Independent
Living in Scotland
Inspire • Involve • Invest

Solutions Series: 3

Politically (in)correct – representation of disabled people in Politics

The Solutions Series is series of pop up Think Tanks hosted by the Independent Living in Scotland project (ILiS). Each Think Tank brings people together in coproduction to seek solutions to a specific barrier to independent living. This is the third report in the Solutions Series.

"Politically (in)correct – representation of disabled people in politics" sought solutions to the under-representation of disabled people in politics. This report reflects the discussion on the day and not necessarily the views of ILiS.

THE ILiS PROJECT: June 2013

"The Solutions Series – Personalisation and independent living" was a solution focussed, pop up think tank on Personalisation and independent living.

This report reflects the discussion on the day and not necessarily the views of the authors, the Independent Living in Scotland (ILiS) project.

Acknowledgements

ILiS would like to express our thanks to all the participants for their contributions to the Think Tank. We would especially like to thank Dame Anne Begg MP, for agreeing to chair the Think Tank and Councillor James Adams for sponsoring the event in Glasgow City Chambers.

Thank you also to Kainde Manji for reporting and editing support.

Look out for more reports from The Solutions Series at www.ilis.co.uk

1. SUMMARY OF THE SOLUTIONS

The solutions identified and highlighted in this report originate from a variety of organisations and individuals. As such they do not necessarily represent the agreed, or indeed the only way forward.

This is a summary of key solutions identified. You can find out more about each of them at Section 5.

a) Role models and leadership

> **Party leadership – Political and official** – have a crucial role in driving forward change, including by; publically standing up for disabled people when they are under attack, talent spotting and supporting disabled people to organise within Party structures through, for example, local Disability Champions and Disabled Members Groups.

> **More role models for disabled people are needed:** Disabled people in politics – including those who have seen and unseen impairments – could be louder and prouder about their identity and about issues important to disabled people. There should be a national, cross-party 'coming out as disabled' campaign to support this.

> Non-disabled people in politics should support disabled politicians to gain a platform and challenge the barriers to disabled people's wider involvement.

1. SUMMARY OF THE SOLUTIONS *Continued*

b) Capacity and engagement with disabled people and Disabled People's Organisations (DPO's)

- The capacity of disabled people, both generally and more specifically of those aspiring to be involved in Politics, should be built, supported and resourced.
- DPO's should be resourced properly to work locally and nationally; through peer support, capacity building, and the development of policy and practice to empower disabled people in challenging the barriers to their equal participation in society and in politics – including by being able to operate at a political level without restrictions on their funding that could prevent them from doing this.
- A range of practical Solutions to build capacity should be considered including; setting up 'Operation Disabled People's Vote' (similar to 'Operation Black Vote'); young disabled people observing politics in action e.g. at a City Chambers; an outreach programme, developed and delivered in coproduction with the Parliamentary Outreach Team and DPO's; mentoring or 'buddy' schemes; and internships.
- Political parties should work in coproduction with DPO's to build their capacity to engage with disabled people and to understand the issues important to them. They should look to leaders within the disability movement as a key source of support, knowledge and signposting including spotting aspiring disabled Politicians and activists.
- Political parties in Scotland should work together in an informal cross-party forum – informed by their wider engagement with DPO's – to look at how they can improve representation of disabled people and other underrepresented groups. The Electoral commission could host this and set it up.

1. SUMMARY OF THE SOLUTIONS *Continued*

c) Funding

> A publically funded, 'Scottish Access to Politics Fund' should be set up to support disabled people who want to be politicians or involved in politics. The fund and its administration should be developed in coproduction with DPO's.

> DPO's need to be properly resourced to be able to support the engagement and capacity building initiatives outlined at 1a and 1b.

> The Parliamentary Body (and the equivalent in Local Government) – as the body responsible for Parliamentary/elected business and representation within it – should fund disabled people's political internships and job-shadowing schemes.

> A fund should be developed that political parties can draw on to help them with the additional costs of involving disabled people specifically in their party political activity. This should be funded by both political parties and the public purse.

