 100 per cent of large ones do so.

Yet even some of the large unions seem not to monitor all categories: just four of the six record, in each case, ethnic background, disability and LGBT+ status, and five of the six monitor young membership. Indeed, a higher proportion of medium-sized unions (nine of the 12, or 75 per cent) monitor BME membership.

**Monitoring stewards and workplace reps**

Overall, 25 of the unions responding to the audit (66 per cent) monitor the number of stewards or workplace reps who are women. For the role of branch officials, 17 of the unions responding to the audit (45 per cent) gather figures on the number of branch officers who are women.

The monitoring suggests that women are still under-represented in union roles and structures compared with their proportion in membership. The limited data provided to the audit indicates that women are often under-represented in the roles of steward or workplace rep, health and safety rep and branch official or officer and as delegates to union conferences and TUC Congress.

Women are more likely to be proportionately or over-represented in learning rep and equality rep roles. In half the 14 unions providing figures on learning reps, women were more than proportionately represented in this role.

Unite launched a Step Up campaign at its national women’s conference to encourage women to stand as union reps and branch officers. The focus is on member-to-member conversations about empowering women members to step up to the leadership roles of workplace, equality, learner, health and safety or environment rep, or branch officer.

In addition, Unite’s West Midlands region has run training sessions – one for women members and one for BAEM members – to encourage members to become reps. This was designed to build their confidence and give them practical tools to develop their involvement. The region has been organising a 100-strong training conference event, again aimed at women and BAEM members who are thinking of becoming shop stewards or reps.

The NASUWT has updated its working assertively training course for women, which teaches assertiveness skills in the context of school, college and within the union and can help those seeking to hold union office. In addition, its regional equalities networks (see p19) include organised networking and training events for women. The union adds that its earlier introduction of a ‘workplace contact’ category of activists has encouraged predominantly women members to job-share representative roles.

Seventeen unions (45 per cent) collect data on BME stewards and workplace reps and 14 unions (37 per cent) monitor BME branch officer roles. Only a small number of unions were able to provide sufficient data on the proportion of BME members to assess how well they are represented in union structures. From the figures that are available, it is evident that BME members are likely to be proportionately under-represented among stewards, safety reps, branch officials and executive members. They are more likely to be proportionately represented as conference and TUC Congress delegates and as equality officers.

The UCU ran a campaign entitled Witness in 2015 which detailed UCU’s BME members’ experiences of everyday racism, which were identified through a member survey. Among other things, the union holds an annual day of action against workplace racism along with
a scheme of work for branches to follow to raise awareness about workplace racism and how to challenge it. Members follow a specific theme identified by the UCU Black members’ standing committee. This work has helped to recruit new members and to encourage existing members to become more active within the union and its structures.

CSP monitoring shows that in one year (2016–17), BME participation in steward and safety rep roles rose from 4.2 per cent to 5.8 per cent, while in student rep roles BME participation went from 8.1 per cent to 9.5 per cent.

A recent rule change in the CWU requiring branches to have a BAME officer has helped engage many new representatives, the vast majority of whom are BAME. Now 75 branches have a BAME officer in post, and 110 have a women’s officer.

Sixteen unions (42 per cent) record the number of stewards and workplace reps who are disabled. The data from unions suggests that, where information is available, disabled members are well represented or over-represented in all union positions. Twelve unions (32 per cent) monitor the disability status of their branch officials.

Unite successfully recruited members in the finance sector when a Unite rep (who is also on the union’s disabled members’ committee) set about encouraging people with hidden disabilities to get involved with the union. This action resulted in a significant rise in membership.

In 2016 the TSSA held a successful recruitment month themed around its neurodiversity programme: membership increased in workplaces that had run activities. There was also an increase in members getting active, becoming equality reps and being trained as neurodiversity specialists.

Twelve unions (32 per cent) monitor the LGBT+ status of stewards and workplace reps and 9 (24 per cent) monitor the LGBT+ status of branch officials. There is very limited comparable data to indicate how well LGBT+ members are represented in union structures, and what is available shows a very mixed picture.

The BECTU section of Prospect has established an LGBT+ webpage, Facebook and Twitter pages and a WhatsApp group since the last equality audit. BECTU’s merger partner, Prospect, has also created an LGBT+ webpage providing a single place for LGBT+ materials and an online facility for joining. In addition, the union has developed branch-based LGBT+ networks and has also been working with employers to encourage people to get involved.

Sixteen unions (42 per cent) monitor the number of young stewards and workplace reps and 12 (32 per cent) monitor the number of young branch officials and officers. Unions were also able to provide some data on the representation of young workers in their membership and structures. This showed almost universally that young members were under-represented in all union positions. A notable exception was the NUJ, where young members formed a disproportionately high percentage of activists at every level.

The CWU’s Building Tomorrow Together initiative, designed to recruit more women and young workers, includes an action month in October as well as specific materials to encourage these two groups to join. The union’s figures show that under-30s have grown as a proportion of new joiners and of overall membership since 2014.

Smaller unions are less likely to carry out monitoring than larger unions. So, for example, whereas 100 per cent of large unions (six) conduct gender monitoring of stewards and workplace reps, only 67 per cent of medium-size unions (eight) and 55 per cent of small unions (11) do so. This pattern is repeated for each equality strand.

