

CAJ's submission no. S328

CAJ's submission to the Staff Commission for Education and Library Boards' consultation on the draft Equality Schemes

May 2011

What is the CAJ?

The Committee on the Administration of Justice (CAJ) was established in 1981 and is an independent non-governmental organisation affiliated to the International Federation of Human Rights. CAJ takes no position on the constitutional status of Northern Ireland and is firmly opposed to the use of violence for political ends. Its membership is drawn from across the community.

The Committee seeks to ensure the highest standards in the administration of justice in Northern Ireland by ensuring that the government complies with its responsibilities in international human rights law. The CAJ works closely with other domestic and international human rights groups and makes regular submissions to a number of United Nations and European bodies established to protect human rights.

CAJ's activities include - publishing reports, conducting research, holding conferences, campaigning locally and internationally, individual casework and providing legal advice. Its areas of work are extensive and include policing, emergency laws and the criminal justice system, equality and advocacy for a Bill of Rights.

CAJ however would not be in a position to do any of this work, without the financial help of its funders, individual donors and charitable trusts (since CAJ does not take government funding). We would like to take this opportunity to thank Atlantic Philanthropies, Barrow Cadbury Trust, Joseph Rowntree Charitable Trust and the Oak Foundation.

The organisation has been awarded several international human rights prizes, including the Reebok Human Rights Award and the Council of Europe Human Rights Prize.

Submission to the Staff Commission for Education and Library Boards' Consultation on the draft Equality Schemes

**Committee on the Administration of Justice
May 2011**

The Committee on the Administration of Justice ('CAJ') is an independent human rights organisation with cross community membership in Northern Ireland and beyond. It was established in 1981 and lobbies and campaigns on a broad range of human rights issues. CAJ seeks to secure the highest standards in the administration of justice in Northern Ireland by ensuring that the government complies with its obligations in international human rights law. CAJ is co-convenor of the Equality Coalition. We welcome the opportunity to comment on the Staff Commission for Education and Library Boards' ('SCELB') consultation on its draft equality scheme.

CAJ acknowledges SCELB's efforts in producing a comprehensive draft equality scheme. However, we believe that the consultation period was too short to allow for full consideration by civil society. SCELB did not inform consultees when its draft scheme was released for consultation, and stakeholders have had just under five weeks to respond. This is clearly well below the three month minimum recommended in the OFMDFM,¹ BERR² and ECNI³ Guidance.

We were encouraged to see that SCELB has adopted the ECNI model scheme as a basis for its draft equality scheme, and expanded on it in parts. In this brief submission, we will query two divergences from the ECNI model scheme and suggest a few additions, which would strengthen the SCELB equality scheme.

¹ OFMDFM (2003) „A practical guide to policy making in Northern Ireland“, at section 8.5, found at: <http://www.ofmdfmi.gov.uk/practical-guide-policy-making.pdf>.

² Department for Business, Enterprise and Regulatory Reform, July 2008, *supra*. Criterion 2 states that '[c]onsultations should normally last for at least 12 weeks with consideration given to longer timescales where feasible and sensible.'

³ Section 75 of the Northern Ireland Act 1998 A Guide for Public Authorities, April 2010, *supra*. At page 38, it states '[w]e recommend that the consultation period lasts for a minimum of twelve weeks'.

First, it is not clear why SCELB has removed the commitment, at para 4.20 of its equality scheme, to include in its screening report a list of all policies screened by SCELB over the three month period, as set out in para 4.20 ECNI model scheme. The above is perhaps implicit in the other contents of each screening report, given that they will include details of each assessment, but this is not clear. Indeed, uninformed staff could inadvertently include only the most recently screened policies. Therefore, we recommend that SCELB include this statement for the sake of clarity.

Further, it would be helpful for consultees to be informed when screening forms are posted on the SCELB website. We are concerned that, if screening reports are sent to consultees on a quarterly basis, it is possible that civil society may not be aware of a specific policy's screening for a long period of time. By this time, the policy may be implemented or further developed, so that alternative measures would be more difficult to apply. It would therefore be important for civil society to be informed sooner of policies for which 'no' or 'minor' impact was found, but for which they may have specialist knowledge of otherwise unforeseen equality impacts.

