



KEEP CALM AND STOP IT!



**Independent
Living in Scotland**

Inspire • Involve • Invest

Solutions Series: 4

KEEP CALM & STOP IT: Disability harassment in the workplace

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

"Keep calm and stop it!: Disability harassment in the workplace" sought solutions to this issue. This report reflects the discussion on the day and not necessarily the views of ILiS.

Independent Living in Scotland (ILiS)

1. Summary of solutions	2
2. Background to the Solutions Series	5
3. The issue: disability harassment in the workplace	6
4. The discussion	7
5. The solutions	12
6. Next steps	18
Appendix 1 Independent living, equality and human rights – an understanding	19
Appendix 2 list of participants	20

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 Muriel Robison, for agreeing to chair the Think Tank.

Thank you also to Kainde Manji for reporting support and Lucy Ritchie for 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 only way forward.

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

a) Address the barriers to disabled people's employment in general

- > When there are more disabled people in the workplace, there are more opportunities to create positive perceptions and cultures within it, through leadership and learning. All employers should employ more disabled people, and be more positive about doing so, thus reducing harassment and the causes of it.

b) Employers and DPO's should work together

- > Disabled people and their organisations (DPOs) can support employers to understand the direct lived experience of disabled people – including their experience in the workplace. Employers should work with DPOs to get more disabled people into their workplace, to train their staff and to offer them advice and guidance. Some of the public money available from closing the Remploy Factories should be used to support employment projects run by and for disabled people to work with employers to address the barriers to disabled people's employment.

1. Summary of the solutions *continued*

c) Highlight existing and offer new incentives to employ disabled people

- > Access to Work should be marketed in a way that ensures disabled people can see that there is support available, and also so that employers can see the 'financial benefits' of creating an inclusive workplace – rather than worry about costs that can lead to work place cultures where disabled people are made to fear like 'financial burdens'.
- > Requirements for equality, human rights and harassment policy – and the ability to demonstrate how these will be fulfilled – should be included in contracts for employability providers and in wider public sector procurement.

d) Develop and encourage leadership on inclusive workplaces

- > Creating a culture of dignity and respect for all employees was thought to be crucial as it creates an environment where all employees can feel comfortable, including enabling disabled people to declare their disability status (and obtain support for it).

- > Managers should be encouraged to 'come out' as disabled and they should also encourage staff who are disabled to do the same.
- > Employers and senior managers should work with DPOs to help them understand the benefits of working with disabled people.
- > Larger employers – e.g. the NHS and other public bodies – should come together and show leadership. They should run high profile campaigns in the workplace, led by disabled employees (supported by national and local DPO's) to; highlight the direct experience of disabled people, encourage disclosure (including of harassment) and create a supportive environment to help this happen and highlight what harassment is.
- > A national DPO should partner a large employer (e.g. the NHS) and target messages at the general public to tackle some of the negativity/myths in Government discourse around disabled people as well as highlighting what harassment is and the forms it takes.

1. Summary of the solutions *continued*

e) Target training at staff at all levels and disabled people and incorporate the lived experience of disabled people

- > Equalities training for all should be embedded within induction programs and other training that takes place as a matter of course e.g. around health and safety, holiday protocol etc.
- > Disabled people and their organisations should be involved in designing and delivering workplace training.
- > Empathy, compassion and an understanding of the lived experience of disabled people should be added to professional training and criteria used in recruitment processes.
- > Staff should be seconded out to DPOs to learn from them, to buddy up and to be mentored.
- > Vocational education and training – including internships, work based placements and work experience should be promoted, supported and resourced.

- > Personal assistance to support disabled people in education and training should be funded.
- > Access to Work should be open to disabled people who are undertaking training.

f) Set up support systems in the workplace for people who have been bullied or harassed in the workplace

- > People who have been bullied or harassed should have opportunities to overcome the impact of this, through appropriate training to help rebuild confidence and increase self esteem. A telephone helpline should be created to specifically support people who have been, or who are experiencing bullying and harassment – in the workplace.