The proportion of unions monitoring branch officers is also lower the smaller the union. And the difference between large, medium and
small unions monitoring these officers is even wider than for stewards and workplace reps for all equality strands.

Large unions are also more likely to monitor shop stewards and workplace reps. The proportion of stewards and reps of all respondent unions who are covered by monitoring is 91 per cent for gender monitoring; 71 per cent for ethnic background monitoring; 69 per cent for disability status; 65 per cent for LGBT+ status; and 78 per cent for young reps.

There has been very little progress by unions in this area since 2014. There have been improvements in disaggregated monitoring at the level of stewards and workplace reps for some strands, and for disabled and LGBT+ members among learning and health and safety reps. But there have been falls, or at least no increase, in the proportion of unions collecting disaggregated statistics for branch officials, branch and workplace equality reps, conference delegates, TUC Congress delegates and national executive members.

Equality officers and reps

In this section of the report we will be providing examples of actions unions have taken in the past four years to ensure their branch and workplace representatives reflect the membership.

Equality officers play an important role in achieving equality for all. The main responsibility of an equality officer is to lead on overall equality at a national level. The audit shows that 27 unions (71 per cent) have at least one member of staff at national level. Seven (18 per cent) have a member of staff whose main responsibility is equality for young members, and five (13 per cent) have separate officers responsible for individual strands of members.

The audit findings show a drop in the number of unions saying they have equality officers covering individual strands since 2014, as Chart 5 shows.

Chart 5: Unions employing equality officers at national level (%)

All 18 large and medium unions had at least one overall equality officer, though in 11 cases these officers also had other responsibilities. Three of the large unions, but only two of the medium ones, had officers for most of the individual strands.

Just nine of the 20 small unions employ equality officers (all for overall equality) of which only the officer in one union (ASLEF) is working solely on that role. None of the small unions had officers for the individual strands.

In total, of the 27 unions with overall equality officers, two-thirds (18 unions) say these equality officers also have other responsibilities. This spread of duties is more common with the individual-strand equality officers, except for LGBT+ officers. All but one of the five unions with LGBT+ officers say that the member of staff is dedicated solely to that role.

The 35 unions completing the main questionnaire were asked if they employed any equality staff at regional, group or sectoral level. Sixteen unions (43 per cent) had overall equality officers at these sub-national levels and four unions (11 per cent) had sub-national
officers with clear responsibility for one strand – women, BME, disabled, LGBT+ or young members. In all cases these post-holders also had other responsibilities.

The NEU (NUT section) has introduced senior organising officers for equality, who the union says, “have made a significant difference in organising members in the equality areas”. They have focused on increasing participation in conferences and building local networks for members in those groups.

To give a focus throughout the union, the PFA has introduced equality executives within its coaching, community and education departments, on top of its core equalities staff.

**Equality reps at workplace or branch level**

Equality reps in the workplace can help ensure that equality is properly considered as part of all workplace consultation and bargaining activities. Equality reps also help to prevent discrimination.

Fifty-eight per cent of the unions responding to the audit (22) had a rule or practice on workplace or branch overall equality reps. This was much more common among the large unions than the small and medium-size unions. Five unions (83 per cent) had such a rule or practice compared with seven (58 per cent) of medium unions and 10 (50 per cent) of small unions.

In total, 84 per cent of members of unions who responded were in unions with a rule or practice on overall equality reps, as Chart 6 shows. ASLEF has adopted a new rule providing a job description for the role of branch equality rep (BER). The union has also run campaigns in some regions to increase the number of BERs and has managed to do so by 50 per cent in some areas. ASLEF has also made particular efforts to engage with elected BERs through regional newsletters, customised training events and, for the first time, an equalities weekend school.

A number of unions have reps at branch or workplace level with responsibility for individual equality strands. (In some cases, these are unions which also have overall equality reps.) Larger unions are more likely to have reps responsible for individual strands. Eighteen per cent (seven unions) had a rule or practice for appointing reps with responsibility for women; this applied to 50 per cent of large unions (three), 25 per cent of medium unions (three) and 5 per cent of small unions (one). Overall, 66 per cent of members of unions responding to the audit were in unions with women’s reps.
Again, 18 per cent of unions (seven) had a rule or practice for appointing reps with responsibility for BME members, including 50 per cent of large unions (three), 17 per cent of medium ones (two) and 10 per cent of small ones (two). Overall, 62 per cent of members of unions responding to the audit were in unions with BME members’ reps.

Just 11 per cent of unions (four) had a rule or practice for appointing reps with responsibility for disabled members, including 50 per cent of large unions (three) and 8 per cent of medium unions (one). Overall, 59 per cent of members of unions responding to the audit were in unions with disabled members’ reps.

Thirteen per cent of unions (five) have a rule or practice for appointing reps with responsibility for LGBT+ members. They included 67 per cent of large unions (four) and 8 per cent of medium unions (one). Overall, 65 per cent of members of unions responding to the audit were in unions with LGBT+ reps.

Eighteen per cent of unions (seven) had a rule or practice for appointing reps with responsibility for young members, including 50 per cent of large unions (three), 25 per cent of medium unions (three) and 5 per cent of small unions (one). Overall, 65 per cent of members of unions responding to the audit were in unions with young members’ reps.

