**Equality Screening Form**

**INTRODUCTION**

The information contained in this Equality Screening Form has been extracted from the Equality Commission for Northern Ireland’s Guide for Public Authorities (2010). Additional information about the 5 parts of the form and a flowchart to demonstrate the process of completion is detailed in [**Appendix 1**](#Appendix1) of the form.

This template document and further guidance can be found by clicking the following link - [www.equalityni.org/S75duties](https://www.equalityni.org/S75duties)

**PART 1- POLICY SCOPING**

The first stage of the screening process involves scoping the policy under consideration. The purpose of policy scoping is to help prepare the background and context and set out the aims and objectives for the policy, being screened. At this stage, scoping the policy will help identify potential constraints as well as opportunities and will help the policy maker work through the screening process on a step by step basis.

Public authorities should remember that the Section 75 statutory duties apply to internal policies (relating to people who work for the authority), as well as external policies (relating to those who are, or could be, served by the authority).

**Information about the policy**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Name of Policy** | Dignity at Work Policy |
| **Is it existing, revised or a new policy?** | Existing |[x]  New |[ ]  Revised |[ ]
| **If revised, please outline main updates:** |  |
| **What is it trying to achieve?** **(Intended aims/outcomes)** | Detailing the company’s views and expectations on applying equal rights and opportunities to all staff as well as defining bullying, harassment and victimisation. It also details the procedures should someone wish to report or complain about any incident(s) that breaches the policy.  |
| **Are there any Section 75 categories which might be expected to benefit from the intended policy? If so, explain how.**  | All categories will benefit as the policy is designed to specifically ensure fair treatment to all staff, with particular reference ad consideration for those in minority categories.  |
| **Who initiated or wrote the policy?**  | HR Manager |
| **Who owns and who implements the policy?** | Human Resources |

**Implementation Factors**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Yes |[x]  No |[ ]

Are there any factors which could contribute to/detract from the intended aim/outcome of the policy/decision?

If yes, are they: (Select all applicable)

|  |
| --- |
|[ ]  Financial |
|[x]  Legislative |
|[ ]  Other – please specify:  |  |

**Main stakeholders affected**

Who are the internal and external stakeholders (actual or potential) that the policy will impact upon?

|  |
| --- |
|[x]  Staff |
|[ ]  Service Users |
|[ ]  Other Public Sector Organisations |
|[ ]  Voluntary/ Community/ Trade Unions |
|[ ]  Other – please specify: |  |

##### [Other policies with a bearing on this policy](#Onefour) (please list):

|  |
| --- |
| * Equal Opportunity Policy
 |

**Available Evidence**

Evidence to help inform the screening process may take many forms. Public authorities should ensure that their screening decision is informed by relevant data. The following document should help you source data - [Section 75 - Evidence Signposting Guide](https://www.equalityni.org/ECNI/media/ECNI/Publications/Employers%20and%20Service%20Providers/Public%20Authorities/S75DataSignpostingGuide.pdf)

What evidence/information (both qualitative and quantitative) have you gathered to inform this policy? Specify details for each of the Section 75 categories.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Section 75 category** | **Details of evidence/information** |
| Religious belief | **Internal data from fair employment monitoring for employees** (4242) shows that there is breakdown of religious belief for the following:

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Protestant | Roman Catholic | Other |
| 2311 | 1849 | 82 |
| 54.4% | 43.6% | 2% |

 |
| Political opinion | There is no data captured regarding political opinion, and often religious belief would be taken as proxy for this category.  |
| Racial group | Internal data from fair employment monitoring shows the following figures regarding racial groups of employees:

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| White | Indian | Black African | Mixed Ethnic | Pakistani | Other | Prefer not to say | Blank answers |
| 4076 | 1 | 3 | 4 | 1 | 13 | 3 | 141 |
| 96% | <1% | <1% | <1% | <1% | <1% | <1% | 3% |

NI Census 2011: <https://www.nisra.gov.uk/sites/nisra.gov.uk/files/publications/2011-census-results-key-statistics-northern-ireland-report-11-december-2012.pdf>The census data shows that 98% of the NI population is considered to be of white ethnicity, with all other racial groups at less than 1% of the population. |
| Age | **Internal Fair employment monitoring** data shows the following approximate figures for age groups of Translink employees (4242):

