



SECTION 75

Keeping it Effective

**Report on Public Authority
Five Year Reviews of Equality Schemes**

August 2007

Equality Commission

FOR NORTHERN IRELAND

Contents

Executive Summary	1
Background	4
Equality Schemes as a Workable Basis for Mainstreaming	5
Key Lessons Learnt in Effectively Implementing Equality Schemes	7
Leadership	7
Improving Core Business	9
Engagement	10
Coherence	12
Overall Conclusions	13
What More can be Done to Achieve Outcomes for Individuals	17
Appendix 1: Schedule for Submission of Review Reports by Public Authorities with Approved Schemes	19
Appendix 2: Five Year Review Reporting Template	25

Executive Summary

This report sets out a number of key themes and conclusions emerging from an analysis of Five Year Review reports received from public authorities up to July 2007. The schedule of submission of five year review reporting is included in the analysis set out in Appendix 1. This analysis has contributed to the Commission's consideration of the effectiveness of Section 75.¹

The overall picture is one of sustained progress in scheme implementation for the majority of public authorities and evidence of some effectiveness in meeting the Section 75 duties. The vast majority of public authorities recognise that the development of equality schemes has provided them with a useful framework for implementation of Section 75. Department of Finance and Personnel noted its "*...scheme proved an effective vehicle for mainstreaming equality*". However, some public authorities proposed that reviews should take place every two to three years to learn lessons and update schemes as necessary.

The key lessons identified by public authorities from their experience of implementation of the legislation over the past five years have been arranged below in terms of Leadership, Improving Core Business, Coherence and Engagement.

Leadership

There are a number of public authorities whose effectiveness in meeting the duties has been considerable. This has been most apparent in public authorities where there has been top-level leadership in driving compliance with the duties. For many non-departmental public bodies, the commitment of parent departments to Section 75 is seen as relevant to their ability to make fundamental policy changes to deliver outcomes.

Improving Core Business

Various reports referred to the cultural as well as structural changes

¹ Reviewing the Effectiveness of Section 75 of the Northern Ireland Act 1998 - ECNI

necessary for effective implementation of the duties. Issues with regard to training, good communication and increased partnership working have led to equality thinking being more commonplace. While this is encouraging, some five year review reports indicate that public authorities have on occasions confused the setting of equality scheme related objectives with compliance with the legislation.

Engagement

The vast majority of public authorities cited greater engagement or consultation with those directly affected by policies as one of the key successes arising from Section 75. The Department of Health, Social Services and Public Safety described it as ensuring that *'government can no longer take key policy decisions without first having conversations with people who will be affected by those decisions.'* However, the reports also highlighted some of the challenges faced by public authorities in meeting their duties regarding consultation.

Coherence

Reports highlighted various arrangements and variance in practices within public bodies to support equality scheme implementation. While Section 75 applies to public authorities in a uniform way, authorities are applying it inconsistently. Within some sectors, strategic arrangements are in place to facilitate policy development and networking. Facilitation of shared learning and economies of scale derived from a partnership approach were also seen to reduce the burden of consultation on the voluntary and community sector.

Clearly those authorities that have been more effective in implementation of the duties are those that have developed valuable internal systems with ongoing top-level commitment, championing scheme implementation. They also tend in the main to have arrangements for consistent review of the allocation of resources to deliver communication and training, and a culture that fosters co-operation with other parts of the sector and those affected by the statutory duties.

A range of pertinent points were made in reports regarding what more needs to be done to address issues of equality including:

- More work on consulting those directly affected by policies rather than representative groups.
- Building on areas of cooperation and partnership.
- Further develop outcome-related actions.
- More monitoring information needs to be gathered and gaps in data addressed.

Background

Schedule 9 of the Northern Ireland Act 1998 requires public authorities to review their equality scheme every five years, and submit a report of that review to the Equality Commission². The purpose of the five year review is to allow public authorities, through a process of self assessment, to review their approved schemes.

Five Year reviews of schemes by public authorities were based on the 'Blue Section' of the Commission's Guide to the Statutory Duties (February 2005), approved by the Secretary of State, which states on page 69:

“This review is a formal review of the scheme to evaluate its effectiveness in meeting the public authority's statutory duties.”