The GMB had previously recommended that all branches elect a branch equality officer whose role was to cover all equality strands. They are now also encouraged to elect youth officers and race officers, so that the union “can highlight and change anything that acts as an obstacle to branch members’ inclusion and participation”.

The NEU (NUT section) and NASUWT both say they have seen an increase in the number of local equality officers in post, but other unions have had a harder time. For example, Prospect reports that, because of cuts in facility time, the role is now usually held by committee members with other responsibilities. Community also says that the lack of facility time allocated to the role, as well as the fact that the union operates in many non-recognised areas, act as barriers to expansion in this area.

Equality committees

The main audit questionnaire was changed slightly in 2018 from 2014’s: unions were asked both if they had any formal committees for equality or for individual strands and also if they had any informal networks or groups.

Twenty (57 per cent) of the unions completing the main questionnaire have a formal national overall equality committee (see Chart 7). Seventeen (49 per cent) have a formal body for women, and the same number do for BME members. Sixteen (46 per cent) have formal bodies for LGBT+ members and for disabled members and 14 (40 per cent) do so for young members (see Chart 7).

The RMT have had a rule change since the 2014 audit to create a disabled members’ advisory committee and annual conference on the same basis as the other equality groups. Community has had a disabled members group for many years but is now in the early stages of developing groups for women, BME, LGBT+ and young members.

The CSP dissolved its equality and diversity group, with equality work now carried out by a number of other committees and the CSP council (its executive), but there is now a requirement for the council to demonstrate a “rigorous equality impact assessment” of its decisions.

Increasingly union members are creating less formal networks. Of the unions completing the main audit questionnaire, more than one in three had an informal overall equality network.
or group. In addition, a significant minority of unions had informal networks for individual strands: 46 per cent had an informal group or network for women, 40 per cent had one for BME members, 37 per cent in each case for LGBT+ members and disabled members and 29 per cent had one for young members (see Chart 7).

Informal networks are not necessarily replacements for formal committees, and in many cases unions have both. Ten of the 35 unions completing the main questionnaire (29 per cent) have both formal and informal overall equality groups, and this group includes three large unions, four medium unions and three small ones. Twelve unions (34 per cent) have formal and informal women’s groups, 10 (29 per cent) do so for BME members, 11 (31 per cent) for disabled members, nine (26 per cent) for LGBT+ members and eight (23 per cent) for young members.

The NEU (NUT) has replaced its former advisory committees for the equality strands with national organising forums, which are elected through regional councils. The focus of these is on lay activists carrying out organising work in their region, supported by the union’s senior equality organisers. In some regions they have set up equality networks in the various strands, and the union reports some very strong lay-led networks operating in London for BME, women and LGBT+ teachers. Trans teachers and disabled teachers have digital networks and are exploring other ways of bringing members together through social media and other electronic means. Meanwhile, the all-NEU trans teachers network held its first face-to-face meeting in January 2018.

While Unite has had a full range of formal committees for most of the strands for some time, several informal social media groups have also been established, including among young and LGBT+ members. Similarly, the UCU has both committees and active digital networks for all equality groups. And the NASUWT, which has a formal committee for each category, also hosts specific sections within its social media programmes for each of the strands, including NASUWT Facebook pages.

ASLEF also has informal networks that operate via Facebook, as does the CSP, on top of its national networks for BME, disabled and LGBT+ members, which hold twice-yearly meetings. It has been piloting a young members forum following an executive committee decision, and rule changes will be proposed at the 2018 annual conference to establish this as part of the union’s rulebook.

The PFA has developed various specific committees in recent years and now also has networks for LGBT+ football practitioners and for mental health practitioners (to address stigma around mental health in football). UNISON added a new network in 2016 following the Brexit vote for European Union workers. Its previous Polish workers group has merged with this.

The AUE is currently building informal networks for general equality, with an aim to move on to specific groups, and the SCP is looking to develop networks in the future.
Networks can also be the prelude to more formal activity. The BDA set up virtual equality networks for each strand using social media, which the union hopes will develop into meetings or events in the future.

Some unions have also been facing difficulties in maintaining their equality groups and committees. Napo formed informal networks covering women and BME members after the last audit, but the Napo Black network, which has held two events, has been hindered from further activity by funding constraints.

Accord has ended its LGBT+ and BME advisory committees because they duplicated its main employers’ networks, which made it difficult to maintain interest among members.

Meanwhile the CWU national advisory committees have been cut in frequency and length to help manage costs, and the PCS is having to rebuild some of its established equality structures after check-off and facility time were withdrawn.

Some unions raised issues around inactivity among some groups, leading to changes in how they operate. The TSSA said that while its previous LGBT self-organised group saw limited activity, a vibrant new network had been formed in 2016 which works with outside LGBT+ campaigns.

Equality conferences and seminars

Unions were asked if they held regular national conferences either for overall equality or for specific strands of members.

Since 2014 there has been a decline in national conferences for individual equality strands,

| Chart 8: Unions holding equality conferences or seminars at national level (%) |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overall equality</th>
<th>Women</th>
<th>BME</th>
<th>Disabled</th>
<th>LGBT+</th>
<th>Young</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Base: All unions responding to the audits (36 in 2014, 38 in 2018)

How the TSSA re-established LGBT+ organisation

The TSSA’s LGBT+ Network was established in 2016, about 18 months after its original LGBT self-organised group disbanded.