We appreciate that SCELB will make the screening forms available on its website and on request (para 4.13). However, given that there are over 200 designated public authorities in Northern Ireland, it is impossible to review each of those websites daily, or even weekly, to check if screening forms have been posted. We would therefore recommend that SCELB include a statement, at para 4.13, that consultees will be informed of screening forms when they are completed or posted on its website.

Secondly, CAJ recommends that SCELB include statements in its equality scheme to explain the operation s75 Northern Ireland Act 1998 ('s75'), which is often misunderstood. In particular, the SCELB equality scheme does not explain the relationship between the equality duty (s75(1)) and the good relations duty (s75(2)). The ECNI Guide for Public Authorities⁴ ('the ECNI Guide') clearly states that 'good relations cannot be based on inequality' and confirms that 'the term due regard was intended to be, and is, stronger than

⁴ Section 75 of the Northern Ireland Act 1998: A Guide for Public Authorities, ECNI, April 2010, found at <http://www.equalityni.org/archive/pdf/S75GuideforPublicAuthoritiesApril2010.pdf>.

regard’.⁵ It also clarifies that ‘the discharge of the good relations duty cannot be an alternative to or cannot set aside the equality of opportunity duty.’⁶

As the SCELB equality scheme will be used as a point of reference for its staff’s application of s75 and any training provided, it is crucial that the equality scheme itself contains clear statements on the relationship and difference between the two s75 duties. Similarly, the ECNI Guide provides useful statements on positive action and multiple identities. We believe that the inclusion of these statements, or similar, would help staff to understand s75. For example, it is a common misunderstanding that ‘universal application’ implies a neutral impact on equality groups, when it can, of course, exacerbate inequalities.

The useful passages in the ECNI Guide are as follows: ‘The promotion of equality of opportunity entails more than the elimination of discrimination. It requires proactive measures to be taken to facilitate the promotion of equality of opportunity between the categories identified in Section 75 (1). The equality duty should not deter a public authority from taking action to address disadvantage among particular sections of society – indeed such action may be an appropriate response to addressing inequalities. There is no conflict between the Section 75 statutory duties and other affirmative action measures or positive action measures which a public authority may undertake under anti-discrimination laws.’⁷

Thirdly, we recommend that SCELB publishes and/or consults upon its audit of inequalities, once complete. This will help civil society inform SCELB of any irregularities or omissions, and also provide a useful frame of reference for the draft action plan. We recommend that SCELB commits to publish and consult on its audit of inequalities in the future, by explicitly adding the audit as a document for which SCELB will seek input from its stakeholders and consult upon (at para 2.15 SCELB draft equality scheme). Please note that, due to a lack of time and expertise, we have not reviewed the SCELB audit of inequalities or draft action plan.

⁵ Ibid at page 26.

⁶ Ibid, at page 27.

⁷ Ibid, at page 25. At the same page, the ECNI Guide also states: ‘Individuals do not neatly fit into one Section 75 category or another, individuals will invariably be members of a number of Section 75 categories. Thus Section 75 enables multiple identity issues to be considered as well as issues regarding particular categories of people.’

Also, it is not clear why SCELB has removed from para 2.12 the explanatory sentence in relation to audits of inequalities. The same paragraph in the ECNI model scheme states that '[t]he audit of inequalities will gather and analyse information across the Section 75 categories to identify the inequalities that exist for our service users and those affected by our policies.' We believe that the inclusion of this sentence in the SCELB equality scheme would help inform staff about the approach and benefits of audits of inequalities, which are often misunderstood.

Finally, we would like to remind SCELB that, in addition to the s75 action-based plan, s75 continues to apply to all SCELB policies in relation to all nine equality groups. Although we recognise the positive impacts that the action-based plan could have on addressing inequalities, we are also aware that it could have a limiting influence on the operation of s75 outside the specific priorities identified within it. Also, newly emerging inequalities may not be captured in the original audit of inequalities. We therefore hope that any data gaps identified in the audit of inequalities will be addressed, and that the audit will provide a useful tool for policy-makers when applying s75 beyond the scope of the action-based plan.

If you would like any further information, please do not hesitate to contact CAJ at the details listed below.