**Equality Screening Template**

**Introduction**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Part**  | **Part Title** | **Description** |
| **1** | **Policy Scoping** | 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** | 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** | 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** | Provides guidance to public authorities on monitoring for adverse impact and broader monitoring. |
| **5** | **Approval and Authorisation** | Verifies the public authority’s approval of a screening decision by a senior manager responsible for the policy. |
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**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** | Paternity/ Partners Leave Policy |
| **Is it existing, revised or a new policy?** | Existing |
| **What is it trying to achieve?** **(Intended aims/outcomes)** | The policy outlines statutory and company entitlements to leave and pay after the birth of a child with direct links to the entitled party for example father of the child |
| **Are there any Section 75 categories which might be expected to benefit from the intended policy? If so, explain how.**  | There are 3 categories that would be expected to benefit from this policy more than others:The second parent on the birth certificate regardless of gender, or spouse or partner regardless of gender, or the child’s adopter, or the intended parent in a surrogacy arrangement – this covers both men and women, and regardless of sexual orientation.Those with child dependants as the policy is specifically designed to provide entitlement to leave of absence from work when a child is born. Therefore, those availing will have become employees with child dependants, if they were not already in that category.  |
| **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 |
|  | 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):

|  |
| --- |
| * Adoption Policy
* Maternity Policy
* Parental Leave Policy
* Shared Parental Leave Policy
* Time off for Dependants 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 | **Internal data of those who took Paternity/Partners Leave between 2017-2019** shows that of 103 employees recorded the two main religious beliefs were (and their respective percentages of the employees who used the policy):Protestant = 56 (54%)Roman Catholic = 38 (36%)Neither/Unknown = 9 (8.7%)Based on Fair employment monitoring data of current employees the following percentages of religious belief is:Protestant = 54%Roman Catholic = 43% Neither/Unknown = 1.9% |
| Political opinion | No specific data on political opinion is recorded, however religious belief would be taken as a proxy for this category.  |
| Racial group | **Internal data of those who took Paternity/Partners Leave between 2017-2019** shows 2 employees where of a different racial group than white, which is the majority racial group of employees at Translink. This is 1.9% of the 103 who are recorded as taking paternity/partners leave between 2017-2019.On the **Fair Employment data for current Translink employees** only 0.5% of employees have identified themselves as a racial group other than white.  |
| Age | The **internal data of those that** **took Paternity/Partners Leave between 2017-2019** shows the following age ranges:18-34 = 4935-44 = 3745 – 54 = 8 55+ = 2Unknown = 7 |
| Marital status | This is an optional question on **fair employment monitoring** and so data is incomplete on this category. **National Statistics from NISRA on Births statistics by marital status** show information on births that take place inside or outside of marriage: Inside Outside2011 - 14682 105912017 - 13080 99952018 - 12674 10155**Legislation** has acknowledged various types of marital status in connection with being a parent of a new baby for those that do not give birth to the child. <https://www.nidirect.gov.uk/articles/paternity-leave>  |
| Sexual orientation | This is an optional question on **fair employment monitoring** and so data is incomplete on this category. **Legislation** acknowledges that those in a same sex relationship may be able to avail of Paternity Pay and/or leave. **NI national statistics from the Dept of Communities** showing that 1.2% household population identifies as LGB.    |
| Men and women generally | The **internal data of those that** **took Paternity/Partners Leave between 2017-2019** shows that all (103) were men. |
| Disability | No evidence available to indicate correlation between this category and the Paternity/Partners Leave Policy. |
| Dependants | **Internal data register of those who took Paternity/Partners leave between 2017-2019** details 103 employees used the policy in that timeframe, which would typically expect that those 103 are now employees with child dependants if they did not already have other children **NI Census 2011** – details that 33.86% of the NI populations households have dependent children. It should be noted that there is no mandatory requirement to take Paternity/Partners leave and therefore there may be other employees who chose not to avail of the policy after a partner gave birth, but it is not possible to say how many. **Legislation** has expanded entitlements to Paternity leave and/or pay for those who will have child dependants via adoption or surrogacy (covered by separate screening).  |