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 16-24 | 25-34 | 35-44 | 45-54 | 55+ |
| 95 | 538 | 1020 | 1456 | 1133 |
| 2.23% | 12.68% | 24.04% | 34.32% | 26.7% |

A report by CIPD about the ageing workforce indicates that approximately 30% of the typical UK workforce are aged 55+:<https://www.cipd.co.uk/knowledge/work/trends/ageing-workforce-report> |
| Marital status | **Internal Fair employment monitoring** data shows the following approximate figures for marital status of Translink employees (4242): It should be noted this is not a mandatory question and this record is taken from start of employment, thus the status could change during employment with no requirement to inform/update HR or the system.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Married/ Civil Partnered | Co-Habiting | Single (Never married) | Other | No Answer |
| 557 | 142 | 788 | 81 | 2674 |
| 13.1% | 3.3% | 18.6% | 1.9% | 63% |

 |
| Sexual orientation | **Internal Fair employment monitoring** data shows the following approximate figures for sexual orientation of Translink employees (4242): It should be noted this is not a mandatory question.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| A different sex | Same sex | Both | No Answer |
| 1268 | 51 | 4 | 2919 |
| 30% | 1% | <1% | 68% |

Data from Office for National Statistics shows that in Northern Ireland, the percentage of people identifying themselves as LGB in 2018 was 1.2%. [https://www.ons.gov.uk/peoplepopulationandcommunity](https://www.ons.gov.uk/peoplepopulationandcommunity/culturalidentity/sexuality/bulletins/sexualidentityuk/2018) |
| Men and women generally | **Internal Fair employment monitoring** data shows the following breakdown by gender for employees:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Male | Female |
| 3639 | 603 |
| 85% | 15% |

Information from the Equality Commission NI about previous legal cases (in which the equality commission may have provided support) involving harassment shows 14 cases (between 2015-2017) – In 12 of these the claimant was female. |
| Disability | **Internal Fair employment monitoring** data shows the following breakdown of employees who have declared whether or not they have a disability:

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| No Disability | Disability | No Answer |
| 872 | 67 | 3303 |
| 20.55% | 1.57% | 77.86% |

Policy has an appendix added - Code Of Practice On The Employment Of People With DisabilitiesData from Office of National Statistics which details that NI had an employment rate for disabled people of 37. [https://www.ons.gov.uk/peoplepopulationandcommunity/healthandsocialcare/](https://www.ons.gov.uk/peoplepopulationandcommunity/healthandsocialcare/disability/bulletins/disabilityandemploymentuk/2019)  |
| Dependants |  **Internal Fair employment monitoring** data shows the following approximate breakdown of employees who have declared whether or not they have dependants:It should be noted this is not a mandatory question and this record is taken from start of employment, thus the status could change during employment with no requirement to inform/update HR or the system.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Yes | No | No Answer |
| 811 | 484 | 2947 |
| 19% | 11% | 70% |

 |

**Needs, Experiences and Priorities**

Taking into account the information referred to above, what are the different needs, experiences and priorities of each of the following categories, in relation to the particular policy/decision?