To help establish the network, after the shooting of 49 people in a gay nightclub in Orlando in the US, the TSSA’s general secretary wrote an open letter to members inviting them to attend a seminar, LGBT+ in the Workplace, one aim of which was to explore setting up a new network and what that might achieve.

Stonewall gave a presentation on its work to the seminar, and the meeting came up with a list of issues for a network to address.

In February 2017 the TSSA became the first union to officially join Stonewall and its diversity champions programme. This was promoted to the union’s membership, which resulted in more LGBT+ members coming forward to get involved in the network.

The network set a plan of action including recruitment and campaigning goals. This led to the launching of the union’s #NoBystanders campaign. A further LGBT+ in the Workplace seminar has been held, and in February 2018 the network ran various campaign activities as part of LGBT History Month. This has built more momentum for the #NoBystanders campaign.
as is shown in Chart 8. Just over a third of unions responding to the audit (34 per cent) hold a regular national women’s conference or seminar, and 29 per cent hold one for LGBT+ members. Twenty-six per cent hold one in each case for BME, disabled and young members. There has been a small rise in the overall equality conferences.

Not surprisingly, large unions are more likely than others to hold all types of equality conference, especially those for individual strands. A hundred per cent of large unions (six) hold young members conferences, for example, compared with 33 per cent of medium unions and no small ones. And 83 per cent (five) of large unions hold women’s conferences compared with 58 per cent of medium unions (seven) and just 10 per cent (two) of small ones.

A third of the unions completing the main questionnaire (31 per cent) said they hold conferences or seminars on overall equality at sub-national level. (This question was not asked of those completing the small-unions questionnaire.) A small number of unions held sub-national events for individual equality strands: 29 per cent of unions held conferences for women; 23 per cent for BME members; 20 per cent for disabled members; 20 per cent for LGBT+ members; and 31 per cent for young members.

**Developments in Wales and Scotland**

A number of unions reported progress in equality work specifically in Wales and Scotland since the last audit.

Since 2015, NASUWT has established equalities committees and held equalities conferences in the devolved nations. Following the introduction of the equalities development courses in 2016 and the success of the Scotland equalities conferences, NASUWT set up the Scotland equalities advisory group. The group will operate through virtual contact – allowing for quick access and response – and will also meet occasionally.

**TUC Congress monitoring**

At the 2016 TUC Congress, equality monitoring of delegates was carried out online.
for the first time. The overall level of returns was 75 per cent of delegates.9

TUC data showed that 49 per cent of delegates were women. This compares to 44 per cent in 2015. Forty-six per cent of delegate speakers were women, the highest rate ever recorded, and a significant increase on the previous high of 40 per cent in 2011.

The monitoring questionnaire responses included answers to the question on ethnicity from 401 delegates. According to these responses, 11.7 per cent of delegates identified as Black, an increase on the 10.5 per cent recorded in 2015; 2.2 per cent of delegates identified as Asian, 3.5 per cent as African Caribbean, 0.8 per cent as African and 5.2 per cent as other within the Black category.

Of the 395 delegates who answered the question on disability, 15.2 per cent considered themselves disabled, up from 9.7 per cent in 2015.

There were 386 responses to the question on sexuality. This question had the lowest response rate, significantly down on the 415 delegates responding in 2015. In 2016, 7.8 per cent of delegates identified as lesbian, gay or bisexual, a similar proportion to 2015.

There were 393 delegates answering the separate question on gender identity which was introduced in 2013 on the advice of the TUC’s LGBT committee. Sixteen delegates (4 per cent) identified as trans, up from 10 delegates in 2015. In addition, three delegates ticked the “prefer not to say” box, significantly fewer than the 15 delegates who selected this option in 2015.

Four hundred delegates answered the question on age, a higher response rate than in previous years. There was a slight increase in the proportion of delegates under 35, with 7.1 per cent of delegates in this category compared with 6.3 per cent in 2015. The proportion of delegates aged over 55 had also increased to 44.5 per cent, compared with 37.1 per cent in 2015.

Reserved seats
All unions responding to the survey were asked about reserved seats on national executives, conference delegations and TUC Congress delegations. Several unions have rules on reserving seats on some bodies and delegations. These rules seek to ensure a certain level of representation for groups that have traditionally been under-represented.

The most likely body to have reserved seats is a union’s national executive body (NEC). BME members have reserved seats on 26 per cent of unions’ executive bodies, as Chart 9 shows. 21 per cent of unions have reserved seats for women, while 16 per cent of unions have seats

---

9 There was a low overall return for monitoring at the 2017 TUC Congress because of difficulties implementing an online system. As a result, we cannot make a meaningful comparison with the result of monitoring exercises in the last audit in 2014.
for disabled members. Only eight per cent have reserved seats for young members and five per cent for LGBT+ members. There has not been much change in these proportions compared with four years ago.

The eight unions who have reserved seats for women comprise two large unions, two medium ones and four small ones. Overall, 37 per cent of members of unions responding to the audit are in unions with reserved seats for women.

The 10 unions with reserved seats for BME members consist of three large ones, five medium ones and two small ones. The result is that 60 per cent of members of unions responding to the audit are in unions with reserved seats for BME members.

The six unions with reserved seats for disabled members comprise two large ones and four medium ones. This means that 33 per cent of members of unions responding to the audit are in unions with reserved seats for disabled members.