**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 | Data shows that a similar percentage of employees of different religious belief are availing of the policy and this percentage is also similar in correlation to the percentages of total employees with different religious beliefs, therefore there is no indication from the data that this policy will be needed by any particular religious belief.  |
| Political opinion | There is no identified content that would affect a person’s political opinion in order to adhere to or apply the Paternity/Partners Leave Policy.     |
| Racial group | Whilst the data shows that a higher percentage of those who have taken paternity/partners leave were of a racial group other than white, compared to the average percentage of those who have identified in that category from the total employees, there is no criteria within the policy that would impact on any racial groups ability to avail of or adhere to the Paternity/Partners Leave Policy.  |
| Age | As the data shows (86 employees aged between 18-34 = 83% of those who used the policy), the policy is expected to be needed more by a younger employee than an older one. This is expected as child-bearing age is between 15-49, there would be some assumption that most partners of women bearing children would be of a similar age range to the mother of the child.However, the policy does not have any criterion that restricts or limits the age of which someone can avail of the policy. This is also evidenced by the data showing some older employees who have taken paternity/partners leave between 2017-2019.  |
| Marital status | The NISRA data shows that typically those in a relationship determined as ‘married’ are more likely to have children that those outside of that status. It should also be noted, however, that there has been a significant reduction in the numbers of those giving birth inside a marriage over the last 20 years.As mentioned in the data evidence, legislation recognises that intended parents may have different marital status’ and has amended the eligibility criteria to demonstrate this.  |
| Sexual orientation | The policy wording has been amended at the recommendation of Stonewall to include a statement that the needs of trans employees were considered when reviewing the policy. |
| Men and women generally | As evidenced by the data, it is expected that men will have a greater need for the policy than women, as women are more commonly expected to avail of the Maternity Leave policy when giving birth.However, at the recommendation of Stonewall, the policy wording has been amended to include gender neutral language and explicit statements of inclusion e.g. including ‘regardless of gender’ when referring to partners or spouses.  |
| Disability | There is no identified content that would affect a person’s disability in order to adhere to or apply the Paternity/Partners Leave Policy.     |
| Dependants | Using the census data we could presume that approximately 33% of Translink employees have child dependants. However, there is no criterion in the Paternity/Partners Leave policy that limits or restricts access to the rights/entitlements of the policy if you have existing dependants.  As rights of the policy only apply to those who have a child dependant through birth, adoption or surrogacy, it is specifically designed by legislation to assist the needs of those with child dependants. There is no identified content that would affect those employees without child dependants, except that they cannot avail of the policy entitlements.    |

**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: <https://www.equalityni.org/S75duties>

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** 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 | None identified.     | None |
| Political opinion | None identified.     | None |
| Racial group | None identified.     | None |
| Age | Whilst the policy is expected to impact on younger employees this is only technical in nature and is not expected to have any impact on good relations or equality of opportunity.  | None |
| Marital status | Whilst the policy would typically be expected to impact those with a marital status of ‘married, civil partnered or cohabiting’, there is no relevance in the policy to affect good relations or equality of opportunity.  | None |
| Sexual orientation | Whilst the policy is expected to impact on employees with a sexual orientation towards those of a different sex more than any other sexual orientation, it also covers those whose sexual orientation is not towards someone of the same sex therefore there is no expected impact on good relations or equality of opportunity.  | None |
| Men and women generally | The policy covers all genders therefore there is no expected impact on good relations or equality of opportunity.  | None |
| Disability | None identified.     | None |
| Dependants | Whilst the policy is not applicable to those without [child] dependants, it is in accordance with legislation and any impact on those not in this category is expected to be negligible. To offer equality would be an enhancement from legislative entitlement and would not be possible to be monitored and/or applied equally.   | None |

|  |
| --- |
|  **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 has no impact on this category. |
| Political opinion |  | No, as the policy has no impact on this category. |
| 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 has no impact on 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 it would not be possible to provide equal opportunity of the policy to those without child dependants. |

|  |
| --- |
| **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 | None identified     | None |
| Political opinion | None identified     | None |
| Racial group | None identified     | None |

|  |
| --- |
| **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 has no impact on this category.  |
| Political opinion |  | No, as the policy has no impact on this category.  |
| Racial group |  | No, as the policy has no impact on 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).

|  |
| --- |
| **Same-sex Couples**. The policy covers all genders, and includes those whose sexual orientation is not towards the opposite sex. |

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

|  |
| --- |
|  |

**Part 3 - Screening Decision**

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

|  |
| --- |
| No equality impact assessment required as no impact on categories identified.  |

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.

|  |
| --- |
|  |

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.

|  |
| --- |
|  |

**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  |  |
| Social need |  |
| Effect on people’s daily lives |  |
| Relevance to a public authority’s functions |  |

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:** | **Paternity/ Partners Leave Policy** | **Version No:** |  |
| **Print Name** | **Signature** | **Position/Job Title**  | **Date** |
| **Screened By:** |
| Kerri Adams |  | HR Compliance & Governance Officer | 16/08/20 |
| **Approved by:** |
| Paula Ludlow |  | HR Services Manager | 16/08/20 |

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.