> Access to Work (AtW) should be encouraged to consider political Activism – in addition to working in politics – as voluntary work for the purposes of eligibility for support.

d) Making the job of elected office more accessible

> Job sharing for elected members should be considered.

> The Parliamentary Body (or equivalent in Local Government) should cover the extra costs associated with access requirements of elected members.

e) Quota's and targets

> Political parties should be required to develop their own targets for the numbers of disabled candidates – including in winnable seats – that they get elected – and the mechanisms to achieve them.

> Quotas should be set for the number of disabled interns involved in wider Parliamentary internship programs. These quotas should be developed in coproduction with disabled people, their organizations, Political parties and officials.

2. BACKGROUND

The Independent Living in Scotland (ILiS) project is working with the Scottish Government, disabled people and other key stakeholders on the strategic interventions that will make independent living the reality for disabled people in Scotland (see appendix 1 for detail on independent living and human rights).

"The Solutions Series" which is hosted by ILiS is a series of solution focused discussions – 'pop up think tanks' – designed to bring together DPOs, decision makers, academics, public service leaders and other key experts from across Scotland and beyond. Each pop up Think Tank in The Solutions Series will consider, and seek solutions to, a specific issue which has been identified as preventing or hindering progression of independent living in Scotland.

Each Solutions Series discussion will result in a report, capturing the solutions offered. This will be used to promote wider awareness and understanding of the issue and to influence and direct change at national and local level.

This is the report of the third pop up Think Tank in The Solutions Series: "Politically (in)correct – representation of disabled people in politics" which took place on the 15th of February, 2013. The think tank was chaired by Dame Anne Begg MP. A full list of participants is provided at appendix 2.

3. THE ISSUE: REPRESENTATION OF DISABLED PEOPLE IN POLITICS

"Parliament can do its work effectively only if its Members are in tune with the experiences of the people they represent"[1]

Ensuring our Parliaments and councils reflect the diversity of our society is just, it makes them more effective, and it enhances their legitimacy. However, it is widely noted that whilst our society is increasingly diverse is:

- **1 in 5 people in both Scotland[2] and the UK are disabled**
- **A representative House of Commons would include at least 65 disabled MPs, yet "only a handful identify themselves as disabled"[3]**
- **The average councillor is a white, married, middle-aged (54), home-owning, well-educated male drawn from professional or senior managerial occupations[4]**

Our representative bodies' do not reflect the diversity of our society.

"Members of Parliament are for the most part white, male, middle-aged and middle class."

Recognising this, through desk based research and conversation with experts, ILiS found that disabled people are particularly under-represented in politics[5]. (for more detail on these issues, see section 4)

There are a number of specific reasons for this, including:

- **A general lack of support for disabled people to participate in society and be active citizens within it**
- **Few role models for disabled people, in political office**
- **Data collection is sketchy and where it exists, it relies on 'self-definition'**
- **The physiology of political participation presents barriers to disabled people's participation e.g. door knocking etc.**
- **A major route into politics is via political parties, however, support for disabled people to engage in the party political process can be patchy**

ILiS also found that, whilst there has been some work done to highlight and address this at UK level[6]. This work has a limited effect in Scotland and on the devolved institutions.

1) Report of the Speakers Conference on Parliamentary Representation, 2010

2) http://www.scotland.gov.uk/Topics/People/Equality/disability/

3) House of Commons "The Speakers Conference 9on Parliamentary representation) – the final report); 2010

4) Maloney, W "Scotlands Councillors 2007"; Report commissioned by the Improvement Service, Scottish Government and CoSLA; 2008

5) Rationale for Politically (in)correct – www.ilis.co.uk

6) http://odi.dwp.gov.uk/odi-projects/access-to-elected-office-strategy.php

4. THE DISCUSSION

The Think Tank considered the following broad questions:

What do we want to achieve?

How do we do it?

Who can help?

The chair welcomed the group and noted that having representatives of the main political parties in Scotland round the table showed considerable cross party support for the issue and that this would help support progression of the solutions suggested. The conversation was wide-ranging and presents a useful starting point and direction for further work.

a) Disabled people don't see politics as 'something for them'

It was felt there were two reasons for this: that there are not many role models for disabled people in politics and; that there are few politicians and political parties publically 'sticking up' for disabled people when they are under attack.