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 fourth pop up Think Tank in The Solutions Series: “KEEP CALM & STOP IT: disability harassment in the workplace”

which took place on the 8th of August, 2013. The think tank was chaired by Muriel Robison (Employment Tribunal Judge). A full list of participants is provided at appendix 2.

3. The issue: Disability harassment in the workplace

“Bullying and harassment... are key barriers to workplace culture”¹

Only 46.9% of disabled adults are in work, compared to 71% of non-disabled adults². This represents a significant employment rate gap between disabled and non-disabled people, however it has decreased since 2002³.

Reduced or modified working hours and duties, support and accessible work areas/buildings are all considered to be ‘enablers’ to getting and staying in work; and lack of support, lack of role models, anxiety, and attitudes of employers and colleagues, are considered barriers to getting and staying in work⁴.

However, attitudes to disabled people generally and in work are dismissive, are getting worse⁵, and prejudice is commonplace. In addition, in work relationships with management and colleagues are typified by suspicion and discomfort, and colleagues resent

support/adjustments for disabled people (e.g. periods of absence), seeing these measures as ‘favouritism’⁶.

The cumulative impacts for disabled people of these attitudes and cultures are profound and wide-ranging. Disabled people are afraid they will be discriminated against at work and are anxious about attending or returning to work (including following an absence as well as re-entering work after a period of unemployment) as a result. They are less likely to reveal their ‘disability status’ and afraid to ask for help that could benefit them; they are not able to realise their full potential as a result. All of this, against back drop of welfare reform and a ‘back to work’ push, results in a crisis of identity for disabled people, who underplay their disabled identity and support requirement simply to enter or stay in work, without seeking the support they need.

1) EHRC; “Opening up work: The views of disabled people and people with long-term health conditions”, 2012

2) Annual Population Survey, 2010

3) <http://www.scotland.gov.uk/Topics/People/Equality/Equalities/DataGrid/disability/disabLab> accessed 16.7.13

4) Life Opportunities Survey, 2011

5) <http://www.scope.org.uk/news/attitudes-survey>

6) EHRC; “Opening up work: The views of disabled people and people with long-term health conditions”, 2012

4. The discussion

The Think Tank considered the following broad questions:

What needs to change?

What action could we take today and what could we do in the future?

Who can help?

The chair welcomed the group and noted that often people experiencing harassment in the workplace say they ‘just want it to stop’ and that preventing it happening in the first place is important. This was reflected in the discussion that followed. The conversation was wide-ranging and presents a useful starting point and direction for further work.

a) Support, disclosure and culture

“Disabled people have to get into work first, before they can be bullied”

Support to get into and stay in work

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

Barriers to both disabled people’s participation in society and getting into work were thought to contribute to the experience of disability harassment in work.

A range of employability services are needed to address these because some disabled people are more ‘work ready’ than others. The support some may need could include reasonable adjustments in the workplace. Other disabled people, who because of structural barriers and inequality of access to opportunity, have limited employment experience or significant gaps in their employment history and will need support to gain experience of dealing with work situations.

However, budgets to support disabled people – and their organisations – are stretched. What limited support disabled people get is prioritised to ensure personal care needs are met. This is often at the expense of support to get, and stay in, employment – n.b.

4. The discussion *continued*

Access to Work is only available for people in work or in voluntary work, it does not 'kick in' before this e.g. to support wider employability. Lack of support has an impact on the numbers of disabled people and their experience in the workplace. It can mean they struggle to do their job particularly if they do not declare their disability for fear of reprisals. This can create tensions among colleagues who may have to help out or even take on other duties to compensate.

Case example: Glasgow Centre for Inclusive Living's "Professional Careers Service" supported 82.4% of disabled people on their programme into full-time employment; 94.1% got an academic qualification; and 11.7% went into further education⁷ compared to the UK Government's Workfare programme; which, of the 104,000 people taken off incapacity benefit, only placed 3.7% in a job lasting more than three months.

7) House of Commons Committee of Public Accounts "DWP: work programme outcomes." Thirty-third Report of Session 2012-13" <http://www.publications.parliament.uk/pa/cm201213/cmselect/cmpublicacc/936/936.pdf>

8) Participant

Support for people affected by bullying and harassment

Disabled people experience of bullying and harassment is profound...:

"My experience of bullying and harassment in the workplace has always stayed with me, 6-7 years on"⁸

...yet there was thought to be little support for people who have been affected by harassment and bullying in the workplace, e.g. training to build confidence or a national helpline supporting people who are being or have been bullied or harassed.

Disclosure of disability status

Many people in the workplace do not disclose their disability status – and not all disabled people believe they are 'disabled'. This means that even where it is available, they rarely access the support they need to do their job effectively. It also means there are fewer people 'coming out' as disabled at work. Given that leadership and lack of support are barriers to getting and staying in employment, this was cause for concern.

It was agreed that encouraging people to 'disclose' and/or to talk about their disability status (both in private e.g. to their managers, and in public i.e. to their colleagues) is therefore crucial, but, that this was getting harder to do.

4. The discussion *continued*

This was considered a particular issue for people with ‘unseen’ impairments who tend not to ‘fit’ the public idea of what a disabled person is e.g. people with mental health issues despite the experience of bullying and harassment being particularly prevalent amongst this group:

“The thing I was really scared about, was declaring that I am bipolar”

Culture

The (limited) understanding of what ‘disability’ is – and what the experience of it means – was thought to make it difficult for disabled people to accept that they may be able to get support; and for colleagues to recognise and accept why and where support is in place. This feeds a culture of suspicion, distrust and resentment...

“I can’t tell you how often we hear ‘aye, but they’re getting....”

...which itself can be bullying and harassing, or can result in bullying and harassment.

It was felt that whilst this is as much a problem among peers and colleagues as it is with managers, management intervention – or lack of it – greatly impacts on the workplace culture and on the prevalence and experience of

bullying and harassment. It was considered unfair in this sense, that some managers are retained, and indeed promoted, despite that they may have ‘presided over’ such cultures and behaviors.

What was of particular concern was that disabled people tended to normalise both this sort of culture and behaviour, and their experience of bullying and harassment – both in and out of the workplace. They and their colleagues are influenced by a wider culture, including by the negative portrayal of disabled people in the media, and by Politicians. This was thought to feed the workplace cultures of suspicion, resentment and distrust – and the resulting bullying and harassment. It was also thought to encourage people to normalise the experience, and to keep their disability status – and support requirements – to themselves.

A difference in the experience of and approach to bullying and harassment between large and small organisations was noted. Large organisations are almost a microcosm of society and have many cultures and divergent practises across different workplaces.

4. The discussion *continued*

It was also noted that harassment and bullying can be subtle; it can include patronising and 'belittling people'. Considering that negative behaviours and cultures have become 'commonplace', it was felt unlikely that such subtleties would be easily identifiable and therefore, could in fact contribute to an 'unconscious bias'. In other words, where people are treated in a discriminatory, bullying or harassing way, without the perpetrator even being aware of it. This was thought to be something that is not easily 'trained' out of people, particularly where training focusses on the legal requirements and not the reasons for the laws in the first place.

b) Training

Training was however, considered crucial as a means to change the culture in both large and small organizations. The type and focus of any training, and the money available for it were important factors.

Training often focuses on the law and is targeted at management. This was thought not to be enough as it fails to get to the real issues and to all the people. There was general agreement that most people understand the law, but that what is harder is 'getting the disability bit'; the lived experience; the barriers that face disabled people; and the inter-connectedness of all of this.

There is a lack of 'soft skill'/low level training, including training that covers areas like how to talk about disability, how to address people's support requirements and so on.

Despite the quality and target of training, a key issue highlighted was actually getting the buy-in, from the top down, to deliver a sustained and useful programme that was resourced and valued:

"As a trainer, I am constantly told 'we can't release people for training'"

"If we release a GP to training, we need to backfill the post"

A variety of ways have been tried to address this including 'E-learning'. However, that was thought to have limited benefit because, it simply transfers information rather than growing the understanding of what it really means, in other words, the 'lived experience'.

4. The discussion *continued*

c) Work and economic pressures

All of the issues highlighted above (support, disclosure, culture and training) were understood to be compounded by the current economic downturn:

“Over worked and stretched staff teams make for a very difficult environment for disabled people to flourish”

In an environment of ruthless ‘cut backs’ and decisions to spread more work across less people, there is also less money to support disabled people, job losses and resulting increase in work pressures among colleagues. This, coupled with the prevalence of negative perceptions of disabled people have combined to increase resentment of the support for disabled colleagues and fear of asking for support or to be seen in any way ‘unfit’ for the job by disabled people. The result is that there is even less support – financially and culturally – for disabled employees, and less money for preventative measures such as training.

d) Workplace policy

It was noted that there are policies in place to prevent and/or address bullying and harassment in many workplaces, it was felt however, that these are not always enacted in an effective way and that. It was suggested that this was because the difficulties with training (outlined above) made it harder for workplaces to translate well meaning policy, into practice.

The issues with training were also thought to undermine schemes such as ‘The Double Tick’⁹. Instead of addressing inequalities, it was argued that these fail to address the attitudinal and cultural barriers to employment and often result in disabled people being ‘tokenistically interviewed’ without any likelihood of success.

9) The Double Tick’ scheme (also known as the ‘positive about disabled people’ symbol) means the employer is committed to employing disabled people. If a job advert displays the symbol, disabled people will be guaranteed an interview for a post they apply for with that employer, if they meet the basic conditions for the job.

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) Address the barriers to disabled people's employment in general

When there are more disabled people in the workplace, there are more opportunities to create positive perceptions and cultures within it, through leadership and learning.

Therefore, whilst the topic of the day was specifically harassment in the workplace, solutions also focussed on the broader issues around the under-representation and retention of disabled people in employment in general. It was therefore suggested that solutions to support all employers to employ more disabled people, and be more positive about doing so, thus reducing harassment and the causes of it, should be pursued.

5. The solutions *continued*

b) Employers and DPO's should work together

Part of getting disabled people into work and staying in work is about ensuring employers understand the real issues for disabled people, and that everyone knows what support is available and how to get it.

Additionally, there is a need to highlight the benefits of employing disabled people, including by making the economic case for equality, as well as the legal and moral case.

Disabled people and their organisations can support employers in this. They offer a wide range of support services that seek to address the significant barriers disabled people face – in general and in the workplace including considerable support and intervention for disabled people, before they are ready to benefit from more focussed, work based support.

DPOs can also help bring the direct lived experience of disabled people to the workplace, either directly, including by supporting disabled people into employment, or by offering training and advice to employers (more at 5 d), or indirectly through sustained campaigns (see also section 5d below) and the use of mass media.

Glasgow Centre for Inclusive Living was suggested as an example of good practise. They are a DPO and have an employment project which supports

disabled people to get and stay in work, by working directly with both the disabled person and the employers over the long term. This helps support employers to understand their obligations and the support available to them because, as a DPO, GCIL can share the direct lived knowledge and experience of disabled people. Further, as a DPO they are acutely aware of and provide support to address the wider significant barriers to disabled people's participation more generally and ensure this is factored into their approach. As noted at section 4 b above, their work yields significant results.

However, disabled people and their organisations are facing profound resource pressures in terms of their capacity to engage, influence and participate as well as to support. It was also noted that small, specialist work programmes can also be better placed than the 'Work Choice contractors' but they too are facing significant budget constraints.

It was suggested that some of the money available from closing the Remploi Factories could be used to support employment projects, like GCIL's (run by and for disabled people), to work with employers to address the barriers to disabled people's employment – including negative cultures and harassment in the workplace.

5. The solutions *continued*

c) Highlight existing and offer new incentives to employ disabled people

It was noted that universities get their money to support disabled students, based on how many students disclose their disability status. The more people who disclose, the more money they get, the more disabled people they have and the quicker they meet their targets of widening access. In this sense, it is a win-win situation for them to create an inclusive culture where disabled students can ‘come out’ as disabled. It was suggested that if Access to Work were ‘marketed’ in this way, disabled people may begin to see that support is available, and, employers could see the ‘financial benefits’ of creating an inclusive workplace.

As well as this, putting disabled people in touch with other disabled people who use Access to Work, to learn from them about what support is available, was thought to be a useful way of ‘spreading the word’ and crucial to the success of negotiating a package of support from AtW that ensures the person can fully participate in the workplace.

It was further suggested that a requirement to have policies that support equality and human rights – including challenging harassment and creating inclusive environments, as well as demonstrating how they will ‘deliver’ on these – be included in procurement, including that of employability providers.

d) Develop and encourage leadership on inclusive workplaces

Creating a culture of dignity and respect was thought to be crucial as it creates a comfortable environment for all employees thus enabling disabled people to declare their disability status. It was agreed that such cultures are set by leadership and that corporate buy-in is essential. To support this, it was suggested that employers and senior managers should work with DPOs to help them understand the benefits of nurturing such a culture.

In addition, managers should seek positive role models – prominent people in the workplace identified as disabled people – to demonstrate to others that ‘this is a workplace where it is ok to be disabled’.

5. The solutions *continued*

It was also suggested that larger employers – e.g. the NHS and other public bodies – could come together and show leadership by being self-critical, recognising the issue and putting their heads above parapet. This would help others (including smaller business and employers) to realise that these issues are important and that it is ok to ask for help. This was noted as a useful way to affect change as opposed to stridently campaigning or punishing employers, which can disengage them.

However, given the complexities involved in harassment in the workplace and in addressing employability for disabled people, some campaigning was thought to be helpful. Campaigns should be focussed, passionate, aspirational and run by disabled people – with a national umbrella DPO leading.

Campaigns within the workplace could be run by disabled employees (supported by national and local DPO's) but crucially, also supported at corporate levels. They would; highlight the direct experience of disabled employees, encourage disclosure and a supportive environment to help this happen in and also highlight what harassment is. It was suggested that the public sector could show leadership on this and pool resources to do a high profile internal campaign, which would then have a ripple effect to other workplaces who may then run their own campaigns of this sort.

Broader campaigns were also suggested. A national DPO could partner a large employer (the NHS) and target messages at the general public. It was felt that such a campaign could aim to tackle some of the negativity and myths in Government discourse around disabled people as well as highlighting what harassment is. A campaign like this, targeted at the general public rather than just workplaces would tackle simultaneously managers, employers (both big and small) and colleagues.

5. The solutions *continued*

e) Target training at staff (at all levels) and include the lived experience of disabled people in it

Training was considered essential – both in terms supporting disabled people into employment and keeping employment, as well as supporting their colleagues to understand the issues better.

Disability Equality Training (DET) was considered crucial and it was agreed that disabled people and their organisations should be involved in designing and delivering workplace training. This would bring the direct lived experience of disabled people to the fore and ensure that otherwise abstract policy and laws are more easily understood, in real-life terms. This would help employers implement their policies in these respects, in a meaningful way, and to improve the ‘softer skills’ such as how to talk about disability which staff say would help them. It could also help to build the empathy and compassion needed to challenge the cultures of suspicion and distrust in the workplace.

Corporate buy-in for this sort of training was considered essential – not only to ensure it becomes an integral part of people’s working practise, but also to ensure it is appropriately resourced and promoted. Training managers, alongside other staff was suggested as a way to help demonstrate such buy-in.

By highlighting the value of DPOs and the lived experience of disabled people, the wider campaigning outlined at section 5e above could help to promote the business case for doing this sort of training. Further, embedding equalities training within induction programs and other training that takes place as a matter of course e.g. around health and safety, holiday protocol etc. was also thought to help reduce resource concerns.

Where DET is not viable – for whatever reason – joint working with DPOs should be promoted as it too can facilitate employers/organisations’ engagement with service users and produce a similar effect.

5. The solutions *continued*

In addition to workplace based training, it was suggested that empathy, compassion and an understanding of the lived experience of disabled people could be added to professional training in some areas. It was also suggested that including such criteria in recruitment processes would mean that such qualities were expected from the outset, as well as being reinforced through training.

Seconding staff out to DPOs to learn from them, to buddy up and perhaps to be mentored was also considered another helpful way to address the softer skills needed to implement well meaning, strategic level policies of equality and human rights.

In addition to training of workers in general, disabled people should be able to access more and better training for work. Vocational education and training for disabled people – including internships, work based placements and school and college work experience for learners – was thought to be essential to help get more disabled people into employment. As well as supporting disabled people to gain skills in work, and create positive expectations for them, this would help employers to gain an understanding of the issues and improve their capabilities in employing disabled people. In addition, personal assistance to help

disabled people in education and training should be funded – including opening up Access to Work to disabled people on training for work.

f) Set up support systems in the workplace for people who have been bullied or harassed in the workplace

As well as preventing it, it was suggested that people who have been bullied or harassed should have opportunities to overcome the impact of it, through appropriate training to help rebuild confidence and increase self-esteem.

Further, a telephone helpline should be created to specifically support people who have been bullied or harassed – or who are experiencing bullying and harassment – in the workplace.

6. Next steps

Better working relationships and joint working between disabled people, their organisations and employers was considered crucial to all of the solutions. For this reason it is suggested that a high profile organisation – like the NHS – could take the first step and begin to work with a DPO, (as set out above. This would show leadership and act as a catalyst to other employers to do the same.

The solutions around support and funding (e.g. around Access to Work or personal assistance) will need buy-in from both the UK and Scottish Government. Dialogue at these levels will be essential to progression.

Several of the solutions outlined could be made to work in isolation if necessary, or together as part of a combined approach towards making change happen. Whilst ILiS will work with key stakeholders to help progress some of the solutions suggested, it is hoped that this report will also inspire others to act together towards change.

The ILiS project

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

As well as visiting our website, why not call in on us via Twitter and tell us your independent living news and views?



@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 to¹⁰ 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 Scotland¹¹.

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”.

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.

10 ILiS; “ILiS Response to the JCHR Inquiry into the Implementation of Article 19 of the UNCRPD”, 2011

11 ILiS; “Response to the SDS Strategy in Scotland”, 2010

Appendix 2 - Participant list

1. Chris Bradshaw:	Member of the CIPD's Senior Diversity Network
2. Stephen Brookes MBE:	Chair of the Disability Hate Crime Network
3. Pippa Coutts:	Employment Development Consultant; Scottish Union of Supported Employment
4. John Dever:	Training Manager, Glasgow Centre for Inclusive Living
5. Eileen Dinning:	Scottish Equalities Officer, Unison Scotland
6. Pam Duncan:	Policy Officer, ILiS – reporter for the pop up think tank
7. Heather Fiskien:	Project Manager, ILiS
8. Bill Fraser:	Equality Advisor, Skills Development Scotland
9. Kainde Manji:	PhD student – reporter for the pop up think tank
10. Dave Moxham:	Assistant General Secretary, Scottish Trade Union Congress (STUC)
11. Steve Robertson:	Chair People First Scotland
12. Muriel Robinson	Tribunal Judge – chair of the pop up think tank
13. Jac Ross	Greater Glasgow and Clyde and member of the National Health Employment Group Corporate Inequalities Manager
14. Brian Scott	Development Manager Pathways for Change, Glasgow Disability Alliance
15. Bill Scott	Chief Executive Officer, Inclusion Scotland

Independent Living in Scotland (ILiS)

Notes:

Independent Living in Scotland (ILiS)

Notes:



**Independent
Living in Scotland**

Inspire • Involve • Invest

Solution Series: 4

Keep calm and stop it!: Disability harassment in the workplace

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

Website: **www.ilis.co.uk**

As well as visiting our website,
why not call in on us via Twitter
and tell us your independent living
news and views?



@ilisproject