In September 2005 the Commission produced guidance for public authorities including a framework of questions; see reporting guidance for Five Year Review of Equality Schemes in Appendix 2. The five year review of equality schemes included both backward and forward-looking elements. As well as assessing the 'workability' of each scheme, it was necessary to assess what each scheme has achieved, what remains to be done, how to build on success and how to meet the challenges identified.

This report sets out a number of key themes and conclusions emerging from an analysis of the first tranche i.e. the one hundred and twenty public authorities due to report by July 2007, see Appendix 1. Reporting by public authorities is a process of self-assessment and the Equality Commission does not formally validate the accuracy of information provided. Nevertheless this analysis has contributed to the Commission's consideration of the effectiveness of Section 75.³

² Public authorities are required to review their scheme within five years of the date in which the approved scheme was submitted to the Commission. This means that deadlines for reporting are spread over a period of years.

³ Keeping it Effective: Reviewing the Effectiveness of Section 75 of the Northern Ireland Act 1998, Equality Commission for Northern Ireland, May 2007.

Equality Schemes as a Workable Basis for Mainstreaming

The overall picture is one of sustained progress in scheme implementation for the vast majority of public authorities and evidence of some effectiveness in meeting the Section 75 duties.

In the main, public authorities indicated approved schemes provided a workable basis for public authorities to take forward the promotion of equality of opportunity and good relations over the past five years.

The Department of Finance and Personnel noted its *"...scheme proved an effective vehicle for mainstreaming equality"* while the Department for Social Development commented that their scheme *"...brought a more formal and structured approach to policy making...the dept is satisfied the operation of the statutory duty is making a difference to policy development..."*

In many review reports public authorities restated their commitment to Section 75. Several public authorities took the opportunity to highlight that early work on scheme drafting and consultation was resource intensive, onerous and detracted from the spirit of the legislation. It was also suggested schemes were 'not an easy read' and some reports emphasised the need to make changes to their schemes to keep them up-to-date and respond to structural changes within authorities. Notably some Local Authorities acknowledged that schemes afforded an opportunity for difficult issues to be discussed both within the Council Chamber and also the workplace.

Other reports highlighted that reviewing an equality scheme every five years was not practical and it was suggested that reviews should take place every two to three years to learn lessons and update schemes as necessary. There was no evidence to suggest scheme reviews should take place more infrequently than every five years, or another framework other than a scheme should be introduced.

Key Lessons Learnt in Effectively Implementing Equality Schemes

In the Guide to the Statutory Duties, the Commission identified that effective implementation of Section 75 required a range of activities and arrangements within each public authority. The key lessons identified by public authorities from their experience of implementation of the legislation over the past five years have been arranged in terms of Leadership, Improving Core Business, Coherence and Engagement.

Leadership

Overall, analysis of the reports shows that successful implementation of Section 75 is dependent on commitment from senior staff. Across the public sector there is considerable variation in terms of how Section 75 has been embedded structurally and functionally within organisations, and inconsistency in terms of whether commitment at senior level goes beyond simply signing the equality scheme, or driving compliance with the duties throughout the organisation.

Effectiveness in meeting the duties has been most apparent in public authorities where there has been top-level leadership, for example the Northern Ireland Housing Executive, where implementation of the duties is led by the deputy Chief Executive. Another aspect of leadership was highlighted by Enterprise Ulster which noted the role of Departments in developing and setting policy. For many non departmental public bodies the commitment of parent departments to Section 75 is seen as relevant to their ability to make fundamental policy changes to deliver Section 75.

Overall, the majority of public authorities continue to have a dedicated equality officer or team of officers. The need for such was underlined by the Department of Culture, Arts and Leisure which noted slow progress following scheme approval before the establishment of a dedicated unit. However, in some cases, these staff have seen their job descriptions change to include non equality related duties e.g. Freedom of Information, Best Value or expanded to cover the good relations brief as well. A small number of bodies have focused responsibility in their Human Resources

functions and on occasions this resulted in a narrower focus of EQIA activity on HR related policies.