All of this affects the confidence of disabled people to try to get into politics in the first place. It also makes it difficult for them to identify with a political party and to benefit from this as a route into politics.

Part of the issue is that there are few 'out and proud' disabled people in politics. There are many politicians who could be described as disabled when using the definition in the Equality Act, yet few define as such. This was thought to be – at least in part – because of the way 'disability status' is captured i.e. by the requirement to self-define. The decision to define publicly as a disabled politician has implications for elected members – particularly when public opinion of disability is as volatile as it is now.

Seeing their peers in political positions and hearing politicians and parties supporting them would give disabled people the confidence to try it out. Without such positive role models, the barriers to disabled people's participation in politics may appear to them to be insurmountable.

b) There is a lack of support for disabled people's engagement in Politics

Disabled people are among the most disempowered people in our communities. This results in a lack of capacity for many disabled people to participate in society generally – including in their families, communities, work, education, leisure activities and so on – all of which has an impact on their capacity to participate in politics more specifically.

Whilst many DPO's are working to build the capacity of disabled people, the organisations themselves face huge capacity issues. They are often under-funded and the funding they have is rarely to support political activism. In addition, those disabled people who have had the opportunity to participate in society and thus have the capacity to engage in politics, are often leaders within DPO's, who then have to focus on funding and organisational issues rather than on political activism.

As well as the difficulties faced by disabled people in engaging in politics, politicians and political parties also face difficulties. Often the only time they do engage with disabled people and their organisations is when they are being lobbied by them. This can cause anxiety and fear about doing it, making it difficult for them to talk with disabled people and their organisations, about how best to involve them. This is the case both in their policy-making practices and in their internal structures e.g. engaging disabled people as members.

Further, the cost of making reasonable adjustments for disabled people's involvement in party political activity – e.g. transport, personal assistance, communication support and so on – was seen to be a barrier. Parties, whilst recognising their responsibilities under the Equality Act (guidance on political parties compliance with the Equality Act 2010: **https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/access-to-elected-office-for-disabled-people-strategy-compliance-with-the-equality-act-2010-guidance-for-political-parties)** often prioritise what money they have to ensure they can fight campaigns and win elections. This allows them to make the changes their supporters, both disabled and non-disabled, want to see. It was acknowledged that whilst there are legal obligations that underpin their duties in this regard, political parties are in a difficult position – both in terms of the realities of their lack of funding and in terms of the perception

of redirecting such funding and the implications this could have on the perceived desirability of attracting disabled members.

Lastly, some of the more formal ways to encourage people into politics e.g. through intern or job shadowing programmes, are harder for disabled people. Not only does their capacity to take up these positions make it harder for them to obtain them, but the additional costs of meeting their requirements presents a further barrier. Very often such interns/placements are unpaid and thus the usual avenues open to disabled people to cover the additional costs associated with their impairment in employment (e.g. Access to Work) are not available to them.

c) Making the job of elected office more accessible

The culture of long hours and heavy workloads associated with being a politician were through to be a barrier for some people. In particular, some disabled people need to be able to take flexible approaches to work e.g. job share, flexi time, condensed hours etc. It is not always easy to achieve this flexibility as a politician. Job sharing was discussed as a potential solution to this, but it was agreed that this has complications especially in its implications for voting agreements in debates. To date, there have been few innovative approaches to addressing these issues.

5. THE SOLUTIONS

The Think Tank identified a number of possible solutions to the issues identified in section 4 above. These could work either in isolation or as a parcel of activities towards the changes needed.
The solutions listed here came from different participants at the Think Tank and do not necessarily represent an agreed, nor the only, way forward. They should be considered as a number of possible ways to drive forward action

a) Role models and leadership

Disabled people need to see politics as an option for them. This includes seeing their peers in politics and hearing and seeing that their issues and perspectives are on the political agenda.

