

The Content and Format of the Letter of Rights
Questions on Content and Format
Reponse by Faculty of Advocates

1. Do you consider the content of the 'standard' version of the Letter of Rights easy to understand?

Yes

2. Is the content of the 'easy read' version of the Letter of Rights easy to understand?

Yes

3. Do you consider that the versions of the Letter of Rights cover the key information individuals need to know when being held in custody?

Yes

4. Does the way the information is organized in the 'standard' version of the Letter of Rights, i.e. with a text box at the beginning, help to convey key information in a way that is easily understood?

Yes

5. Does the way in which the information is organized in the 'easy read' version of the Letter of Rights, i.e. with a text box at the beginning, help to convey key information in a way that is easily understood?

Yes

6. What alternative format(s) do you think the Letter of Rights should be provided in?

Braille and video / audio. We also wonder whether an App might be devised which would be readily accessible to those of an age most likely to require the information. We appreciate that in a police station any telephone would be taken possession of by the police but in situations where perhaps attendance at a police

station can be anticipated it would be a means of the information being accessed at an early stage. It would also mean the information was always available.

7. Do you have any other questions or comments on the content or format of the Letters?

Yes – see Q 14

8. Is the wording used in the ‘standard’ version of the Letter of Rights appropriate and accessible?

Yes

9. Is the wording used in the ‘easy read’ version of the Letter of Rights appropriate and accessible?

Yes

10. Does the ‘easy read’ version meet the aims of making the information provided easier to understand and more accessible to those with differing levels of literacy or with learning difficulties / disabilities?

The illustrations may make the document LOOK a little more user friendly, but the language used in both versions of the document is the same. It is difficult to understand the purpose of the “easy read” version since the wording is, so far as we can see, identical.

11. Do the illustrations included in the ‘easy read’ version of the Letter of Rights help support understanding of the content of the Letter?

The illustrations may make the document LOOK a little more user friendly, but the language used in both versions of the document is the same. The illustrations in our view add nothing to the understanding of the content. They are not sufficiently clear as to show exactly what it is they are supposed to depict.

12. *Aside from providing the ‘easy read’ version, how would you suggest the Letter of Rights is made accessible to those with differing levels of literacy or with learning difficulties / disabilities?*

By making it available on video / audio

13. *Are there any further languages, in everyday use in Scotland, which you think the Letter of Rights should be available in?*

No

14. *Do you have any other questions or comments on the accessibility of the Letter of Rights or the language used in the Letter?*

On the first page, we thought that the reference to ‘important freedoms and supports’, as an explanation of the term ‘rights’ was unlikely to aid understanding. We consider the reader is more likely to understand the term “rights” than “freedoms and supports”.

Given that the purpose of the provision of the Letter is to ‘provide information on an individual’s rights while being held in police custody, we thought that the reference to procedure at court was unnecessary and apt to confuse (see ‘Getting to see paperwork’). We are firmly of the view that this part should be removed