Analysis of the reports has shown that implementation benefits where there is clarity regarding responsibility for Section 75 obligations, such as through job descriptions and dedicated units. For example, the Department of Health, Social Services and Public Safety introduced significant changes to internal structures to ensure that equality of opportunity and good relations were embedded in the policy making process. An Equality and Human Rights Steering Group was established to plan and manage the EQIA programme; meeting every two months and chaired by a senior official at Assistant Secretary level. Responsibility for management of the screening and EQIA process lies with all managers at Deputy Principal and Grade 7 levels. The Department's Evaluation, Equality and Strategic Planning Branch, which carries out evaluation and equality functions, holds an annual round of bilateral meetings with Chief Professional Officers and Directors to update the programme of evaluations and policy reviews.

Analysis of the reports has equally shown that implementation suffers where there is a lack of clarity regarding responsibility for Section 75 obligations. The reports highlight that leadership at a senior level to drive structural and functional change within a public authority is critical.

The issue of leadership in driving compliance and ultimately in promoting equality of opportunity and good relations is particularly pertinent within local government. Analysis has shown that tensions between political parties, particularly on issues such as emblems and representation, have sometimes provided an obstacle to the effective implementation of the duties. Reports suggest that in a small number of Councils, the commitment of staff to the duties is not matched by elected members, who pass motions at Council meetings without regard to their scheme commitments, especially to equality impact assessment.

Improving Core Business

A host of examples were provided in reports of the integration of equality of opportunity and good relations considerations into Business Plans which are then cascaded down into associated objectives and tasks for all staff. Belfast City Council is an example of a public authority which has shown top-level commitment and has made significant progress in implementing the equality duties. The Council has, in particular, focused on the business case for equality of opportunity and good relations and mainstreamed equality objectives into corporate and business planning.

A large number of public authorities have begun to set specific equality objectives which are measured at a senior level in the organisation. The Office of Civil Service Commissioners reported that Section 75 obligations are considered part of normal (core) business rather than being seen as a parallel process. The Central Services Agency reported that individual directorates include specific equality objectives in service delivery/business plans. The Mater Hospital Trust reported that Senior Management Team set equality objectives, with a senior manager appointed to drive equality agenda in the Trust. The Staff Commission for Education and Library Boards has been particularly effective in integrating Section 75 into corporate and business planning processes and key activities. However, while such an approach is increasing, it is not yet the norm. There are some organisations that made no reference in their five year review reports to equality of opportunity and good relations being included in its Business Plans.

Issues with regard to training, good communication and increased partnership working have led to equality thinking being more commonplace. Within the Education and Library Boards, processes and procedures have been developed to ensure consistent application of the equality duties. This included a Screening Toolkit developed by and for the use of those responsible for policy development leading to a supplementary report on the screening of new policies being produced at the end of each financial year. A number of training packages were developed - including disability awareness, consultation skills, dealing with complaints on grounds of sexual orientation. Training materials were developed to assist staff who were encouraged to think about the promotional duties in

terms of their own functions, rather than leave it to a designated officer. Materials were made available to other public authorities, including Youth Council for NI, Fishery Harbour Authority and British Council.

While this is encouraging, some five year review reports indicate public authorities have on occasions confused the setting of equality scheme objectives with compliance with the legislation. For instance, as the development of accessible materials is encouraging and relates to the duty to promote equality of opportunity, it is not sufficient without also ensuring that structures are in place to ensure equality of opportunity is embedded in the policy making process.

Engagement

The vast majority of public authorities cited greater engagement or consultation with those directly affected by policies as one of the key advantages or achievements brought about by Section 75. The Department of Health, Social Services & Public Safety described it as ensuring that *'government can no longer take key policy decisions without first having conversations with people who will be affected by those decisions.'*

Public authorities reported considerable time building up relationships with organisations and individuals to ensure they could contribute to the policy making process. There are examples of good practice in this area. A number of public authorities have developed consultative fora that involve representatives of affected groups in the policy development process at an early stage e.g. OFMDFM Race Equality Forum and Children and Young People's Forum; NI Housing Executive Consultative Forum, the Joint Consultative Forum developed by the five Education and Library Boards and the Staff Commission for the ELBs. Such fora have been very effective at engaging the community and voluntary sector in the process of assessing policies for equality impacts.