Just one large and one medium union have reserved seats for LGBT+ members, accounting for eight per cent of members of unions responding to the audit.

The three unions with reserved seats for young members are two large ones and a small one. But they account for 46 per cent of all union members.

Since the 2014 audit, UNISON has increased its NEC by three seats to include two reserved seats for disabled members – one male and one female – and one additional seat for young members, so that group now has two seats.

Unite’s efforts to embed equality in its industrial work have included introducing a new rule to ensure that each regional women’s, BAEM, disabled member and LGBT+ committee is directly represented on the regional industrial sector committees. This is in addition to the existing requirement on these committees to have ‘minimum proportionality’ – to include as a minimum the proportion of women BAEM members covered by the committee.

The NEU (ATL section) took steps to improve BME representation on its E&D committee. It advertised for two BME members, but so many wished to take the seats that a ballot was required.
Equality-related union services and benefits

Since 2014, there has been a decline in services and benefits from trade unions aimed at particular strands of members. These services have been declining for some time, and 2018 is no exception.

The most likely targeted service to be provided is a website or special area of a site. Just over half of unions provide websites for women, for BME members, for LGBT+ members and for younger or older members – this proportion is much lower than in 2014. The next most common strand-specific service or benefit is targeted publications.

Only small proportions of unions monitor their general service provision to see if it delivers equality of access. Eleven per cent do so for women and for BME members, and nine per cent do so for disabled, LGBT+ and younger or older members.

An important equality-related service provided by unions is taking discrimination cases to tribunal.

All unions were asked if they monitored the number of cases they take to tribunal under each of the discrimination jurisdictions. Just under half of unions that responded monitored the cases taken to tribunal.

There was a noticeable increase since 2014 in monitoring of cases relating to sexual orientation (up from 14 unions to 17) and gender reassignment (up from 13 to 17). A new category added to the questionnaire was cases of pregnancy and maternity discrimination, which were monitored by 45 per cent of unions.

The NUJ noted that its monitoring showed there was a drop in the number of cases taken to tribunal in each category when the Employment Tribunal fees were introduced, despite the union paying the fees on behalf of members.

The NEU (ATL section) said its monitoring showed the most common issue facing its members was employers’ refusal to allow women having had a baby to return to work part-time. It also said there was a big problem of disability discrimination, which also formed the largest group of cases for the TSSA and Unite (although Unite notes that its very large volume of “unfair dismissal” cases may include discrimination elements which are not included in its monitoring report).

Training

Most unions provide training on equality or diversity awareness for lay officials and members, and the proportion doing so has increased from 79 per cent in 2014 to 89 per cent in 2018. A union that has recently started doing this is the BDA, who says all reps are now given such training as part of the union’s new training package, which includes TUC eNotes.

Two-thirds of the unions completing the main questionnaire said they provided lay reps with training in taking discrimination cases – 29 per cent did so regularly and 37 per cent did so ‘as and when’.

Unions completing the main questionnaire were asked if they provided any trade union training and/or development opportunities specifically aimed at any of the equality strands. A higher proportion of unions are now
offering targeted opportunities for trade union training than did four years ago (other than for women), as Chart 10 shows.

Large unions are significantly more likely than others to have the funding and resources to offer targeted training and learning opportunities to specific groups of members.

Chart 10: Unions providing targeted TU training (%)

As a result, 100 per cent of the large unions provide trade union training specifically aimed at women and young members. All but one of the large unions do so for BME, disabled and LGBT+ members. By comparison, only 58 per cent of medium unions and 12 per cent of small unions completing the main questionnaire provide TU training targeted at women. A similar pattern exists for training aimed at the other strands.

An example of specially targeted trade union training is the course designed by the UCU for BME members who want to be more involved within the union. It provides an overview of the union’s structures and how BME members can be proactive within the union. UNISON provides Black officer training in some regions: this covers equality issues that impact on Black workers and how to support and access services on behalf of members. There are also mentoring schemes to advance Black officers’ skills.

Unions also monitor the diversity of participation in their trade union training. Half of unions monitor the gender and ethnic background of attendees at their training and education courses, with about two in five doing so for disabled and LGBT+ workers. But there has been a reduction in this monitoring since 2014, as Chart 11 shows.

Many unions that do conduct monitoring do so via a form that is completed by course participants. Usdaw has recently added to or amended its monitoring categories in respect of sexual orientation, gender identity and disability.

Some unions take steps to encourage participation in education and training courses by members of the equality groups, although the proportion who do so is lower than in 2014. Chart 12 shows that about a third have taken such steps in each case, although only a quarter have acted to ensure age diversity.

Most of the unions who said they did this in 2014 but haven’t done so in the last four years were small and medium unions. But two large unions had only taken steps to encourage one
The NEU (NUT section) changed its reps training to run it on a regional basis, as it found that many women did not attend its national training courses. The union reported that as a result the number of trained women reps has significantly increased: in the last two years the union has gained 1,057 trained women reps, representing 59 per cent of the total.

Since 2014 trade union training has been affected by government funding cuts to training such as the removal of fee remission, cuts to Further Education adult skills and continued pressure on paid release time for reps, but even with these challenges unions continue to provide equality training for lay reps, officials and members.

