

**OFFICE OF THE DIRECTOR OF
EQUALITY INVESTIGATIONS**

EMPLOYMENT EQUALITY ACT, 1977

EQUALITY OFFICER'S RECOMMENDATION NO: DEC-E/2000/03

PARTIES

**Ms Irene Mac Avin
(Represented by S.I.P.T.U.)**

AND

Department of Arts, Heritage, Gaeltacht and the Islands

1. DISPUTE

- 1.1 The dispute concerns a claim by Ms Irene Mac Avin that on 26th January, 1999, Dúchas the Heritage Service, Department of Arts, Heritage, Gaeltacht and the Islands (referred to in this Recommendation as Dúchas) discriminated against her within the meaning of Section 2(a) of the Employment Equality Act, 1977 and in contravention of Section 3 of that Act when she was placed sixth on a panel for the position of Park Ranger, Phoenix Park.

2. BACKGROUND

- 2.1 The Claimant was employed by Dúchas as Constable in St Stephen's Green and Iveagh Gardens, a position she has held since July, 1996. On 30th November, 1998, Dúchas advertised an internal competition to fill vacancies for the position of Park Ranger, Phoenix Park. This position is higher paid than the Claimant's position in St Stephen's Green and represented a promotional opportunity for her. Following interviews the Claimant was informed on 26 January, 1999 that she was placed sixth on a panel of successful candidates and that the panel would remain open for a period of approximately 12 months. The five candidates ahead of the Claimant on the panel were all males. The first three candidates on the panel were appointed. It was SIPTU's belief that Ms Mac Avin was unlikely to be appointed to a position within the lifetime of

the panel and that the reason why she was placed sixth on the panel was that she was a woman.

2.2 SIPTU referred a complaint to the Labour Court in April, 1999 under Section 19 of the 1977 Act. The Labour Court referred the complaint to an Equality Officer for investigation and recommendation. Submissions were received from the parties to the claim and a joint hearing of the complaint was heard on 23rd November, 1999. During the course of the first hearing I requested from the Respondents copies of the C.V.'s of the candidates placed ahead of the Claimant on the panel. When an Equality Officer obtains documentary evidence from a party to a dispute he or she will normally copy it to the other party. In this case the Respondents, for reasons of confidentiality, were not willing to allow C.V.'s of other candidates to be copied to the Claimant's representatives. The parties agreed however that the Claimant's representatives could have an opportunity to examine the C.V.'s in the presence of the Equality Officer while the Equality Officer would retain copies. A further hearing was held on 30 November, 1999 to facilitate the examination of the C.V.'s by the Claimant's representatives.

3. SUMMARY OF THE CLAIMANT'S CASE

3.1 It is the Claimant's case that Dúchas discriminated against her in terms of Section 2(a) of the Employment Equality Act, 1977 when it failed to appoint her to the position of Ranger in the Phoenix Park.

Section 2 (a) states that discrimination shall be taken to occur

'where by reason of his sex a person is treated less favourably than a person of the other sex'

3.2 The Claimant had been employed by Dúchas as a Constable in St Stephen's Green and Iveagh Gardens, Dublin since July, 1996. She has a wide range of qualifications and experience which I will refer to in detail in my conclusions below. Ms Mac Avin also holds a full driving licence and has experience of driving four wheel drive jeeps and mini buses. SIPTU describes Ms Mac Avin as a well educated, highly motivated, experienced, capable, tactful and confident woman used to communicating with people, dealing with situations and making decisions.

3.3 On 30th November, 1998 Dúchas published an internal staff notice inviting applications for a number of positions of Park Ranger, Phoenix Park. A copy of the notice is included in Appendix 1 and a list of the duties of the post which issued with the notice is included in Appendix 2. The notice specifies that "a Ranger will be expected to be a person of good presence with self-assurance, tact, imagination and the ability to communicate effectively with the public. The person will work in a trained mobile unit and should have team spirit, commitment and should identify with the aims of the Park".

The notice also specifies that the successful candidate will require a full driving licence. At the time of the complaint the Phoenix Park Ranger position attracted an additional £56.47 per week at the maximum above the Claimant's salary scale. SIPTU states that the Phoenix Park job provides more opportunity for advancement and offers better job satisfaction than the Claimant's present position although the duties were very similar. According to SIPTU the main differences between the two jobs are that in the Phoenix Park the Rangers are required to drive and to assist in the control of traffic, enforce speed limits etc. while in St Stephen's Green the Constables deal with a greater number of visitors and general public on a daily basis and deals with drunks, drug abusers and assaults regularly. SIPTU states that their skills for tact, decorum and communications are called upon daily. According to SIPTU, Dúchas advertised an internal competition on 26th January, 1999 for positions of Constables in St Stephen's Green/ Iveagh Gardens and states that the duties and requirements were identical with those of the Ranger in the Phoenix Park other than the driving licence requirement for the latter post.

- 3.4 SIPTU states that the Claimant was encouraged by her superiors to apply for the Phoenix Park position. Eleven candidates applied for the advertised positions, nine male and two female. Three applicants were Constables from St Stephen's Green, including the Claimant, one was a Tour Guide (the other female candidate) and seven were General Operatives. The interview board consisted of three males as follows, a Higher Executive Officer from the Personnel Section, Dúchas, the Park Superintendent,

Phoenix Park and the Foreman, Phoenix Park. SIPTU questions whether the absence of a female member on the interview board was indicative of the employer's attitude towards a woman being employed in what has traditionally been a male role.

3.5 The Claimant was interviewed for approximately 45 minutes and was asked a range of questions including a lengthy discussion on the question of marketing and how her experience in this field could be applied to the Phoenix Park. SIPTU states that candidates were assessed under four headings i.e. work experience, technical knowledge, general suitability and interview performance. Candidates were awarded between 1 and 7 marks under each of these headings by each member of the interview board. The breakdown of her marks were available for two of the board members but not the third member who did not retain his interview notes. Ms Mac Avin was awarded 18, 12 and 16 marks by the respective members giving a total of 46 marks.

3.6 SIPTU states that the Claimant's interview lasted 45 minutes while the male candidates' interviews lasted 25 to 30 minutes. SIPTU states that a significant amount of time was devoted to her experience in marketing and public relations and how she would use this experience in the Phoenix Park and adds that this line of questioning was not put to any of the other candidates. SIPTU draws particular attention to the fact that when they requested from Dúchas sight of the interview assessment and scores for the Claimant they established that the records were not available for one of the three members of the

interview board i.e. the Park Superintendent, Phoenix Park. According to SIPTU this raises several questions in relation to how the interview board arrived at its decision. SIPTU also raises a question as to when the interview notes were written. SIPTU refers to apparent differences in the manner in which the other two members of the interview board recorded their assessment of the Claimant and suggests that by reading the scoring sheets it cannot be determined how each of the interviewers arrived at their respective scores. SIPTU refers to the interviewers' notes in relation to 'interview performance' where it states that one member noted the Claimant "lacked confidence" and marked her 4 while the other noted that "she portrayed confidence" and marked her 2.

3.7 Although unable to obtain information about the other candidates from Dúchas, SIPTU states that it was able to obtain limited information through its representatives which would help them to compare the Claimant with the appointees and other panelists. This they did by reference to the advertised requirements for the job as referred to in paragraph 3.3 above. SIPTU concludes that one of the three appointees (referred to here as Candidate A) would be ahead of the Claimant on service and experience but suggests that the Claimant would be ahead of this candidate on communications skills and overall was equally well suited to the position. However in relation to another appointee (referred to here as Candidate B) SIPTU points out that this candidate did not meet the advertised requirements for the position in that, unlike the Claimant, he did not have a driving licence and she has two years Constable service as against his 14

months service. Compared with the third placed appointee (referred to here as Candidate C) SIPTU states that this candidate had two years more experience than the Claimant but that all of his experience was at the lower General Operative grade, a grade which would not have required him to develop any communications skills or to deal with the public. SIPTU states that candidates placed fourth and fifth (referred to here as Candidates D and E respectively) are also General Operatives and the same observations would apply. Candidate D has less service than the Claimant while Candidate E has 22 years service.

- 3.8 SIPTU is satisfied that the Claimant should have been placed at least second overall in the competition and should have been appointed to one of the three initial vacancies. SIPTU states that only two of the candidates met all of the advertised requirements for the position and that the only reason she was placed sixth and last on the panel was that she was a woman. The Union points out that the job advertisement did not state that the job was open to men and women and did not include any statement that Dúchas was an equal opportunities employer.

4. SUMMARY OF THE RESPONDENT'S CASE

- 4.1 Dúchas denies that discrimination took place in the selection of candidates for the position of Park Ranger, Phoenix Park as alleged by SIPTU. Dúchas challenges the Union's description of the post as a 'promotional vacancy' and suggests that it was open

to candidates of any grade to compete for a position. Dúchas states that candidates of a similar or higher grade might apply for example in order to benefit from more days off.

Dúchas states that the purpose of the competition was to create a panel from which future Park Ranger positions in the Phoenix Park would be filled and the intention was that the panel would be kept open for a minimum period of one year. Four candidates had been appointed from the panel at the time of the hearings leaving one candidate ahead of Ms Mac Avin. Dúchas stated at the hearing that they were in a position to confirm that the panel would be kept open until all six panelists i.e. including Ms Mac Avin, had been appointed. At the date of issue of this Recommendation Ms Mac Avin had in fact been appointed.

- 4.2 Dúchas states that SIPTU relies heavily on arguments related to the Claimant's educational and employment background and that these arguments are supported by a Curriculum Vitae included in their submission. However Dúchas points out that the C.V. included in the submission is not the C.V. which the Claimant submitted with her application for the Ranger post and includes many details in relation to her education and work experience which were not included in the latter. Dúchas states that the C.V. submitted with her application does not mention her auctioneering or manual handling courses, her experience as market researcher, consultant, public relations officer, accounts clerk, designer or health club owner.

- 4.3 In relation to the job advertisement and the absence of any reference to equal opportunities, Dúchas states that until recent years, State industrial employees have been overwhelmingly male but that traditions are changing and refers to several areas in the Parks Service where females are employed in growing numbers. They add that female applicants for the General Operative and Craft grades are rare and that the Claimant was the first General Operative/Constable to be appointed in the Department. Inevitably the majority of applicants for the Park Ranger position would be male.
- 4.4 Dúchas challenges SIPTU's arguments with regard to the absence of a female member on the three member interview board. Firstly, Dúchas states that Mr Savage, who is a Higher Executive Officer in the Personnel Section, has sole responsibility for the recruitment of industrial staff and that at the present time, no female member of staff is assigned to recruitment and interviewing. Mr Savage therefore was the appropriate representative of the Personnel Section to be on the interview board. Dúchas also contends that the Park Superintendent and Foreman from the Phoenix Park who have responsibility for the positions to be filled are the most appropriate persons to sit on the interview board. Dúchas is of the view that the interview board should consist of members with a direct relationship to the site concerned, or with a significant degree of knowledge of the site, the duties of the post being advertised, and the desirable characteristics of the candidates applying. Dúchas is satisfied that these criteria were

met in this case. Dúchas rejects any suggestion that the Claimant could have felt intimidated by the all male board.

4.5 Dúchas does not accept SIPTU's contention that the duties of the Constable position in the St Stephen's Green are the same as those of the Park Ranger, Phoenix Park other than the need for driving in the latter. Dúchas points to specific requirements in the job advertisement itself which are not part of the Constable's job i.e.

- Assist in the control of traffic in the Park(s) including regulation of commercial vehicles and buses, enforcement of speed limits and parking restrictions etc.
- Assist in the management of wildlife populations and their habitat, including tagging and capture of animals and if necessary, population control by shooting and other means
- Assist with research projects including visitor surveys and traffic counts.

Dúchas rejects SIPTU's suggestion that staff in St Stephen's Green are subject to regular assaults and states that over the last four years no assaults on staff have been reported other than an assault on an ex-member of staff.

4.6 Referring to the advertised requirements for the position of Park Ranger which SIPTU outlined in their submission and which they state the Claimant satisfied, Dúchas in their submission states as follows:

"The vacancy notice, however, also states:

3. *The successful applicants will be required to provide an attendance over two shifts from 6.30 a.m. to 11.30 p.m. as per the current roster arrangement."*

The submission does not elaborate as to why the Respondents should highlight this particular requirement although at the hearing the Respondents, when questioned by the Equality Officer, stated that the Claimant had raised the question of shift work. In relation to the second placed appointee who SIPTU states did not meet the minimum requirements because he did not have a full driving licence at the time of the competition, Dúchas states that this appointee and all of the other appointees, had full driving licences at the time of their appointments. The job advertisement stated that 'the successful candidate will require a full driving licence'.

- 4.7 In their submission, Dúchas respond to aspects of the Claimant's interview which were referred to by SIPTU in support of her complaint i.e. the length of the interview, the amount of time spent discussing marketing, her answers to practical questions and apparently contradictory assessments by interview board members. They state that all of the interviews were of much the same duration and that any discussion on marketing arose from her C.V.. She was asked if she missed the challenges of the marketing business and she replied "No". Dúchas refers to the depth of the Claimant's answer when questioned on measures to improve safety for Rangers and in relation to a particular question about measures to improve safety, states that in a post interview

discussion with the Claimant she said "when you ask an off the wall question like that, what sort of an answer do you expect?". Dúchas states that the Claimant herself raised the issue of attacks on Constables and dealing with drug addicts and drinkers during a Labour Relations Commission hearing on another matter. Regarding the seemingly contradictory assessments of the Claimant's confidence at interview, Dúchas states that when SIPTU quoted the comment "the interviewee portrayed confidence" it omitted the second half of the sentence which read "but seemed to be indifferent to the position on offer".

4.8 Dúchas states that it was misleading of SIPTU to state on their referral of Ms Mac Avin's complaint to the Labour Court dated 27th April, 1999 that the Respondents had been notified of and disputed the complaint. Dúchas states that they were notified by letter from SIPTU dated 20th April, 1999 that the Claimant believed she was discriminated against contrary to the 1977 Act. However Dúchas did not reply to that letter until 28th April, 1999 and SIPTU could not therefore have been in a position to make a declaration that a dispute existed until they received that reply. Dúchas adds that the Claimant was not unsuccessful in her candidature for the Park Ranger position as implied in the referral but was placed on a panel of successful candidates.

4.9 Dúchas states that it is "amazed at the post interview 'comparison' exercise the Union indulge in" in support of their complaint. Dúchas states that the exercise is disingenuous,

an affront to the interview board and unnecessarily critical of the other interviewees. In rejecting the Union's allegation of discrimination, Dúchas states that Ms Mac Avin's position on the panel reflected the overall scores attributed to her by the interview board following their assessment of her interview performance.

5. CONCLUSIONS OF THE EQUALITY OFFICER

5.1 The matter for consideration is whether or not Dúchas discriminated against the Claimant on the basis of her sex in terms of Section 2(a) of the Employment Equality Act, 1977 and contrary to the provisions of Section 3 of that Act. In making my recommendation in this case I have taken into account all of the evidence, both written and oral, made to me by the parties to the case.

5.2 The principal question to be addressed is whether or not Dúchas conducted the selection process in a manner which was fair and objective and free from any form of gender based bias. The Union argued that the absence of a female member on the three person interview board was itself a discriminatory practice and would lead to a bias against female candidates. I am mindful of the Labour Court's determination in the case of Gleeson vs The Rotunda Hospital and The Mater Misericordiae Hospital (DEE003 / 2000) where the Labour Court stated :

"The appellant queries the constitution of the interview board, eight males and one female. The composition of such a board does make a case for a prima facie finding of discrimination."

In the present case, where the interview board consisted of three members, the Respondents have argued that having regard to the vacancy to be filled, the three persons selected for the interview board were the most appropriate i.e. the Superintendent and Foreman of the Phoenix Park and the Higher Executive Officer in Personnel Section with responsibility for recruitment of industrial staff. I am satisfied that the circumstances in the present case differ significantly from those of the above case having regard to the size of the interview board and the availability of suitable female members and I do not consider therefore that the composition of the interview board gives rise to a prima facie finding of discrimination. I do however make a recommendation in this regard at paragraph 6.2 below.

- 5.3 At paragraph 4.8 above, I refer to an issue raised by the Respondents in relation to the date of referral of this complaint to the Labour Court on 27th April, 1999. As the complaint was referred by the Labour Court for investigation by an Equality Officer I do not consider it a matter for the Equality Officer to decide whether or not a dispute existed on the date of the referral to the Labour Court. I am guided in this respect by the decision of the Supreme Court in the case of Aer Lingus vs the Labour Court in 1990 in relation to a different matter where it states:

"The Equality Officer has no function to deal with any matter concerning the question of the time bar and therefore any finding he makes is strictly without prejudice to what the Labour Court may decide about the latter point."

5.4 I considered the advertised requirements for the position, the selection criteria adopted by the interview board and the qualifications and experience of the Claimant and those placed ahead of her. A copy of the internal job advertisement is included in Appendix 1 and the duties attached to the post as referred to at paragraph 2 of the advertisement are included in Appendix 2. In relation to requirements, the notice states as follows:

"4. A Ranger will be expected to be a person of good presence with self-assurance, tact, imagination and the ability to communicate effectively with the public. The person will work in a trained mobile unit and should have team spirit, commitment and should identify with the aims of the Park.

5. The successful candidate will require a full driving licence."

The interview board marked the candidates under three headings i.e. Experience, Technical Knowledge, Interview Performance and General Suitability. The marking sheets showing the breakdown of the marks given under each of the above headings were available to the Equality Officer in the case of two of the three interview board members while the third member was unable to locate his marking sheet. The overall marks awarded to each candidate by the third member were available and I note that this member ranked the Claimant in third position behind Candidates A and B. The

Respondents argued that the Claimant's performance at interview on the day was a significant factor in her placing in the competition although she was found to be suitable for the position. The Respondents also stated that the version of the Claimant's C.V. included in the Union's submission included many details which were not included in the version submitted as part of her application for the disputed position and that there were several differences in the description of responsibilities and significant differences in dates. The Claimant countered that her full career history was on her Personnel file and that she felt no need to include all the detail again. I would accept the Respondent's argument that the candidate has a certain responsibility to present a complete, accurate and up to date application and that her failure to do so made an assessment of her qualifications and experience more difficult. The Equality Officer also noted an inconsistency between the C.V. attached to the Claimant's application and the C.V. furnished by the Union.

- 5.5 The Union has argued that the Claimant was equally well qualified as Candidate A and that while he would be ahead of the Claimant on service and experience she would be ahead on communications skills. Candidate A had six years Constable service in St Stephen's Green while the Claimant had two years experience. Candidate A has had a range of other work experience dating back to 1964 when he trained as a welder. He worked as a welder for fifteen years, as a supervisor in a company manufacturing storage equipment for five years and as a security patrol officer with a security

company for seven years. The Claimant had two years Constable experience in St Stephen's Green and a range of other experience including three years working with inner city development groups, two years running her own clothing company, six years as partner and marketing director of a clothing company and eight years as managing director of a fitness club. The Union's submission states that the Claimant holds diplomas in Business Studies, Accountancy and Public Relations and that she also attended courses in auctioneering, international marketing, French and manual handling. The Claimant has pointed out that in addition to her extensive range of past experiences and responsibilities, she is an experienced driver and has driven four wheel drive vehicles and minibuses. In terms of relevant experience however, Candidate A's six years as park Constable compares favourably with the Claimant's experience and is not in contention. While the Claimant highlights her communications skills, the interview board marked Candidate A ahead of the Claimant in overall terms. The Claimant's knowledge of the Phoenix Park is described in the interview notes as average and her answers on questions of safety were regarded as weak. From my examination of the available records I am satisfied that Candidate A was given credit for his confidence at interview and practical knowledge derived from his six years of experience in the parks service. I could find no evidence of gender discrimination in the appointment of Candidate A.

5.6 The Union argued strongly that Candidate B did not satisfy the minimum requirements for the position in that he did not hold a full driving licence at the time of the competition. The Respondents have argued that the interview board were aware at the time of the interview that this candidate had a provisional licence and was awaiting a date for his driving test. They point out that he had in fact obtained a full driving licence by the time of his appointment. Candidate B had ten months experience as a Constable in St Stephen's Green which was less than half that of the Claimant. Prior to working for Dúchas he had five years experience as a charge hand at a supermarket, moving on to another branch for ten months on cashier and stock ordering duties. He had training in forklift operation, manual handling and tool safety. I referred in paragraph 3.6 to questions raised by SIPTU as to when the interview notes were written up and apparent inconsistencies therein. In relation to Candidate B, I note that the interview notes for one of the interview panel state among other things *"his previous experience working as a security officer is evident and would be of advantage to our working environment"*. However from the documentation provided to the Equality Officer, this candidate had no such experience while it was Candidate A had who had worked as a security officer for seven years. I am not satisfied therefore that the evidence presented by the Respondents shows objective grounds for the placing of Candidate B ahead of the Claimant, particularly having regard to the fact that he had less relevant experience than the Claimant and did not satisfy one of the essential requirements for the position at the time of his interview i.e. that he hold a full driving licence. I must conclude therefore

that the reason why this candidate was placed ahead of the Claimant was that the Claimant was a woman.

5.7 Candidate C had 4 years experience as a General Operative in the Phoenix Park. He also had 19 years general operative experience in four different jobs, 18 months of which was acting foreman with a county council and 5 years experience as a salesperson in two different jobs. This candidate had training in the use of various mechanical equipment including J.C.B., Tractors, Gull Wing mowers, hedge trimmers and also had manual handling training. The Union argued that as a General Operative, this candidate's experience was less valuable than that of the Claimant who would have developed skills in dealing with the public ranging from tourists and television crews to drinkers and drug addicts. This candidate was credited for his confident performance at interview and a very good working knowledge of the Phoenix Park and I am satisfied that on balance the Respondents had objective grounds for placing this candidate ahead of the Claimant.

5.8 Candidate D had 13 months General Operative experience in the Phoenix Park. He previously had 21 years gardening and security experience in private grounds in the Phoenix Park and was a shop assistant for two years before that. He studied horticulture at night for one year through a local vocational school and has attended courses in life saving and CPR, use of chain saws, tractor driving, hedge trimming,

manual handling and safety. This candidate was credited at interview for his working knowledge of the Phoenix Park including the history and wildlife of the park, his security experience and his confident performance overall. I am satisfied therefore that the Respondents had objective grounds for placing this candidate ahead of the Claimant.

5.9 Candidate E had 22 years General Operative experience in the Phoenix Park having previously worked for 18 months as a cartography assistant and 2 years as a security officer. He had training in tractor driving and Gull Wing mower along with safety and manual handling training. According to the available interview notes he displayed evidence of having prepared well for the interview, had a working knowledge of the Phoenix Park and had a good grasp of the history and wildlife of the park. I am satisfied therefore that the Respondents had objective grounds for placing this candidate ahead of the Claimant.

5.10 I concluded at paragraph 5.6 above that the Respondents failed to demonstrate that there were objectively justifiable grounds for the placing of Candidate B ahead of the Claimant while in paragraphs 5.7 to 5.9 I concluded that the Respondents demonstrated that they had objective grounds for placing Candidates C, D and E ahead of the Claimant. As Candidate B was also placed ahead of Candidates C, D and E, all of whom are male, I must again take cognisance of the Labour Court's determination in the

case of Gleeson vs The Rotunda Hospital and The Mater Misericordiae Hospital (DEE003 / 2000) where the Labour Court stated :

"The first named respondents advance the case that some of the other candidates had academic qualifications equal if not superior to those of the appellant and, therefore, the appellant was not discriminated against on the grounds of her sex. The Court cannot accept this contention. It can only judge the appellant vis-a-vis the successful candidate."

I must therefore find that the Claimant was the victim of unlawful discrimination by virtue of the placing of Candidate B ahead of her in the competition. As a consequence I find that she should have been placed fifth in the competition and not sixth as was the case.

6. RECOMMENDATION

- 6.1 On the basis of the foregoing, I find that Dúchas did discriminate against Ms Irene Mac Avin on the basis of her sex in terms of Section 2(a) and in contravention of the provisions of Section 3 of the Employment Equality Act, 1977 when it placed Ms Mac Avin sixth on the panel to fill vacancies for the post of Park Ranger in the Phoenix Park. It is normal in cases of this nature that the Equality Officer recommend that the Claimant be placed in the position that she would have been but for the discrimination. As stated at paragraph 4.1 above, the Claimant was, appointed to the sixth vacancy arising for Phoenix Park Ranger. As I have found that she should have been placed fifth on the panel I recommend that she be appointed to the position with effect from the

same date as the fifth appointee and paid arrears of salary increases accordingly. As I have accepted the Respondents' arguments that the lack of accurate detail in Ms Mac Avin's C.V. as presented to the interview board made a complete assessment of her experience and qualifications more difficult, I am taking this into account in recommending that Ms Mac Avin be paid £500 in compensation for the inconvenience and distress she has suffered in bringing the complaint.

- 6.2 I recommend also that where Dúchas is conducting competitions to fill vacancies in areas which have traditionally been filled by males and where the management structures in those grades are largely filled by males, every effort should be made to bring gender balance to the selection panels.

Raymund Walsh

Equality Officer

29 September, 2000

APPENDIX 1

ADVERTISEMENT FOR THE POSITION OF PARK RANGER

PHOENIX PARK

APPENDIX 2

DUTIES OF PARK RANGER, PHOENIX PARK