

OFFICE OF THE DIRECTOR OF EQUALITY INVESTIGATIONS

3 Clonmel Street
Dublin 2.

Phone: 353 -1- 4173300
Fax: 353-1- 4173399

E-mail: info@odei.ie
Website: www.odei.ie

EMPLOYMENT EQUALITY ACT, 1977

EQUALITY OFFICER'S RECOMMENDATION NO: DEC - E 2000/10

**Ms. Mary Crowley
(Represented by the T.U.I.)**

AND

Co. Cork Vocational Education Committee

**File No. EE 22/1999
Date of Issue 08/12/2000**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Section	Page
1. Dispute	1
2. Background	1
3. Summary of claimant's case	2
4. Summary of respondent's case	3
5. Conclusions of Equality Officer	3
6. Recommendation	18

1. DISPUTE

- 1.1 The dispute concerns a claim by Ms. Mary Crowley that County Cork Vocational Education Committee discriminated against her in terms of Section 2 (a) of the Employment Equality Act, 1977 and in contravention of section 3 of that Act in the selection for appointment to the Assistant Principal post of responsibility at St. Fanahan's College, Mitchelstown, Co. Cork

2. BACKGROUND

- 2.1 In November 1998, the claimant applied for an Assistant Principal post of responsibility at the school. At the time of application for the post, the claimant held a Special Duties Teacher post of responsibility. The Assistant Principal post of responsibility for which she applied carried a greater allowance. She was interviewed for the position on 27 January 1999, by an interview board consisting of one female and four males and was subsequently notified that she was unsuccessful at interview. Four female teachers and three male teachers applied for the position and the successful candidate was a male. The claimant alleges that she was discriminated against in the selection process on the basis of her gender. She states that the successful candidate is a male with less years of service and experience.
- 2.2 The claimant referred a claim to the Labour Court on 17 August 1999. The Labour Court subsequently referred the claim to an Equality Officer for investigation and recommendation. Submissions were received from both parties to the claim and a joint hearing was held on Thursday, 13 July 2000. At that hearing, the claimant and the Chief Executive Officer of the

VEC attended. It became apparent that the Chief Executive Officer was not in a position to answer questions in relation to the selection process itself. It therefore was necessary to adjourn the hearing and the hearing was reconvened on Wednesday, 15 November 2000.

3. SUMMARY OF THE CLAIMANT'S CASE

3.1 The claimant alleges that she was discriminated against on the grounds of gender in the selection process applied by the respondent for appointment to the Assistant Principal post of responsibility at interviews held on 27 January 1999. Four female teachers and three male teachers applied for the post and a male was appointed.

3.2 The claimant alleges that she was discriminated against in the marking system applied by the interview board. The claimant states that she was more senior and had more teaching experience than the successful candidate. The claimant also states that she had more non-teaching experience within the school and that her extracurricular activities proved that she was more than capable of fulfilling the needs of the school. She states that the low mark awarded (64%) for 'capacity to meet the needs of the school' was quite unfair and did not do justice to her record of dedicated service for twenty five years with the respondent.

3.3 In support of her argument that she was discriminated against in the selection process, the claimant states that the interview board consisted of four men and one woman. The claimant further states that there is a gender imbalance at senior management level within the school. She states that, at September 1999, there were 11 female and 11 male staff and the breakdown of staff at senior management level within the school was:

Principal	-	Male
Deputy Principal	-	Male
Assistant Principal	-	4 Male
		1 Female

14. SUMMARY OF THE RESPONDENT'S CASE

- 4.1 The respondent in its submission acknowledges that the claimant had longer service than the successful candidate and also acknowledges that the claimant had more teaching experience than the successful candidate.
- 4.2 The respondent also states that it was the decision of the board to award more points to the successful candidate under the heading 'capacity of the applicant to meet the needs of the school' than those awarded to the claimant. It also states that the claimant was awarded more points than the successful candidate under the headings of 'service' and 'experience'.
- 4.3 The respondent states that, at September 1999, in a staff of 11 female and 11 male, senior management in the school was as follows:

Principal	-	Male
Deputy Principal	-	Male
Assistant Principal	-	4 Male 1 Female
Special Duties Teacher	-	1 Male 5 Female

5. CONCLUSIONS OF THE EQUALITY OFFICER

- 5.1 The matter for consideration by me is whether or not the respondent discriminated against the claimant on the basis of her gender in terms of Section 2 (a) of the Employment Equality Act, 1977 and in contravention of section 3 of that Act, in the selection for appointment to the Assistant Principal post of responsibility at St. Fanahan's College. In making my recommendation in this case, I have taken into account all of the evidence, both written and oral, submitted to me by the parties.