**Campaigns**

Most of the unions completing the main questionnaire (86 per cent) say they take some action to ensure that their materials indicate a diverse membership or audience, and that language is accessible and does not cause offence to particular groups. Almost half (43 per cent) of the unions completing the main questionnaire also take steps to enable or encourage branches to produce communications indicating a diverse audience.

The audit asked unions a new question in this area in 2018, which was whether they had launched any campaigns or policy initiatives that have consciously sought to link two or more equality strands in the last four years. The NUJ has introduced an equality strands meeting which draws together the chairs and vice-chairs of the equality groups to look at multi-strand issues. Another aim is to work collaboratively to raise the profile of equality issues among the membership and encourage participation. The group has also been reviewing Project Diamond on diversity within the media.

Half of unions responding to the audit (53 per cent) reported having taken some measures to make their campaigns and communications materials accessible to people with visual or hearing impairments since 2014.

**The TSSA’s Time to Grow strategy**

The TSSA has established a Time to Grow strategy with two action points: to “make members the face of our union” and “stand up for respect and equality, be relevant to all groups”. The union is therefore looking for members to be the face of its campaigns, share their stories and include these in various communications. It has started to develop role model posters of LGBT+ members and staff with positive messages, with the aim of breaking down stereotypes and discrimination against LGBT+ people. It follows the approach the union used in relation to neurodiversity, and will be replicated in future campaigns on, for example, mental health and Fair Pay=Equal Pay.
Increasingly, unions are moving towards providing materials online, which provides more flexibility for adjustments. Many unions have created responsive websites that allow members to enlarge copy and, in some cases, accept speech commands. The NASUWT produces its videos in accessible formats, including with subtitles, and NARS says all its print, website and social media communications are accessible to those with hearing impairments.

Half of unions (53 per cent) provide some campaign and communications materials in languages other than English. In Unite there is increasing demand for material in different languages due to the increasing number of migrant workers in its workplaces. The union also has a number of multi-lingual organisers, and an employee who translates materials into Braille.

Half of unions responding to the audit (50 per cent) say they “consider /monitor the impact” of their campaigns on the diversity of their membership. The TSSA has developed a project planning toolkit that includes making an assessment of outcomes in relation to equality as part of the project planning process. The union has also, as part of its agreed operational plan, started surveying staff to identify what they are doing to further the union’s equality agenda in their projects, organising plans and general areas of responsibility.
**Staff equality policies, procedures and training**

Unions were asked if they had an equal opportunities or non-discrimination policy relating to their own employees.

Overall, 33 unions (87 per cent) responding to the audit had a policy, compared to 30 unions (83 per cent) in 2014. The total included 100 per cent of the large unions, 92 per cent of medium unions and 80 per cent of small unions. Thirty-two unions had a procedure for complaints related to breaches of their equality or non-discrimination policy.

In this section we also introduced a new question asking unions if they had an explicit reference to dealing with harassment and discrimination in their internal complaints, disciplinary or grievance procedures. Thirty-one unions (82 per cent) said they did. This included 100 per cent of the large unions responding to the audit, 92 per cent of the medium ones and 70 per cent of the small unions.

Some unions, particularly the large ones, added that they had a specific policy on bullying and harassment or dignity at work. UNISON has negotiated a new bullying and harassment policy with its staff and their unions.

Unite reported the establishment of twice-yearly separate meetings of Unite women officers and Unite BME officers, coordinated by the national equalities officers for women and BME members respectively, together with the assistant general secretary for equalities. The general secretary also issued a statement along with the union’s updated policy on harassment, dignity and respect, which covers Unite events (see box).
In other unions, staff handbooks clearly state that such behaviour is unacceptable, and advocate the use of the grievance and disciplinary procedures. For example, The RMT’s staff handbook states:

“Individual allegations of unlawfully discriminatory behaviour by individual employees will be dealt with through the disciplinary procedure where appropriate. Individuals are entitled to use the grievance procedure to raise any individual allegations of discrimination…

“The Union will also investigate fully any reported harassment of members of staff by lay members or the RMT or visitors to Union buildings.”

Unions were asked if they provide staff with E&D training. Most (83 per cent) do so, providing training either in-house or through third-party providers. Several make use of TUC training and third-party training.

Most of the unions completing the main questionnaire said they provided paid officials with training in taking discrimination cases – 31 per cent did so regularly and 54 per cent did so where required.

Seventeen unions (45 per cent) have reviewed staff pay and conditions in the last four years to ensure they do not discriminate on grounds of sex. Slightly fewer have checked they do not discriminate on grounds of ethnicity (39 per cent), disability (37 per cent), LGBT+ status (37 per cent) and age (39 per cent). These proportions are lower in each case than in 2014.

The FBU is carrying out a benchmarking exercise to review salaries in respect of sex. The CWU had also just started a review of all main policies, and its staff union (the GMB) had raised some issues which were to be explored.

Following the new gender pay gap reporting regulations, unions were asked if they were required to report on their gender pay gap. The regulations apply to organisations with 250 or more employees. Eight of the unions said they were required to do so. These are all the six large unions (Unite, UNISON, GMB, NASUWT, NEU [NUT section], Usdaw) plus two medium unions (Prospect and NEU [ATL section]).

Meanwhile the BDA, which was not required to report, had carried out a gender pay gap analysis anyway, and the NUJ was planning to do so. The audit questionnaires were completed prior to the government’s deadline for gender pay gap reports, but Usdaw said it would be publishing a ‘narrative’ on its data on the union website.