Specify details for each of the Section 75 categories

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Section 75 category** | **Details of needs/experiences/priorities** |
| Religious belief | The troubled history of NI is well documented with a divide between the two main community backgrounds. Whilst NI is now in a time of peace there is still awareness of the past divides which bear consideration regarding bullying, harassment and victimisation actions regarding religious belief. The employee figures above show a relatively equal split between these religious beliefs therefore it is reasonable to assume there is no minority within Translink that would benefit more under this category. Additionally, the policy does stipulate that equal treatment will and must be provided to those of any religious belief and additionally specifies examples of harassment such as ‘sectarian songs’ is unacceptable.  |
| Political opinion | There is no data recorded regarding political opinion, but is typically viewed in proxy with religious belief within NI.  |
| Racial group | As seen in the data above, the predominant racial group of employees in Translink is white. However, this is line with census data of the general NI population. The policy does specify that all racial groups, with additional consideration for ethnic minorities will have equal treatment and that racism will not be tolerated.  |
| Age | As shown by the data, over 25% of the Translink workforce is aged over 55+ and aligns similarly well to CIPD data about approximate expectations of the older age range continuing in work. This policy details that employees of all ages will receive equal treatment and so there is no specific age category identified as having a need for this policy.  |
| Marital status | The data available shows a very similar split between married/civil partnered and co-habiting couple compared to that of employees who are single or other and the policy does not have any content aimed at any specific marital status group therefore there are no identified needs for this category. |
| Sexual orientation | The data available shows a very similar split between those employees who identify with a sexual orientation towards those of the same sex, compared to that of the national statistics i.e. respectively 1:1.2%. The policy also does not have any content aimed at any specific sexual orientation group and therefore there are no identified needs for this category.  |
| Men and women generally | The data shows a significantly higher ratio of men to women employees at Translink and so from this, it could be deemed that the Dignity at Work Policy would have a bigger impact on men than women. However, given the information ascertained regarding legal cases involving harassment, showing that more often it is women who report such concerns/incidents, and with women being the minority group within this category – there is possibility that this policy would be required more by the female employee population at Translink. However, the policy does not contain any content aimed at any specific gender, other than to show inclusion under the category of gender, for gender reassignment.  |
| Disability | As seen from the data it can be seen that those employees with a disability are in the minority within this category and this is typical across employment rates of disabled people in the UK. With consideration of the potential challenges faced by employees with disabilities, it is expected that there is a particular need for this policy for those in this category to ensure fair and equal treatment as well as no bullying, harassment or victimisation is received compared to those who do not have a disability.There is no identified content within the policy that is expected to cause an impact or adverse effect for any employee with a disability to Translink.  |
| Dependants | The data available is very limited and subject to change throughout an employees tenure with Translink, and there is no specific content identifying any advantage towards those employees with or without dependants specifically, therefore there is no identified need or priority for this category. |

**PART 2 - SCREENING QUESTIONS**

**Introduction**

In making a decision as to whether or not there is a need to carry out an equality impact assessment, the public authority should consider its answers to the questions 1-4 which are given on pages 66-68 of the Guide: [Guide for Public Authorities April 2010](https://www.equalityni.org/ECNI/media/ECNI/Publications/Employers%20and%20Service%20Providers/S75GuideforPublicAuthoritiesApril2010.pdf)

Taking into account the evidence presented above, consider and comment on the likely impact on equality of opportunity and good relations for those affected by this policy, in any way, for each of the equality and good relations categories, by applying the screening questions given overleaf and indicate the level of impact on the group i.e. minor, major or none.

**Impact: Major / Minor / None**

If the public authority’s conclusion is **major** in respect of one or more of the Section 75 equality of opportunity and/or good relations categories, then consideration should be given to subjecting the policy to the equality impact assessment procedure.

**In favour of ‘MAJOR’ impact**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **A** | The policy is significant in terms of its strategic importance; |
| **B** | Potential equality impacts are unknown, because, for example, there is insufficient data upon which to make an assessment or because they are complex, and it would be appropriate to conduct an equality impact assessment in order to better assess them; |
| **C** | Potential equality and/or good relations impacts are likely to be adverse or are likely to be experienced disproportionately by groups of people including those who are marginalised or disadvantaged; |
| **D** | Further assessment offers a valuable way to examine the evidence and develop recommendations in respect of a policy about which there are concerns amongst affected individuals and representative groups, for example in respect of multiple identities; |
| **E** | The policy is likely to be challenged by way of judicial review; |
| **F** | The policy is significant in terms of expenditure. |

If the public authority’s conclusion is **minor** in respect of one or more of the Section 75 equality categories and/or good relations categories, then consideration should still be given to proceeding with an equality impact assessment, or to:

* Measures to mitigate the adverse impact; or
* The introduction of an alternative policy to better promote equality of opportunity and/or good relations.

**In favour of ‘MINOR’ impact**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **A** | The policy is not unlawfully discriminatory and any residual potential impacts on people are judged to be negligible; |
| **B** | The policy, or certain proposals within it, are potentially unlawfully discriminatory, but this possibility can readily and easily be eliminated by making appropriate changes to the policy or by adopting appropriate mitigating measures; |
| **C** | Any asymmetrical equality impacts caused by the policy are intentional because they are specifically designed to promote equality of opportunity for particular groups of disadvantaged people; |
| **D** | By amending the policy there are better opportunities to better promote equality of opportunity and/or good relations. |

If the public authority’s conclusion is **none** in respect of all of the Section 75 equality of opportunity and/or good relations categories, then the public authority may decide to screen the policy out. If a policy is ‘screened out’ as having no relevance to equality of opportunity or good relations, a public authority should give details of the reasons for the decision taken.