Part of this is about having more role models for disabled people in political office. This requires encouragement and leadership from those already involved – disabled and non-disabled. It was agreed that parties have a crucial role to play in this and that party leaders – political and official – have a crucial role in driving this.

For those disabled people already involved – and who define themselves as 'disabled' – it means them taking the lead in terms of getting louder and prouder about their identity and about issues important to disabled people. This would crucially include those disabled people in politics – including those who are politicians – who have a whole range of impairments – both seen and unseen. By publically putting their head above the parapet as disabled people in this way, they will immediately show others that it is possible to be a disabled person in politics. This will also have the wider benefit of demonstrating that not all disabled people are wheelchair users but that disabled people are affected by a range of impairments.

5. THE SOLUTIONS *Continued*

One way to support this to happen is to have a national, cross-party 'coming out as disabled' campaign – similar to that run by the National Union of Students in recent years[7]. This would include parties actively encouraging current and past leading disabled politicians from various backgrounds and with wide ranging impairments to publicly 'come out as disabled' at the same time, and en masse. Doing this could lead to those already involved and 'out' becoming more prominent and also may also serve to inspire those not 'out' to do so. At the same time, it was also noted, that there should be no 'undue expectation' on disabled people already 'out' to be role models for other disabled people, nor on those not 'out' to 'come out', if they don't want to.

It was felt that, for non-disabled people involved in politics, leadership is about supporting disabled politicians to gain a platform as well as challenging the barriers to disabled people's involvement such as inaccessible processes and practices like holding meetings in inaccessible places. Doing this would mean that both existing disabled politicians would gain prominence in the public eye as role models, and that disabled people who want to be involved may be able to become involved more easily.

It would also mean that disabled people may start to see parties and political processes supporting disabled people. This would send a message both to disabled people aspiring to engage in politics that politics is for them; and to current disabled politicians that it is 'safe' to come out.

What is incumbent on all politicians, it was agreed, is that they take an active role in talent spotting disabled people both from within their party and out with it e.g. in Disabled People's Organisations. This means doing all of the things noted above about making politics more accessible, but it also means – especially for those disabled people who are aspiring politicians – that they seek opportunities to build the capacity of and to raise the profile of disabled people within their party. This must also include action at a local level.

7) http://www.nusconnect.org.uk/blogs/blog/hannahpaterson/2012/12/05/Thank-you-to-every-single-person-who-came-out-for-International-Day-of-Disabled-People/

It was suggested that to do this, parties could include in their structures, local Disability Champions and Disabled Members Groups. The role of the champions could include ensuring politics is accessible locally, supporting and encouraging local disabled people to be involved in party activity as well as their policy making processes, talent spotting, and – where appropriate – role modelling. Parties that choose to set up Disabled Members Groups could encourage and support disabled people in the party to self-organise as disabled people. They may also like to consider how the party itself could support this, by making it clear what options there are in terms of secretariat support for a group and what the structures for influence are.

As well as having individuals and groups within politics who take leadership roles as described above, parties themselves need to be seen to be supporting disabled people, their issues and their perspectives – including by publically standing up for them when they are under attack. Getting this right will mean actively working within parties to support disabled members, as well as externally with Disabled People's Organisations.

b) Capacity and engagement with disabled people and DPO's

The need to build the capacity – generally and in relation to politics – of disabled people and their organisations was recognised. It was agreed that consideration of community development generally, and in relation to politics, cannot be considered in isolation – one will work to support the other. There is therefore a need to build capacity of disabled people generally. This is a necessary prerequisite to the involvement of disabled people aspiring to be involved in politics, on an individual and collective level and will help to build a network of politicised Disabled People.

Both forms of capacity building will require properly supported and resourced DPO's who can work locally and nationally through peer support, capacity building and the development of policy and practice, to empower disabled people to challenge the barriers to their equal participation in society. On political capacity building, DPO's will need to be able to operate at a political level without restrictions on their funding that could prevent them from doing this. One way to do this is to set up an equivalent to 'Operation Black Vote' for disabled people.

This would help disabled people to 'organise', and to be political in a way that other 'organisations of disabled people' (DPO's) cannot as a result of funding constraints.

