**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** | Flags and Emblems Policy |
| **Is it existing, revised or a new policy?** | Existing |[ ]  New |[ ]  Revised |[x]
| **If revised, please outline main updates:** | Revision added emblems to indicate disabilities.  |
| **What is it trying to achieve?** **(Intended aims/outcomes)** | Policy conditions and reasons for permitting or not-permitting the wearing and/or displaying of flags or emblems particularly relating to religious or political beliefs in or on work property.  |
| **Are there any Section 75 categories which might be expected to benefit from the intended policy? If so, explain how.**  | This policy has specific considerations to the civil unrest ‘the troubles’ in Northern Ireland, which related to the populations religious and political beliefs. The policy is drafted non-exclusively to these considerations, but religious belief (and/or by-proxy political opinion) is the primary category which may benefit.  |
| **Who initiated or wrote the policy?**  | HR Services 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 |
|[x]  Other – please specify:  | The Flags Regulations (NI) 2000, Joint Protocol on Display of Flags In Public Areas (NI Assembly) |

**Main stakeholders affected**

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

|  |
| --- |
|[x]  Staff |
|[x]  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 Opportunities Policy
* Dignity At Work 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.

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 | The Flags Regulations (NI) 2000, Joint Protocol on Display of Flags In Public Areas (NI Assembly), NI Human Rights Commission paper on The Display of Flags in NI: [104020\_NIHRC\_The\_Display\_of\_Flags\_Single\_Column\_V7\_Final\_Low\_Res.pdf](https://www.nihrc.org/uploads/publications/104020_NIHRC_The_Display_of_Flags_Single_Column_V7_Final_Low_Res.pdf)Equality Commissions Guide to Employers and Employees – Promoting a Harmonious working environment:[Promoting\_a\_good\_and\_harmonious\_working\_environment.pdf (equalityni.org)](https://www.equalityni.org/ECNI/media/ECNI/Publications/Employers%20and%20Service%20Providers/Promoting_a_good_and_harmonious_working_environment.pdf)

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

 |
| Political opinion | This data is not specifically obtained, but the data of religious belief would be deemed a proxy for political opinion.    |
| Racial group | There is no evidence to show a correlation between racial group and this policy.  |
| Age | There is no evidence that shows a correlation between age and this policy. |
| Marital status | There is no evidence that shows a correlation between marital status and this policy. |
| Sexual orientation | Fair Employment Monitoring information of Translink employees 2022 - Of 4123 employees, only 101 have declared a sexual orientation of ‘a different sex, both, or prefer not to say’. This is an optional response query and most have no response selected. Translink has regularly supported Belfast Pride for several years and have developed an LGBTQ+ networking group for employees.  |
| Men and women generally | There is no evidence that shows a correlation between gender and this policy. |
| Disability | NI Chamber of Commerce – Member News Dec 2020: Details that NOW Group has more than 60,000 JAM card users in NI |
| Dependants |  There is no evidence that shows a correlation between having or not having dependants and this policy. |

**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 | It is acknowledged that Northern Ireland has a particularly controversial history involving religious belief (in particular of the 2 listed in the data above) and/or political opinion where these 2 categories have become linked. Whilst there is currently no civil war and a strong element of harmony, this history of the ‘NI Troubles’ still has residual effects on the communities of these 2 primary religions which is considered sensitive and can see levels of tolerance and good relations waiver if there is feeling of provocation from either party. This consideration of provocation can come from symbolism of a flag or emblem reflective of the ‘opposition’ which is the reason for legislation, regulation and policy, so that each individuals belief can be acknowledged in an appropriate and timely way so as to avoid or minimise any offence to others.This policy is clearly, understandably developed with the specific needs of Northern Ireland’s history of conflict on grounds of religious belief in mind, and in that regard, there are no specific needs or priorities affected by either primary religion of NI. It is also noteworthy that the policy remains in accordance with guidelines published by the Equality Commission NI (as linked in the evidence section above). |
| Political opinion | The category of Religious belief would be viewed in proxy of the category of Political opinion.  |
| Racial group | There is no information to indicate that this category has any needs or priorities in relation to the Flags and Emblems Policy.  |
| Age | There is no information to indicate that this category has any needs or priorities in relation to the Flags and Emblems Policy.  |
| Marital status | There is no information to indicate that this category has any needs or priorities in relation to the Flags and Emblems Policy.  |
| Sexual orientation | In recent years, the rainbow symbol/colours have become associated with, and demonstrate support of the LGBTQ+ community. It is recognised as a minority group and as such has seen significant work by Translink in its equality, diversity and inclusion offering, such as offering of rainbow lanyards, and other merchandise for staff to wear, if they choose, regularly referred to as ‘Pride’.  |
| Men and women generally | There is no information to indicate that this category has any needs or priorities in relation to the Flags and Emblems Policy.  |
| Disability | Emblems and symbols are being used more than ever to help individuals demonstrate their personal situation regarding disability in a subtle way. An example of this is the development of the Just A Minute (JAM) Card which provides an indication to businesses that the individual has a communication barrier and may require a little extra time to utilise their service. Translink is signed up to the JAM Card scheme. Another example that has become better known more recently, is the sunflower (on green background) which is commonly available as a badge, lanyard or keyring and helps to demonstrate that the individual has a hidden disability and may require some assistance, or may be exempt from wearing a face mask. The addition of these details to the policy are examples to positively recognise and reinforce that there are emblems and symbols that are acceptable and should be acknowledged correctly in the workplace.  |
| Dependants | There is no information to indicate that this category has any needs or priorities in relation to the Flags and Emblems Policy.  |