**In favour of ‘NONE’**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **A** | The policy has no relevance to equality of opportunity or good relations. |
| **B** | The policy is purely technical in nature and will have no bearing in terms of its likely impact on equality of opportunity or good relations for people within the equality and good relations categories.  |

**Screening Questions 1 - 4**

|  |
| --- |
| **Screening Question 1**  |
| What is the likely impact on equality of opportunity for those affected by this policy, for each of the Section 75 equality categories? Minor/ Major/ None |
| Section 75 category | Details of policy impact | Level of impact? Minor/Major/None |
| Religious belief | There is no content that would be expected to impact on the equality of opportunity for anyone under this category.  | None |
| Political opinion | There is no content that would be expected to impact on the equality of opportunity for anyone under this category.  | None |
| Racial group | There is no content that would be expected to impact on the equality of opportunity for anyone under this category.  | None |
| Age | There is no content that would be expected to impact on the equality of opportunity for anyone under this category.  | None |
| Marital status | There is no content that would be expected to impact on the equality of opportunity for anyone under this category.  | None |
| Sexual orientation | There is no content that would be expected to impact on the equality of opportunity for anyone under this category.  | None |
| Men and women generally | There is no content that would be expected to impact on the equality of opportunity for anyone under this category.  | None |
| Disability | There is no content that would be expected to impact on the equality of opportunity for anyone under this category. | None |
| Dependants | There is no content that would be expected to impact on the equality of opportunity for anyone under this category.  | None |

|  |
| --- |
|  **Screening Question** **2**  |
| Are there opportunities to better promote equality of opportunity for people within the Section 75 equalities categories? |
| Section 75 category | If **Yes**, provide details | If **No**, provide reasons |
| Religious belief |  | No, as there is no impact on this category |
| Political opinion |  | No, as there is no impact on this category |
| Racial group |  | No, as there is no impact on this category |
| Age |  | No, as there is no impact on this category |
| Marital status |  | No, as there is no impact on this category |
| Sexual orientation |  | No, as there is no impact on this category |
| Men and women generally |  | No, as there is no impact on this category |
| Disability |  | No, as there is no impact on this category |
| Dependants |  | No, as there is no impact on this category |

|  |
| --- |
| **Screening Question** **3**  |
| To what extent is the policy likely to impact on good relations between people of different religious belief, political opinion or racial group? Minor/ Major/ None |
| Good relations category | Details of policy impact | Level of impact Minor/Major/None |
| Religious belief | This policy is specifically designed to impact on and promote good relations and safeguard fair and equal treatment for all individuals regardless of their religious beliefs.  | Minor |
| Political opinion | This policy is specifically designed to impact on and promote good relations and safeguard fair and equal treatment for all individuals regardless of their political opinion. | Minor |
| Racial group | This policy is specifically designed to impact on and promote good relations and safeguard fair and equal treatment for all individuals regardless of their racial group. | Minor |

|  |
| --- |
| **Screening Question 4**  |
| Are there opportunities to better promote good relations between people of different religious belief, political opinion or racial group? |
| Good relations category | If **Yes**, provide details | If **No**, provide reasons |
| Religious belief |  | No, as the policy is already designed to enhance promotion of good relations in this category.  |
| Political opinion |  | No, as the policy is already designed to enhance promotion of good relations in this category. |
| Racial group |  | No, as the policy is already designed to enhance promotion of good relations in this category. |

**Additional Considerations**

**Multiple Identity**

Generally speaking, people can fall into more than one Section 75 category. Taking this into consideration, are there any potential impacts of the policy/decision on people with multiple identities?  (For example: disabled minority ethnic people; disabled women; young Protestant men; and young lesbians, gay and bisexual people).

|  |
| --- |
| No multiple identity categories identified |

Provide details of data on the impact of the policy on people with multiple identities. Specify relevant Section 75 categories concerned.

|  |
| --- |
| N/A |

**PART 3 - SCREENING DECISION**

If the decision is **not** to conduct an **equality impact assessment**, please provide details of the reasons.

|  |
| --- |
| No, as there is little to no impact on any category and where impact has been identified, it would be deemed to have a positive impact on the relation and opportunities of the respective categories.  |

If the decision is not to conduct an equality impact assessment the public authority should consider if the policy should be **mitigated or an alternative policy be introduced**.

|  |
| --- |
| N/A |

If the decision **is to** subject the policy to an **equality impact assessment**, please provide details of the reasons.

|  |
| --- |
| N/A |

All public authorities’ equality schemes must state the authority’s arrangements for assessing and consulting on the likely impact of policies adopted or proposed to be adopted by the authority on the promotion of equality of opportunity. The Commission recommends screening and equality impact assessment as the tools to be utilised for such assessments. Further advice on equality impact assessment may be found in a separate Commission publication: Practical Guidance on Equality Impact Assessment.