5.2 Section 2(a) of the Employment Equality Act, 1977 provides, inter alia, 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,.....

Discrimination normally also involves a difference in treatment. The European Court of Justice has stated:

*“It is well settled that discrimination involves the application of different rules to comparable situations, or the application of the same rules to different situations”.*¹

In this case, the claimant has argued that she was treated differently and less favourably on the basis of her gender in the selection process applied by the respondent for appointment to the Assistant Principal’s post at the school.

5.3 A person making an allegation of discrimination under the 1977 Act has to present *prima facie* evidence of his or her allegation. *Prima facie* evidence has been described as:

*“Evidence which in the absence of any convincing contradicting evidence by the employer would lead any reasonable person to conclude that discrimination had probably occurred.”*²

Once a *prima facie* case of discrimination has been established, the burden of proof then shifts to the respondent who must rebut the presumption of discrimination by producing evidence as to the existence of an objective, non discriminatory reason for its action.

5.4 The Northern Ireland Court of Appeal commented that :

¹Gillespie & ors v Northern Health and Social Services Board & ors [1996] ECJ C342/93

²Dublin Corporation v Gibney EE5/1986

*“Once the evidential burden has shifted, as it clearly did in this case, the question then is whether there is any evidence to justify the conclusion that the evidential burden has been discharged by the respondent.”*³

The Labour Court applied the same test recently and stated:

*“The first question the Court has to decide is whether the appellant has established a prima facie case of discrimination.”*⁴

This approach was also adopted by the Supreme Court and it stated in a case which related to indirect discrimination that it is sufficient for the claimant to show that the practice complained of bears significantly more heavily on members of the complainant’s sex than on members of the other sex. *“At that stage the complainant has established a prima facie case of discrimination and the onus of proof shifts to the employer to show that the practice complained of is based on objectively verifiable factors which have no relation to the plaintiff’s sex.”*⁵

5.5 The first issue for consideration by me is whether the claimant in the present case has established a *prima facie* case of discrimination. The claimant in this case alleges that the respondent discriminated against her on the basis of her gender in the selection process for appointment to the Assistant Principal's post within the school.

5.6 The claimant in her submission states that in relation to the successful male candidate, she:

- (i) was senior;
- (ii) had more teaching experience;
- (iii) had more non-teaching experience in the school.

³Wallace v South Eastern Education and Library Board (NI Court of Appeal) 1980 IRLR 193

⁴The Rotunda Hospital v Noreen Gleeson DEE003/2000

⁵Nathan v Bailey Gibson, the Irish Print Union and the Minister for Labour Supreme 1996 ELR Vol 7 114

and that she was discriminated against in the marks awarded to her.

In support of her argument that she was discriminated against, she raises the issue of the:

- (iii) gender balance of the interview board and
- (iv) the gender balance of senior management in the school.

5.7 From an examination of the application forms submitted by the claimant and the successful candidate for the post, it is clear that the claimant, at the time of the interview, had over 24 years service with the respondent whereas the successful candidate had over 19 years service. In view of the service of both candidates, the claimant is correct in stating that she had more teaching experience than the appointee. In relation to the claimant's non-teaching experience in the school, I have examined the information provided on the application forms under the heading 'Extra curricular school activities, involvement in social and community organisations and non-teaching work experience' which was submitted by the claimant and the successful candidate". It appears to me that the material submitted by the claimant and the successful candidate contains a similar range of activities. I therefore consider that the claimant was at least as equally involved in the school as the successful candidate. It is to be noted that the respondent in its submission acknowledges that the claimant had longer service and more teaching experience than the successful candidate.

The greater marks awarded to the claimant by the respondent under the headings of 'service' and 'experience and involvement' indicate that the claimant had more service, greater experience and was more involved in the school than the successful candidate.

5.8 The three criteria adopted by the interview board to assess candidates were 'service', 'experience and involvement' and 'capacity of the applicant to meet the needs of the school'. It has been established that the claimant had longer service, more teaching experience and was at least as equally involved in the school as the successful candidate. I have also noted the fact that the claimant has a Degree and a Higher Diploma in Education

and that the successful candidate has a Diploma. It would seem therefore that the claimant given her educational qualifications, service, experience and involvement in the school, would have been capable of meeting the assessment criteria of the interview board.