Crucially, building the capacity of disabled people to participate in politics must start at the level people are currently at. One suggestion was to invite young disabled people to a 'political place' such as Glasgow City Chambers, to see first hand how it works. This may not necessarily be a party political visit, it could equally be a civic one, but it would start the journey to people's politicisation. The role of the Parliamentary Outreach team was also thought to be crucial. A specific outreach programme, developed in coproduction with DPO's, should be initiated to reach out to disabled people and their organisations.

Support for individual disabled people who want to be involved in Politics is also needed. As well as doing this through DPO's as described above, activity could include mentoring or 'buddy' schemes for disabled people. Mentors or 'buddy' would be people (disabled and non-disabled) already involved in politics, pairing up with disabled people trying to get involved. They could include mentors at a local level or a national level and could be politicians, party officials or local activists e.g. supported by a Disabled Persons' Champion in party branches (as outlined at section 5a above).

Further, it was suggested that a specific internship scheme for disabled people be set up. This would support disabled people to gain the knowledge, understanding and skills particular to working in politics – whether as elected members or as officials e.g. Special Advisors. It would also support the person hosting the internship (the elected member or official) to get direct experience of working with disabled people, enabling them to gain some insight into issues affecting them by proxy of that.

Due to the capacity and resource barriers faced by DPO's, it is important that political parties are responsible for making the initial approach for working in co-production. As such it was also agreed that the capacity of political parties to engage with disabled people to increase their representation within them and in politics more generally and to increase the capacity of parties to represent them should be strengthened and supported. Political parties should work to get them involved in politics generally as an end in its self and not just to increase representation.

To do this, political parties should work in co-production – as equal partners – with DPO's. DPO's have a wealth of knowledge on the barriers to disabled people's involvement, the issues that affect them and are already building capacity of disabled people in the community. Political parties could learn from and use all of this, in terms of how they engage and how they represent disabled people – not-withstanding the capacity and resource issues highlighted above.

In addition, political parties should look to leaders within the disability movement as key points of contact who have the capacity already to support them and who could help them to spot and develop both talents of aspiring disabled politicians as well as interest in aspiring political activists.

It is vital that DPOs' are resourced to support this way of working and that such engagement is not allowed to turn into political lobbying. However, such opportunities to work in co-production must not preclude opportunities for lobbying in a different environment. Indeed, learning how to better engage with disabled people will mean more effective lobbying – and in the right environment – in the longer term.

This level of engagement between DPO's and political parties has many benefits for the both the organisations and the parties. It will help to grow understanding of the issues which will in turn help to drive change in the future. It will support a healthy coproducing relationship, and will also help to address the under-representation of disabled people in politics.

In addition to working with DPO's, it is important that political parties are able to have frank conversations between and within themselves about the potential barriers to their engagement with DPO's – as DPO's can and should have about them. It was suggested that to support this, political parties in Scotland should work together in an informal cross-party forum – informed by their wider engagement with DPO's – to look at how they can improve representation of disabled people and other underrepresented groups.

This should be led by 'interested people', who may or may not be party leaders, but crucially, any progress made in this context should be supported by or otherwise reported to the party leadership. It was suggested that the Electoral commission might be the appropriate body to facilitate this process.

c) Funding

There are additional costs attached to engaging with disabled people and to supporting their participation – currently these costs fall on disabled people, DPO's and on political parties. It was therefore felt that there is a need for a combination of public and party funding to support disabled people to get involved in political parties – as activists as much as candidates – and to support capacity building to engage in politics through internships, job shadowing schemes and properly funded DPO's.

The UK Government's Access to Elected Office Fund **(see https://www.access-to-elected-office-fund.org.uk/)** recognises these extra costs – however, funding is provided only on an individual level and for disabled people in Scotland, only for those who want to be MP's. There is no equivalent fund for disabled people in Scotland who want to stand as Members of the Scottish Parliament or local councillors. A publically funded, 'Scottish Access to Politics Fund' should therefore be established.

This fund would be used to support disabled people who want to be politicians to meet the extra cost of their access to meet for example the costs of Personal Assistance, transports costs etc. The fund should also be used to develop the capacity of disabled people to engage in politics more generally by supporting those who want to become involved in political parties but not necessarily as potential candidates.

DPO's should also be properly resourced to work with their members to engage in politics and this should be supported by appropriate funding. This could include setting up an 'Operation Disabled People's Vote' (as suggested at section 5b) and/or by offering additional funding to existing DPO's to work on political engagement.

It was agreed that whilst the Scottish Access to Politics Fund and the resources to support new or existing DPO's should come from public funding, how that funding is used and how schemes are shaped, must be developed in coproduction with disabled people and their properly funded organisations.

In addition to this, the Parliamentary Body – as the body responsible for Parliamentary business and representation – was thought to be best placed to fund the disabled people's internship and job-shadowing scheme suggested at section 5b. This funding should include support to fully cover the additional costs associated with access to the scheme.

To support parties with the additional costs of involving disabled people specifically in their party political activity, a fund should be developed that they can draw on. This would support political parties to make all the access adjustments required to ensure disabled people could participate on an equal basis within them. Some people felt that this should come from public funding, others – recognising that parties already have obligations to make reasonable adjustments under the Equality Act 2010 – felt it should be an amalgamation of monies – e.g. civic and Political party money.

Encouraging the Access to Work (AtW) fund to consider Political Activism – in addition to working in politics – as voluntary work was another source of funding suggested to support disabled people to get involved. However, even if activism was deemed eligible for AtW funding, it would only support those already involved, it wouldn't support parties or political organisations to take any anticipatory measures that would in turn demonstrate to disabled people that they could be involved.

d) Making the job of elected office more accessible

To ensure that elected office is not a barrier to participation, job sharing for elected members should be considered. It was agreed that whilst job sharing does raise issues, for example in resolving conflicts over voting decisions, these were not thought to be insurmountable. There was a feeling that the benefits of job sharing could outweigh the potential barriers.

In addition to this, it was felt that the Parliamentary Body (or equivalent in Local Government) should cover the extra costs associated with access requirements of elected members rather than Access to Work. It was considered that it might be inappropriate for AtW to fund access for elected office on the grounds that it could create a conflict of interest. It was also felt that it is not sensible accounting to transfer resources from one part of Government to another.

e) Quota's and targets

As well as encouraging leadership on the issue of disabled people's representation in Politics (section 5a), there was discussion around the use of quotas and targets to encourage parties to become more representative of society at large. It was felt that political parties should be required to develop their own targets for the numbers of disabled candidates that they select to contest seats (including in winnable seats) and be responsible for choosing the mechanisms used to achieve this. This is useful both in terms of helping to direct change and in terms of holding parties to account for their actions, whilst supporting individual parties to do what best works for them.

In addition to targets for parties, it was suggested that quotas should be set for the number of disabled interns involved in wider Parliamentary internship programs. Quotas should be developed in coproduction with disabled people, their organizations, political parties and officials so that they are both realistic and aspirational.

6. NEXT STEPS

To make progress on all of the issues outlined above, it was suggested there is a need to; demonstrate to disabled people that politics is for them, properly fund access requirements and identify resources and support for capacity building and engagement.

For political parties some early next steps towards this could include looking at what they already do to engage disabled people – and their organisations – and how they can take account of the suggestions above such as setting their own quotas for selection/candidacy, introducing Disabled Members Groups and Disability Champions in branches. To support this, it might be useful for them to build up a 'reciprocally beneficial working relationship' with at least one DPO. For disabled people and their organisations the next steps could include; progressing the potential for an Access to Elected Office Fund in Scotland, working with the Parliamentary Outreach Team to develop a programme specifically for disabled people, as well as thinking about ways to develop a more 'politicised' arm of their work – including by working towards a potential 'Operation Disabled People's Vote'.

The solutions outlined in this report could be made to work in isolation if necessary, or together as part of a combined approach towards making change happen. It is hoped that this report will inspire DPO's, political parties and others to act together towards change.