**Mitigation**

When the public authority concludes that the likely impact is ‘minor’ and an equality impact assessment is not to be conducted, the public authority may consider mitigation to lessen the severity of any equality impact, or the introduction of an alternative policy to better promote equality of opportunity or good relations.

Can the policy/decision be amended or changed or an alternative policy introduced to better promote equality of opportunity and/or good relations?

If so, give the **reasons** to support your decision, together with the proposed changes/amendments or alternative policy.

|  |
| --- |
| N/A |

**Timetabling and Prioritising**

Factors to be considered in timetabling and prioritising policies for equality impact assessment.

If the policy has been **‘screened in’** for equality impact assessment, then please answer the following questions to determine its priority for timetabling the equality impact assessment.

On a scale of 1-3, with 1 being the lowest priority and 3 being the highest, assess the policy in terms of its priority for equality impact assessment.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Priority Criterion** | **Rating (1-3)** |
| Effect on equality of opportunity and good relations  | Choose an item. |
| Social need | Choose an item. |
| Effect on people’s daily lives | Choose an item. |
| Relevance to a public authority’s functions | Choose an item. |

Note: The Total Rating Score should be used to prioritise the policy in rank order with other policies screened in for equality impact assessment. This list of priorities will assist the public authority in timetabling. Details of the Public Authority’s Equality Impact Assessment Timetable should be included in the quarterly Screening Report.

Is the policy affected by timetables established by other relevant public authorities?

If yes, please provide details:

|  |
| --- |
| N/A |

**PART 4 - MONITORING**

Public authorities should consider the guidance contained in the Commission’s Monitoring Guidance for Use by Public Authorities (July 2007).

The Commission recommends that where the policy has been amended or an alternative policy introduced, the public authority should monitor more broadly than for adverse impact (See Benefits, P.9-10, paras 2.13 – 2.20 of the Monitoring Guidance).

Effective monitoring will help the public authority identify any future adverse impact arising from the policy which may lead the public authority to conduct an equality impact assessment, as well as help with future planning and policy development.

|  |
| --- |
|  |

**PART 5 - APPROVAL AND AUTHORISATION**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Policy Title:** | **Dignity At Work Policy** | **Version No:** | **2.0** |
| **Print Name** | **Signature** | **Position/Job Title**  | **Date** |
| **Screened By:** |
| Kerri Adams | A close-up of some writing  Description automatically generated with low confidence | HR Compliance & Governance Officer | 3rd October 2022 |
| **Approved by:** |
| Paula Ludlow |  | HR Services Manager | 3rd October 2022 |

Note: A copy of the Screening Template, for each policy screened should be ‘signed off’ and approved by a senior manager responsible for the policy, made easily accessible on the public authority’s website as soon as possible following completion and made available on request.

**APPENDIX 1**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Part**  | **Part Title** | **Description** |
| **1** | [**Policy Scoping**](#Part1) | Asks public authorities to provide details about the policy, procedure, practice and/or decision being screened and what available evidence you have gathered to help make an assessment of the likely impact on equality of opportunity and good relations |
| **2** | [**Screening Questions**](#Part2) | Asks about the extent of the likely impact of the policy on groups of people within each of the Section 75 categories. Details of the groups consulted and the level of assessment of the likely impact. This includes consideration of multiple identity and good relations issues.  |
| **3** | [**Screening Decision**](#Part3) | Guides the public authority to reach a screening decision as to whether or not there is a need to carry out an equality impact assessment (EQIA), or tointroducemeasures to mitigate the likely impact, or the introduction of an alternative policy to better promote equality of opportunity and/or good relations. |
| **4** | [**Monitoring**](#Part4) | Provides guidance to public authorities on monitoring for adverse impact and broader monitoring. |
| **5** | [**Approval and Authorisation**](#Part5) | Verifies the public authority’s approval of a screening decision by a senior manager responsible for the policy. |
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