The 2018 audit questionnaire asked unions if they undertook any work to promote and support flexible working for all staff (a slightly different question from that asked in previous audits). Three-quarters (76 per cent) said they provided support for all staff for flexible working. Large unions are the most likely to say they did, 83 per cent compared with 75 per cent of both small and medium unions.

Few changes in this area were reported since 2014, except that several unions had refreshed their policies in the light of legislative changes. In 2014 the TSSA added a homeworking policy, allowing staff with caring responsibilities or disabilities to request homeworking.

Very few unions use positive action in their recruitment to encourage more applications from each of the equality strands. Eight unions said they do so to encourage more BME applicants and the same number for LGBT+
applicants, and seven do so for women and disabled applicants and in relation to the age of applicants. The large unions are much more likely than the others to take positive action, 50 per cent doing so for each equality strand except youth, where only 33 per cent do so. But small unions are generally more likely than medium unions to use positive action: 25 per cent of small unions use it to encourage applicants of a desired age group, while none of the medium unions do so. In addition, a higher proportion of small unions than medium ones use positive action to encourage women, BME and LGBT+ applicants.

Among the large unions, Unite’s recruitment and selection policy states that “where two candidates are as qualified as each other to be recruited or promoted, and one of the candidates has a protected characteristic of being a woman, having a disability, or being from a black or ethnic minority background, the panel shall be entitled to recruit or promote that candidate with the ‘protected characteristic’.” Members of Unite recruitment panels have been trained to ensure positive action is taken.

The TSSA and RCM are both Stonewall diversity champions, and the TSSA participates in the Stonewall index and uses its logo on its recruitment literature. It also advertises vacancies in specific LGBT+ publications and has held information evenings for potential applicants to promote the union’s equality agenda and practices. The RCM also invites for interview all disabled candidates who meet the job criteria.

Monitoring of staff diversity

As Chart 13 shows, the majority of unions record the number of staff who are women (71 per cent) and who have a BME background (55 per cent), while fewer than half do so for the other equality strands. This represents a fall in the proportion of unions who record the diversity of their staff since 2014, though the numbers monitoring for all characteristics other than gender are still much higher than in 2011. This is especially so in relation to LGBT+ status, which was monitored by just 13 per cent of unions in 2011 but is now monitored by 34 per cent.

The likelihood of unions keeping such statistics on women, BME staff and disabled staff is lower the smaller the size of the union. So, for example, 100 per cent of large unions monitor staff by gender, compared with 75 per cent of medium unions and 60 per cent of small unions. But this is not the case in relation to LGBT+ and age monitoring, which is most likely to be carried out by the medium-sized unions.
Just six unions said they had carried out their own equality audit since the TUC audits began in 2003.

This is clearly an underestimate, as in 2014 the number saying this was 11. (It is possible that some of those completing the audit this time were unaware of audits having been carried out in the past.)

Four of the six large unions included in the audit have carried out their own equality audit (GMB, NASUWT, UNISON and Unite) plus one medium union (CWU) and one small one (Nautilus). These six unions account for 66 per cent of the membership of the unions participating in this audit.

UNISON has an equality scheme and carries out independently commissioned triennial audits, while a review of Unite’s strategy for equality will be finalised following its latest equality and industrial sector conferences and policy conference.

The CWU said some audit work had been carried out, and that a fresh proportionality audit has also been announced. This will focus mostly on encouraging more women to come through in its structures, but it will also look at the other equality strands.

**Equality action plans**

Unions were asked if they had an equality action plan in place. Fifty per cent (19) said they had an action plan, with the proportion doing so diminishing with union size. The unions with action plans include: 100 per cent of the six large unions (UNISON, Unite, GMB, NEU [NUT section], NASUWT, Usdaw); 58 per cent (seven) of the medium unions (Equity, NUJ, PCS, Prospect, RCM, RMT, UCU) and 30 per cent (six) of the small unions (BDA, NARS, Nautilus, NGSU, PFA, TSSA).

Unions provided examples of how action plans are implemented or monitored. UNISON measures its equality action against the union’s strategic objectives published on a yearly basis, which are translated into concrete action plans and outcomes.

The NUJ, a medium-size union, is developing an action plan to promote equality and diversity throughout its functions. This includes better monitoring, considering developing an equality audit and progressing training for staff, representatives and members.

In the TSSA, a smaller union, equality has been established as one of the three priorities in its operational plan, although the union says that translating that into day-to-day practice remains “a challenge”. The union has established a process by which organisers must report on their activities and plans for each year.

Measured are: activities and recruitment linked to equality; visibility for the union; participation and leadership by members; and any recruitment because of the activities. The union is also using the TUC Equality Audit and other standards as benchmarks, and aims to improve its performance in the areas they cover. From this the organising director for equalities, education and projects is establishing an evidence base for how a focus on equality can grow the union and help build its power and influence.
There have been a number of mergers of TUC-affiliated unions since the last equivalent audit.

The NEU has been formed from the coming together of the NUT and ATL. However, it has been counted as two unions in this audit because the NUT and ATL sections submitted separate independent returns.

Prospect has merged with BECTU since the last audit and submitted a single return covering the merged union, so together they have been included as one union in this analysis.

Other mergers of TUC unions since 2014 have no bearing on this analysis due to non-responses.