- 5.9 The claimant raises the issue of the gender balance of the interview board which consisted of four men and one woman. The claimant also raises the issue of the gender breakdown of senior management in the school and produces statistics which show a concentration of males at the three grades of Principal, Deputy Principal and Assistant Principal level in the school.
- 5.10 I am satisfied that the claimant, on the basis of her better qualifications, greater service, greater teaching experience, her equal involvement in the school compared to the successful candidate, her ability to meet all of the assessment criteria adopted by the respondent, the gender balance of the interview board and the gender balance at senior management level has made out a *prima facie* case of discrimination. The burden of proof then shifts to the respondent who must rebut the presumption of discrimination by producing evidence as to the existence of an objective, non discriminatory selection process. It therefore follows that the principal issue to be addressed by me is whether or not the respondent conducted the selection process in a manner which was fair and objective and free from any form of gender bias.
- 5.11 I note that, in relation to qualifications, the claimant held a Degree and a Higher Diploma in Education and the successful candidate held a Teacher Training Diploma. The claimant was therefore better qualified, however, in this case, the qualifications of the candidates were not a significant factor in determining suitability. The respondent confirmed that there was a minimum service requirement in order to be eligible to compete for the post, which both the claimant and the successful candidate satisfied. At the time of the interviews, both the claimant and the successful candidate held a Special Duties Teacher post of responsibility in the school.

- 5.12 There was a lack of clarity as to whether there was a job specification for the post drawn up prior to the interviews and it is noteworthy that there was disagreement between two interview board members who were present at the hearing as to the existence of a job specification. It was also stated by the respondent at the hearing that there was no obligation on it to produce a job specification. While that may be the case, I consider that it would have been prudent and in the respondent's interest to have done so as it may have assisted the respondent to show transparency in its procedures. On the balance of probabilities, I find that a job specification was not drawn up in relation to the post.
- 5.13 All candidates were interviewed on the same day. The respondent stated at the hearing that the interview board met on the morning of the hearing and agreed the areas to be covered by each interviewer. The interviewer then took the same subject for each candidate and similar questions were asked of all candidates. The respondent stated that board members may or may not have made notes at the interview as it was a matter of personal choice. One board member present at the hearing confirmed that he did not make any notes. It was stated that marks were awarded on a consensus basis at the end of the interviews of the seven candidates. I find it questionable as to how marks were determined by an interview board where some members did not make notes during the interview process and which in that case awarded marks from recall at the end of interviews of seven candidates. Where notes were made, they were not retained or forwarded to the head office of the respondent.
- 5.14 The respondent stated that the questioning of candidates was based on a three page document (attached at Appendix 1) which was drawn up at head office prior to the interviews and made available to the interview board members. The document is headed 'Post of Responsibility Interview' but is not signed or dated. This document sets out a range of areas which questioning may cover and a member of the interview board confirmed that this document was referred to when questioning candidates. However, it is of concern that this document refers to "The principal of the school, as adviser to the interview board....". I consider that it is questionable why any member of an interview board should also act as adviser to the board.

- 5.15 The claimant is critical of the fact that the principal of the school sat on the interview board. The Statement of the Selection Board (attached at Appendix 2) which was drawn up some five weeks after the interview states that the principal stated that “he would not be making any recommendations regarding the selection”. The respondent stated that the only role which the principal undertook during the interview process was to confirm the length of service of the candidates at the commencement of each interview. However, the principal’s signature appears on the Recommendation Sheet of the interview board. I also note that principal’s signature also appears on the sheet showing the marks allocated to all of the candidates. The respondent stated that that was an error and that the principal should be described as an adviser to the board. On seeking to establish the areas on which the principal advised the board, the respondent stated that the principal clarified the length of service of the candidates and that if the interview board wished to ask the principal any further point of clarification, he would have assisted but that in this case, there was no further point of clarification. The composition of the selection board was not in accordance with the Department of Education and Science Circular Letter 29/97 (attached at Appendix 3) which states that the composition of the selection board should be 2 VEC representatives, 1 Inspector, 1 Personnel Specialist and 1 Educationalist. The respondent stated that an inspector was asked to sit on the interview board but could not facilitate. However, no evidence was presented to support this contention. I consider that it is questionable as to why the principal sat on the interview board given that it was not in accordance with the Department’s direction on the matter and given that the interview board could have proceeded without the inspector on the basis that Circular 29/97 also states that “The quorum for a Board shall be four persons... ”. No evidence was presented to indicate that there were any other regulations governing the composition of interview boards.
- 5.16 The respondent stated that the interview board followed the procedure for the distribution of marks at the interview as laid out in Circular Letter 30/97 as amended by Circular Letter 46/98 (attached at Appendix 4 and 5 respectively).