The ILiS project June 2013

Email: **contact@ilis.co.uk** Website: **www.ilis.co.uk**

As well as visiting our website, why not call in on us via Facebook and Twitter and tell us your independent living news and views? Don't forget to like us!

@independentlivinginscotland

@ilisproject

APPENDIX 1

Independent living, equality and human rights – an understanding

Independent Living is defined by disabled people themselves as meaning "disabled people of all ages having the same freedom, choice, dignity and control as other citizens at home, at work, and in the community. It does not mean living by yourself, or fending for yourself. It means rights to practical assistance and support to participate in society and live an ordinary life".

For many disabled people, this practical assistance and support (such as access to the environment, advocacy, personal assistance, income, and equal opportunities for employment), underpinned by the principles of independent living, freedom, choice, dignity and control is essential for them to exercise their rights and duties of citizenship, via their full and equal participation in the civic and economic life of Scotland.

Without it, many disabled people cannot; enjoy the human rights they are entitled to[8] on an equal basis to others – as set out in the Human Rights Act and the European Convention of Human Rights, live free from discrimination and harassment as the Equality Act 2010 promotes, nor contribute to a wealthier and fairer, healthier, safer and stronger, smarter and greener Scotland[9].

Independent living thus promotes a modern understanding of disability and disability equality that can support policy and practise to protect the human rights of disabled people. It achieves this by recognising the essential role of "material support" in ensuring disabled people can "participate in society and lead an ordinary life".

8 ILiS; "ILiS Response to the JCHR Inquiry into the Implementation of Article 19 of the UNCRPD", 2011
9 ILiS; "Response to the SDS Strategy in Scotland", 2010

APPENDIX 1 *Continued*

The role independent living plays in protecting the human rights of disabled people is recognised and underpinned by international human rights and equalities obligations to which the UK and Scotland are party to; including the recognition that all of the rights outlined in the ECHR and Human Rights legislation belong to disabled people, and that these are further strengthened and contextualised by the rights set out in the UNCRPD.

5 Duffy, S; "The Citizenship Theory of Social Justice: exploring the meaning of Personalisation for social workers", Journal of Social Work Practise, 2010
6 http://www.scie.org.uk/topic/keyissues/Personalisation
7 ADSW; "Personalisation: principles, challenges and a new approach; a statement by the ADSW", 2006

APPENDIX 2 - PARTICIPANT LIST

1. Cllr James Adams:	Glasgow City Council, Councillor for Govan
2. Dr Nina Baker:	Glasgow City Council, Councillor for Anderston and City
3. Dame Anne Begg MP:	MP for Aberdeen South
4. Sophie Bridger:	Scottish Liberal Democrats, Diversity Champion
5. Tressa Burke:	Inclusion Scotland, Board of Directors
6. David Buxton:	British Deaf Association, Chief Executive
7. Mark Cooper:	disability activist and Parliamentary candidate
8. James Dorman MSP:	Scottish National Party, MSP for Glasgow Cathcart
9. Rosemary Everett:	Parliamentary Outreach Team, Head of Outreach Services
10. Siobhan Flannigan:	Improvement Service, Graduate Assistant attending on behalf of Chief Executive
11. David Hamilton:	Scottish Government Equality Unit
12. Patrick Harvie MSP	Scottish Green Party, Leader
13. Nick Henderson	Glasgow Disability Alliance (GDA), Policy and Communications – attending as an observer
14. Victoria Jamieson	Scottish Labour Party, party Chair
15. Cllr David Meikle	Scottish Conservative Party, Councillor for Pollokshields, attending on behalf of Ruth Davidson MSP, Leader of the Scottish Conservative Party
16. Robin Parker	National Union of Students Scotland, President
17. Marianne Scobie	GDA, Development Manager

NOTES

Independent
Living in Scotland
Inspire • Involve • Invest

Solution Series: 3

Politically (in)correct – representation of disabled people in Politics

The ILiS project 2013

Email: **contact@ilis.co.uk**
Website: **www.ilis.co.uk**

As well as visiting our website, why not call in on us via Facebook and Twitter and tell us your independent living news and views? Don't forget to like us!

@independentlivinginscotland

@ilisproject