**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 | The policy is primarily designed with impact on particular religious beliefs in Northern Ireland in mind, therefore it would be incorrect to say there is ‘no’ impact on this category. But the policy is not unlawfully discriminatory and in accordance with guidelines created by the Equality Commission. | Minor |
| Political opinion | This category is still viewed by-proxy of religious belief regarding this policy.  | Minor |
| Racial group | There is no specific content that would be expected to impact on anyone under this category. However, race is identified as a category in which the outlaying principles of the policy will apply.  | None |
| Age | There is no specific content that would be expected to impact on anyone under this category. However, age is identified as a category in which the outlaying principles of the policy will apply. | None |
| Marital status | There is no specific content that would be expected to impact on anyone under this category.  | None |
| Sexual orientation | There has been an addition to the policy to refer to the wearing of PRIDE badges and/or lanyards. This has been specifically added to improve inclusivity and better promote equality of opportunity for this minority group.  | Minor |
| Men and women generally | There is no specific content that would be expected to impact on anyone under this category. | None |
| Disability | There is no specific content that would be expected to impact on anyone under this category. However, disability is identified as a category in which the outlaying principles of the policy will apply. | None |
| Dependants | There is no specific content that would be expected to impact on 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 the policy itself is designed to better promote equality of opportunity for this category.  |
| Political opinion |  | No, as this category is viewed in proxy of religious belief and so it is considered that the policy already addresses equality of opportunity.  |
| Racial group |  | No, as the policy has no impact on this category |
| Age |  | No, as the policy has no impact on this category |
| Marital status |  | No, as the policy has no impact on this category |
| Sexual orientation |  | No, as the policy itself has been updated to better reflect promotion of equality of opportunity for this category. |
| Men and women generally |  | No, as the policy has no impact on this category |
| Disability |  | No, as the policy has no impact on this category |
| Dependants |  | No, as the policy has 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 | Due to the complexity of the past regarding religious belief in Northern Ireland this policy has been developed to best offer an environment that allows for good relations between people of different religious beliefs.  | Minor |
| Political opinion | Due to the complexity of the past regarding religious belief in Northern Ireland this policy has been developed to best offer an environment that allows for good relations between people of different political opinion. | Minor |
| Racial group | There is no specific content that would be expected to impact on anyone under this category. | None |

|  |
| --- |
| **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 designed primarily to promote good relations for this category.  |
| Political opinion |  | No, as the policy is designed primarily to promote good relations for this category. |
| Racial group |  | No, as the policy has no content that impacts 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.

|  |
| --- |
| Whilst there are some minor impacts identified throughout the categories, these impacts are developed specifically to improve good relations within that category and promote equality of opportunity for any minorities affected. The policy has also been developed in accordance with guidelines provided by the Equality Commission NI with balanced results for the categories of religious belief and political opinion particularly considered.  |

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**.

|  |
| --- |
| No mitigation necessary.  |

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:

|  |
| --- |
|  |

**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:** | **Flags & Emblems Policy** | **Version No:** | **2.2** |
| **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 | June 2022 |
| **Approved by:** |
| Paula Ludlow |  | HR Services Manager | 27.06.22 |

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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