The 2018 respondents include three unions, the AUE, the NAHT and the RCM, who were not TUC affiliates when the 2014 audit was conducted.

Data analysis

The percentages of unions quoted in this report are generally of the total number of unions responding to the audit. In some cases, analysis has also been carried out according to union size. The aim of this approach is to acknowledge that certain rules and structures may be more likely to be adopted by unions of different sizes. For example, it may be more likely for a large union to keep disaggregated statistics on members and activists than a small union.

For such analysis, the unions responding have been grouped into three size categories corresponding to the TUC rules on the composition of the General Council. In this report they are described as either ‘large’ (section A unions), ‘medium’ (section B unions) or ‘small’ (section C unions).

The large unions that responded to the audit are:

GMB, NASUWT, NEU(NUT section), UNISON, Unite, USDAW

The medium unions that responded to the audit are:

Community, CSP, CWU, Equity, FBU, PCS, Prospect, NEU (ATL section), NUJ, RCM, RMT, UCU

The small unions that responded to the audit are:

Accord, Advance, AEP, AFA-CWA, AUE, ASLEF, BDA, BSU, NAHT, Napo, NARS, Nautilus, NGSU, PFA, SCP, SOR, TSSA, UCAC, URTU, WGGB

Where there is a statistic relating to the proportion of union members covered by a rule or structure, this is a percentage of the aggregate number of members of unions responding to the survey.

To monitor change in the areas covered by this report, some data is compared with the situation in 2014. However, comparisons are limited to instances where percentages are changed substantially. This is because the small size of the population covered by the survey (38 respondent unions in 2018 and 36

NOTES

Union changes since the 2014 audit

Section A shall consist of members from those organisations with a full numerical membership of 200,000 or more members. Each such organisation shall be entitled to nominate one or more of its members to be a member or members of the General Council and the number of members to which the organisations comprising Section A shall be entitled shall be determined by their full numerical membership on the basis of one per 200,000 members or part thereof provided that where the total number of women members of any organisation in Section A is 100,000 or more that organisation shall nominate at least one woman.

Section B shall consist of members from those organisations with a full numerical membership of 30,000 up to 199,999 members. Each such organisation shall be entitled to nominate one of its members to be a member of Section B of the General Council.

Section C shall consist of seven members of unions with fewer than 30,000 members.”
in 2014) means a difference of just one or two unions will show up as a noticeable change in percentage figures. A second problem is the subjective nature of some questions, which means unions’ responses might not be fully consistent from one audit to the next and cannot always be meaningfully compared.

**Two questionnaires**

While all TUC unions are sent the main audit questionnaire, those with fewer than 12,000 members are given the option of completing an abbreviated version of the questionnaire. Only three chose to do this in 2018 (see Appendix), compared with eight in 2014, meaning that more unions with fewer than 12,000 members completed the main questionnaire this time.

Where questions were covered in only one of the questionnaires, this is indicated in the report text.
The following unions participated in the 2018 TUC Equality Audit. Membership figures are as at January 2017 and as supplied to the TUC.

### Main questionnaire

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Union</th>
<th>Membership</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Accord</td>
<td>23,329</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advance</td>
<td>7,189</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AEP</td>
<td>3,394</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASLEF</td>
<td>19,321</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AUE</td>
<td>277</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BDA</td>
<td>8,884</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BSU</td>
<td>1,158</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community</td>
<td>31,886</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSP</td>
<td>40,050</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CWU</td>
<td>190,628</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equity</td>
<td>41,841</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FBU</td>
<td>33,842</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GMB</td>
<td>604,379</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAHT</td>
<td>29,138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NARS</td>
<td>2,005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NASUWT</td>
<td>295,565</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nautilus</td>
<td>14,625</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEU (ATL section)</td>
<td>124,260</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEU (NUT section)</td>
<td>339,445</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NGSU</td>
<td>12,640</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NUJ</td>
<td>30,546</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PCS</td>
<td>185,302</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PFA</td>
<td>3,243</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prospect</td>
<td>140,328</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RCM</td>
<td>35,403</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RMT</td>
<td>84,643</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCP</td>
<td>9,512</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOR</td>
<td>26,656</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TSSA</td>
<td>18,494</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UCAC</td>
<td>4,062</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UCU</td>
<td>104,194</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNISON</td>
<td>1,212,894</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unite</td>
<td>1,252,524</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>URTU</td>
<td>10,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Usdaw</td>
<td>434,789</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Abbreviated questionnaire

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Union</th>
<th>Membership</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AFA-CWA</td>
<td>535</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Napo</td>
<td>5,272</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WGGB</td>
<td>1,291</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The following unions did not participate in the 2018 TUC Equality Audit. Membership figures are as at January 2017 and as supplied to the TUC.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Union</th>
<th>Membership</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aegis</td>
<td>4,939</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BALPA</td>
<td>7,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BFAWU</td>
<td>18,145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BOS TU</td>
<td>1,081</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EIS</td>
<td>53,618</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FDA</td>
<td>16,793</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HCSA</td>
<td>3,032</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MU</td>
<td>30,607</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NACO (now merged with Usdaw)</td>
<td>1,241</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NUM</td>
<td>750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POA</td>
<td>30,021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUWBBBS (now merged with Prospect)</td>
<td>478</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>