The Department of Education and Science Circular Letter 30/97, as amended, specifies criteria and a marking system for appointment to Assistant Principal and Special Duties Teacher posts in Vocational Schools as follows:

1. Capacity of the applicant to meet the needs of the school - 50 marks
2. Service to the VEC scheme in a permanent wholetime capacity - 30 marks
3. Experience of a professional nature in the field of education and involvement in the school - 20 marks

5.17 The respondent in its submission acknowledges that the claimant had longer service than the successful male candidate and she was in fact awarded more marks for service than the successful male candidate. Marks for service to the VEC scheme in a permanent wholetime capacity were awarded by the VEC office in Cork on the basis of 100% of the available marks for the most senior candidate and pro rata for the other candidates. The marking sheet with the marks awarded for service was then made available to the interview board to allocate marks for the other two criteria.

5.18 The respondent in its submission acknowledged that the claimant had more teaching experience than the successful candidate. The claimant states that she also had more non-teaching experience. On examining the involvement of the claimant in the school as presented in her application form under the heading "Extra curricular school activities, involvement in social or community organisations and non-teaching work experience" she refers to a diversity of promotional work for the school, educational activities for the students outside of class contact hours and recreational activities for the students. The successful candidate's application form refers to similar activities. The respondent did not dispute the claimant's statement in relation to her non-teaching experience or produce evidence to the contrary. I am therefore satisfied on the basis of the material presented that the claimant was at least as equally involved in the school as the successful candidate. She did in fact receive more marks than the successful candidate under the heading of 'experience and involvement'

5.19 The maximum available marks for the criterion ‘Capacity to meet the needs of the school’ was fifty marks. This criterion allowed the most scope for the interview board to determine the ranking of candidates and there is a major difference in the marks awarded to the claimant and the successful candidate under this heading. The claimant received thirty two marks or 64% of the total mark available whilst the successful candidate received forty five marks or 90%. The respondent in its submission stated that “It was the decision of Board to award more points to the successful candidate under the heading of ‘capacity of the applicant to meet the needs of the school’ than those awarded to Ms. Crowley”. At the hearing, I sought to determine how the mark awarded to the claimant for ‘capacity’ was determined by the interview board and I was informed that all marks were determined on a consensus basis. The respondent stated that when all seven candidates had been interviewed, a discussion took place and the actual marks to be awarded to each candidate were agreed by the interview board members. The respondent also confirmed that the needs of the school were not determined prior to the interviews taking place. This is remarkable given that half of the total marks available were awarded under that category. I consider it extraordinary that the interview board were in a position to assess the candidates’ capacity to meet the needs of the school given that the needs of the school were not determined prior to the interviews. I therefore consider it questionable as to how the claimant was awarded thirty two marks for ‘capacity to meet the needs of the school’. At the hearing, the respondent confirmed that there is no report on the claimant’s personnel file to indicate that she is anything other than satisfactory in the performance of her duties. Appraisals were not conducted for the candidates prior to the interviews and the claimant stated that she was never informed of any shortcomings in her performance.

5.20 The claimant received 85% for ‘experience and involvement in the school’ and 64% for ‘capacity to meet the needs of the school’. The difference in marks awarded under these two headings is remarkable given that the respondent acknowledged at the hearing that capacity to meet the needs of the school could be based on past contribution and past record in the school. The respondent was unable to explain how someone could score so high on ‘experience and involvement’ and score such a low mark for ‘capacity to meet the needs of the school’. The marks awarded to the claimant under those two headings may be

compared with the marks awarded to the successful candidate under the same headings. The successful candidate received 75% for 'experience and involvement', yet received 90% for 'capacity to meet the needs of the school'. I consider that a person's experience and involvement in the school should indicate to a large extent their capacity to meet the needs of the school, once the needs of the school are determined. I also consider it to be logical for the marks awarded to candidates under the two criteria to reflect this pattern unless the performance of the candidate at interview on the day is at issue. Such an argument was not made by the respondent. I examined the three page document provided by the respondent as a guideline for questioning by board members (attached at Appendix 1) and there is a remarkable similarity on the areas listed under 'experience and involvement' and 'capacity'.

5.21 I consider that there is an onus on me to fully investigate the allegation of discrimination and in so doing to examine all of the evidence including the evidence relating to all of the candidates for the post. In adopting this approach, I have considered a High Court case which was appealed on a point of law from the Labour Court and which noted that when the case had been before the Labour Court "... before making its Determination the Labour Court considered a very substantial volume of evidence as to the prior experience and responsibilities of both Ms. Davis, the successful appointee and the other applicants including two other unsuccessful applicants who were called by the Institute for interview."⁶ On examining the marking of all of the candidates, I find that the four females are ranked highest in the marks awarded for 'service' (see the tables attached at Appendix 6) . In relation to the marks awarded for 'experience and involvement', one of the males was ranked joint first with a female who scored highest in that category and the other three females are again ranked next followed by the remaining two male candidates. It can therefore be said that the female candidates scored highest on 'service' and in relation to 'experience and involvement', the females again scored highest save for one male who was awarded the same marks as one of the females. I consider that the marks awarded to the females for 'experience and involvement' are logical given the material submitted on their application forms and given that the length of service of a candidate will to a large extent

⁶Davis v Dublin Institute of Technology 1999 No. 493 Sp Judgment delivered on 23/06/00

determine his/her teaching experience. The difference in marking between all of the candidates under this heading is relatively insignificant. Indeed, there is only a difference of one point between the candidates ranked one to five under this heading and a difference of four points between the highest and lowest mark awarded.

5.22 Given that females scored so high on 'service' and 'experience and involvement', it is extraordinary that when one examines the ranking of the male/female candidates under the heading 'capacity of the applicant to meet the needs of the school' that the four females are ranked lowest and the three males highest. It is also to be noted that the successful male candidate was awarded the second lowest mark for 'experience and involvement' and the third lowest mark for 'service', however, achieved the highest mark for 'capacity to meet the needs of the school'. It is also to be noted that there is a significant difference (26%) between the highest mark awarded to a male and the highest mark awarded to a female. The difference becomes greater again (34%) when one examines the highest mark awarded (to a male) and the lowest mark awarded (to a female). On seeking an explanation at the hearing of the ranking of males compared with females under this heading, the respondent stated that all candidates were treated with equity and fairness. However, I reject this contention and I find that the marking under this category shows a bias in favour of the male candidates.

5.23 Given that I have found that the marking system under the category 'capacity to meet the needs of the school' shows a bias in favour of male candidates, I must now consider the effect of that marking system on the ranking of the claimant. In the order of marks awarded, the claimant ranked fourth, behind two males and a female (see Appendix 6). It is necessary for me to look at the application forms and marking of all of the candidates in order to do this and I consider that the High Court has given tacit approval for this approach.⁷ Having examined the information on all of the application forms for the position, I do not consider that there was a significant difference in the information provided. In relation to the marking of candidates, I am not satisfied as to the ranking of the males given the bias shown under one of the criteria used to mark candidates. One of the female candidates was ranked first

⁷See extract from *Davis v Dublin Institute of Technology* quoted above at page 13

under 'service' and also achieved joint first in ranking with a male candidate for 'experience and involvement' giving her a total mark under these two categories of forty eight out of fifty marks. This compares with a mark of forty three achieved by the claimant under the same two categories. Therefore, I am not satisfied that the claimant would have been successful in her application for the post even if the third category of marking did not show a bias in favour of the male candidates.

5.24 The respondent stated at the hearing that the interview board conducted itself totally in accordance with the expectations of the respondent and that interviews were conducted without bias, in an equitable and fair manner and that there was no gender agenda. However, as I have found that the marking for 'capacity to meet the needs of the school' shows a bias in favour of the male candidates, I reject this contention.

5.25 The Department of Education and Science Circular Letter 29/97 (attached at Appendix 3) prescribes the composition of selection boards for Assistant Principal posts. It states that the composition of the selection board with effect from 1 September 1997 shall include:

2 VEC representatives

1 Inspector

1 Personnel Specialist

1 Educationalist

It also states that there must be appropriate gender balance on the board. The interview board consisted of four men and one woman. The respondent stated that it attempted to improve the gender balance of the interview board but that it was restricted in the selection of females for the interview board. It stated that at that time, there were four female members out of a total of twenty three members of the respondent VEC and three had indicated that they would be unable to sit on interview boards. Evidence was not provided of the unavailability of the three female candidates for interview boards. The respondent stated in relation to the interviews in issue, a second female was asked to sit on the interview

board but she could not facilitate. At the hearing, the respondent stated that it did not have any evidence of the request to the second female member as initial requests to potential board members is always by phone. However, that statement was contradicted by a board member present at the hearing who sits on interview boards on behalf of the respondent and who confirmed that requests are always made by letter. The respondent also provided a list of eight persons who were regarded as Personnel Specialists and Educationalists and I was informed that the list was drawn up by the respondent around September 1997 and agreed at a Joint Consultative Committee meeting of the TUI and the VEC on 15 September 1997. That list does not include any females and an explanation was not provided as to why females were not included on the list. I was informed at the hearing that a new list of Personnel Specialists and Educationalists was drawn up earlier this year to include females. However, I consider it amazing that the respondent drew up a list of Specialists and Educationalists in September 1997 which did not include females given that the Department of Education and Science had drawn its attention to the matter by Circular Letter in June 1997. I also consider it amazing that the respondent allowed a further two and a half years to elapse before it amended the list to include females. I therefore reject the respondent's contention that attempts were made to achieve a more gender balanced interview board.

- 5.26 A copy of the new list of Specialists and Educationalists was made available to me following my request at the hearing. The amended list which is contained in a letter dated 8 May 2000 from the respondent to the TUI comprises eight names, two of which are female. The letter seeks agreement from the TUI to approach the people named. I consider that given that the new list contains only two females, it will most likely make it difficult for the respondent to achieve an appropriate gender balance on interview boards in the future.
- 5.27 The claimant maintains that there is a gender imbalance at senior management level in the school. In this regard, she provides the statistics for the posts of Principal, Deputy Principal and Assistant Principal at September 1999 which shows six males and one female in those grades when there were eleven males and eleven females on the staff.

The respondent in its submission agreed with the claimant's statistics and included the statistics for Special Duties Teacher which were 1 Male and 5 Female. The respondent refers to all of these grades as senior management. In any case, the statistics provided indicate a concentration of males in the three highest management grades, whilst the females are concentrated in the lowest management grade. Although not directly relevant to the selection process, I accept the claimant's contention that there is a gender imbalance at the three highest management grades at St. Fanahan's school.

5.28 At the hearing, the respondent confirmed that it has an Equal Opportunities Policy and a copy was subsequently made available to me. However, I am not satisfied with the contents of the Policy as drafted and I am making a recommendation in relation to it.

6. RECOMMENDATION

6.1 Direct evidence of discrimination will not always be available to the claimant and in these circumstances, "*one is more often left to infer discrimination from the circumstances. If this could not be done, the object of the legislation would be largely defeated....*"⁸

6.2 I am satisfied from the evidence made available to me that County Cork VEC has failed to rebut Ms. Crowley's claim of discrimination. I find that the claimant was discriminated against in the marking system applied by the respondent in the selection process. In making a finding of discrimination, I have taken into account the gender bias in the marking system, the lack of transparency in the selection process, the lack of any notes of the interviews and the failure of the respondent to seek to achieve a more gender balanced interview board.

6.3 In view of the foregoing, I find on the balance of probabilities that County Cork VEC directly discriminated against Ms. Mary Crowley in terms of Section 2(a) of the Employment Equality Act, 1977 and contrary to the provisions of section 3 of that Act in the selection process for appointment to Assistant Principal. However, I do not find that the

⁸Wallace -v- South Eastern Education and Library Board (NI Court of Appeal) [1980] IRLR 193

claimant would have been successful in her application for the post even if the selection process had not been discriminatory and I am taking this into account in awarding redress.

I recommend that:

- (i) County Cork VEC pay the claimant £5,000 for the distress suffered as a result of the discrimination;
- (ii) there be complete transparency in all selection procedures in the future which should include, inter alia, a job specification, a marking scheme which is without bias and which is applied at the end of each interview by reference to clearly defined criteria and the retention of interview notes;
- (iii) there be appropriate gender balance on interview boards and in this regard, the respondent should focus its immediate attention on the list of Personnel Specialists and Educationalists for nomination to interview boards;
- (iv) the respondent liaise with the Equality Authority in relation to the drafting of a new Equal Opportunities Policy.

Mary Rogerson

Equality Officer

8 December 2000