A large number of authorities referred to the impact of consultation on policy outcomes. Fermanagh Council referred to the impact on policy implementation, *'Section 75 helps design services responsive to needs of people'*. Some referred to the need to train

staff to better seek the views of those directly affected by a policy. A number of organisations reported that where policies are seen as complicated or irrelevant, it is difficult to gauge views, e.g. changes to the Common Funding Formula. According to the Department of Education, the most successful consultations related to those policies in which the general public had a real and genuine interest. Public authorities therefore need to spend more time considering how to present policies for consultation, i.e. how to make their relevance readily apparent.

A significant number of public authorities have utilised consultation methodologies which recognise the diverse needs and multiple identities of consultees. Among the examples are health sector public authorities which were particularly proactive in engaging Section 75 groups through consultative forum. For example, Craigavon and Banbridge Community Health and Social Services Trust established a Community Forum made up of representatives from the equality groups. The Trust provides capacity building for members of the Forum and financial assistance to members to assist in their participation. The chair of the Forum rotates between the Chief Executive of the Trust and a member from the voluntary/community sector. Alternatively to facilitate user involvement, Causeway Health and Social Services Trust recruited service users to sit on its committees and steering groups within a Public Involvement Policy and Framework.

In general, consultation has worked best where thought has been given to the appropriate form of engagement (the Housing Executive report using a wide range of approaches), as well as targeting the consultation to the appropriate individuals and groups. For the Education and Library Boards the most successful consultation exercises were events organised in partnership with the community and voluntary sector groups with high levels of engagement or where the policy decision is seen as controversial.

The Central Services Agency reported that face-to-face discussion worked best, particularly where staff meet with groups or individuals in their own venues, e.g. community centres, etc. Examples were given where organisations had a central equality unit, or staff member, and this resource was used to support policy makers. In Belfast City Council, a dedicated Equality Officer is

included in all EQIA consultations and consultation forum meetings and provides advice to individual departments and policy makers who are responsible for pre-consultation and policy development consultation. The Equality Officer has an overview of consultation being undertaken as well as the effectiveness of this regarding equality impact assessment.

However, the reports also highlighted some of the challenges faced by public authorities in meeting their duties regarding engagement or consultation. In general, very few organisations reported having processes in place to feed back to consultees following a consultation exercise, except through publication of the final policy outcome. Almost all five year review reports recognised the need for better approaches in this area. There are lessons to be learned to ensure consultation is targeted appropriately. Innovative ways to consult, i.e. beyond paper based approaches, are still lacking.

Coherence

Reports highlighted a range of practices within public bodies to support equality scheme implementation. While Section 75 applies to public authorities in the same way, authorities are applying it inconsistently. Within some sectors strategic arrangements were in place to facilitate policy development and networking. A collaborative joined-up approach to implementing the duties has been particularly apparent within the education sector (the five Education and Library Boards and the Staff Commission for the ELBs) and in the family of health-related public authorities. Facilitation of shared learning and economies of scale derived from a partnership approach were also seen to reduce the burden of consultation on the voluntary and community sector. Conversely, while there are examples of Councils pooling their resources to employ an Equality Officer through a Service Level Agreement arrangement, there has been a lack of effective coherence and partnership working in the local government sector.

The Education and Library Boards and health sector, a number of government departments and Councils involved members of representative groups in the design and development of a sustained programme of equality training over a five year period. A number of public authorities have made significant progress to

develop monitoring systems to incorporate equality related categories in relation to survey and other data collection systems. However, further guidance and identification of good practice is seen as vital in taking this key aspect forward.

The health sector has undertaken a review of access to information and services leading to an improvement in physical access to buildings, the development of a disability standard and production of information in accessible formats. For example, the Eastern Area Best Practice Forum collaborated on a Northern Ireland Interpreting Project, a *Working with Diversity* website, an *Equalityvision* video and a regional translation contract in order to broaden public access to information and public services.

The education sector has been particularly proactive in working together to ensure robust screening and EQIAs, and as a result have been proactive in reducing potential adverse impacts in the development of policies. The Staff Commission for Education and Library Boards reported that during each equality impact assessment, adverse impacts were identified and mitigating measures developed to reduce adverse impact and better promote equality of opportunity.

Some UK wide public bodies highlighted the benefits of Commission facilitated networking arrangements. They also referred to high levels of work to report on progress regarding Section 75 and GB statutory race and disability obligations. It was suggested a collaborative approach to reporting would make work more effective.

Overall Conclusions

In general, public authorities are convinced of the benefits of Section 75 and have introduced systems and structures to ensure compliance with the duties. However, reports across the board were poor in demonstrating outcomes in relation to screening and equality impact assessment.

A host of public authorities reported struggling to meet their original EQIA programmes, with authorities making considerable changes to their original timetables over the time frame. Very few

authorities were able to demonstrate that the equality impact assessment process is used in parallel with the policy making process; in a number of instances, particularly in government departments, policies are developed in advance of their equality implications being considered. This shows a lack of understanding of the duties, and on a very practical level makes the policy development process considerably more complicated than it needs to be. The Commission's guidance was intended to help authorities define the aim of the policy, gather data, and consider the equality implications as the policy is being developed, rather than afterwards.

The majority of public authorities reported that monitoring for adverse impacts remains a challenge, due to the lack of expertise in this area among equality staff and critically, among policy makers. There is very little evidence that public authorities, particularly government departments, are monitoring the impact of policies during and after implementation, as the Commission's guidance recommends.

Only a small number of public authorities were able to provide evidence of impacts and outcomes; those that did answer this question referred to outputs rather than outcomes. Those who did provide an answer (mainly in the health sector, and the Housing Executive) referred to positive impacts on disabled people, and those of a different race, and related the impacts to proactive positive changes made to their own policies.

Clearly those authorities that have been more effective in implementation of the duties are those that have developed valuable internal systems with ongoing top-level commitment and championing of their scheme and what it stands for. They also tend in the main to have arrangements for consistent overseeing of the allocation of resources to deliver communication and training, and a culture that fosters co-operation with other parts of the sector and those affected by the statutory duties.

The reports suggest that equality schemes have acted as a mechanism for alerting policy makers to proactively identify potential equality implications and have contributed in some part to better decisions being made by public authorities. In terms of

assisting public authorities to address effectively and efficiently issues of equality, a range of pertinent learning points have been identified regarding what more needs to be done.

What More can be Done to Achieve Outcomes for Individuals

A range of pertinent points were made in reports regarding what more needs to be done to address issues of equality of opportunity including:

- More work needed on consulting those directly affected by policies rather than representative groups.
- Build on areas of cooperation and partnerships.
- Further develop outcome related initiatives.
- Explore how to communicate better with individuals in particular children and young people.
- Press for additional financial resources to deliver services to meet the needs of the whole community including particular equality needs.
- See Section 75 as an important part of a continuous improvement agenda.
- More monitoring information to be gathered and gaps in data addressed particularly regarding sexual orientation and political opinion.
- Develop stronger working relations with representatives of the nine categories.
- More good practice collated and circulated.
- Have strategic focus linked to PSI priorities.
- Reinforcement of the duties at regional level with Government Departments.
- Media campaign to highlight Section 75 and how it can influence change.
- Further development of statistical information by NISRA particularly for use by smaller public bodies.
- Greater focus on outcomes and less on process.

Appendix 1: Schedule for Submission of Review Reports by Public Authorities with Approved Schemes

Public Authority	Date Approved	Deadline for Report
Dept. of Education	08/02/2001	08/02/2006
Dept. for Employment and Learning	08/02/2001	08/02/2006
Dept. of the Environment	08/02/2001	08/02/2006
Dept. of Health, Social Services and Public Safety	08/02/2001	08/02/2006
Staff Commission for Education & