

## Response ID ANON-PYJC-FRTJ-C

Submitted to Sign Language Bill - Call for Evidence  
Submitted on 2025-03-21 15:49:25

### Consent and introduction

What is your name?

Name:

[REDACTED]

What is your email address?

Email:

[REDACTED]

What is your organisation?

Organisation:

[REDACTED]

Please confirm you have read the Northern Ireland Assembly's Committee privacy notice by clicking the button below.

I have read the privacy notice

Do you consent to your submission being published on the Committee's website and included in the Committee's report?

Yes, publish but with my personal information and any content that could be used to identify me redacted.

### Clause 1

Do you feel Clause 1 goes far enough in formally recognising BSL and ISL as languages of Northern Ireland?

Yes

Please give details to support your answer.

Text box to enter additional details:

### Clause 2

Do you feel Clause 2 goes far enough in promoting the use of BSL and ISL and developing deaf culture?

No

Please give details to support your answer.

Text box for entering additional information:

There is too much teaching SL to hearing people. Lots of money spent and no tracking to see if these people are using the language. How is that spend justified. How is it decided who comes on courses? Why are free courses being provided to council staff and councillors who can afford their own fee. Deaf people need to be decided how the language is promoted and used. That's not happening. All this money to hearing people is not helping advance usage or awareness!

Are there any other approaches (apart from providing for the availability of classes) that could help to meet the objective of the greater use and understanding of BSL and ISL?

Yes

Please give details to support your answer.

Text box to enter additional details:

Fund deaf spaces, deaf staff, deaf projects, deaf leadership courses, deaf roles.

### Clause 3

Do you think the duty placed on prescribed organisations to make the information and services accessible to members of the deaf community is sufficient?

No

Please give details to support your answer.

Text box for entering additional information:

I struggle with access to private bodies and charities. Who are the prescribed bodies? The government departments provide excellent access already. We need the private sector and the third sector to also take responsibility. There's also no mention of using qualified interpreters here? Why say offer or facilitated?

#### Clause 4

Do you support the approach taken by Clause 4?

Yes

Please give details to support your answer.

Text box for entering additional information:

But only if they are bodies that we want and need and will make a difference. Why has this not been done yet. Surely it should already be provided?

#### Clause 5

Do you support the approach to consultation required in Clause 5?

No

Please give details to support your answer.

Text box for entering additional information:

Who is writing this? And one person on behalf of the community is wrong.

#### Clause 6

Do you support the approach taken in this clause?

No

Please give details to support your answer.

Text box for entering additional information:

This is no better than the DDA. Is it too weak and there are too many get out clauses. How will this be monitored? Where is the accountability? What are implications if these bodies don't obey. What about the actual bodies that we need as the public bodies are already excellent?

Do you feel there is anything else this Clause should include?

Yes

Please give details to support your answer.

Text box to enter additional details:

Accountability, consequence, the guideline...

#### Clause 7

Do you support the provision for the Department for Communities to make regulations detailed in Clause 7?

No

Please give details to support your answer.

Text box for entering additional information:

Why haven't these been done? Who will aid this process? This requires a lot of trust in DFC and they silence us. We aren't allowed to give feedback that is different to what they want. I fear they'll change things to suit certain people.

Do you support the approach to consultation detailed in Clause 7?

No

Please give details to support your answer.

Text box to enter additional details:

They haven't consulted in a transparent way to date and I don't think this will change going forward.

Clause 8

Do you feel the level of consultation required in Clause 8 is sufficient?

No

Please give details to support your answer.

Text box for entering additional information:

At the moment the DC hasn't a clue about the bill or the process. Dfc don't consult and I have no doubt they will continue to behave in a way that suits their own agenda

Clause 9

Do you think evaluating the impact of the Bill in a report every five years is an appropriate length of time?

No

Please give details to support your answer.

Text box for entering additional information:

What are they reporting on? Measuring? Who will be involved?

Clause 10

Do you support the creation of a scheme for accrediting BSL and ISL teachers?

No

Please give details to support your answer.

Text box for entering additional information:

The courses set up here are not good. They don't have or grow deaf expertise nor draw on expertise from anywhere else. They are hearing led and it's not appropriate or effective. Money is not plenty and needs to be spent directly on lifting the deaf community.

Do you support the creation of a scheme for accrediting BSL and ISL interpreters?

No

Please give details to support your answer.

Text box to enter additional details:

Same reasons

Clause 11

Do you agree with the definition of the deaf community provided for in the Bill?

No

Please give details to support your answer. Please outline what people or groups you think should be included or excluded and why.

Text box for entering additional information:

C and the additional? C possibly but the additional is very strange.

## Clause 12

Do you agree with the definition of BSL and ISL provided for in the Bill?

No

Please give details to support your answer. If you think there are any aspects missing, please outline what you think should be included.

Text box for entering additional information:

Strange non linguistic definitions

## Clause 13

Do you agree with the definition of "everyday reliance" provided in the Bill?

Yes

Please give details to support your answer. If you think there are any aspects missing, please outline what you think should be included.

Text box for entering additional information:

## Any other comments

Is there anything which you expected the Bill to make provision for which has not been included in the Bill?

Yes

Please give details to support your answer.

Text box to enter additional details:

Deaf education  
Employment opportunity  
ATW  
Deaf infrastructure

If you have any other comments in relation to the Bill please tell us here.

Text box to enter additional details:

Is it possible to look at Dfc spend and assess how they are assessing the spend. Lots is going to hearing people learning sign but there is no strategy. We need the right ppl to be funded ans not people who can pay for it themselves. Of course deaf family members is not included in that. The SLPG seem to have a lot of influence but they are all gaining a lot of the 0.5 million so is their advice impartial and advice to better the deaf economy and community. I doubt it. We all know a good education system solves problems. Can we look at the research and see if the provision here matches the research. It doesn't. Sorting that once and for all would be hugely beneficial my issue is the lack of trust we as a community have in the process that has got us here. Easy number wins for the department to make them look good and personal financial gain for those in consulting roles makes it very dubious. Eg of the 20 QUB students about to be interpreters there are only 18. And I think 10 of these are already qualified at this time of cuts is that a wise use of money. A course that has no deaf expertise and is run and taught ny hearing people? Please strengthen the deaf community, our deaf leaders, our deaf education and infrastructure. Funding courses that are of little use is not a way of promoting and protecting sign language.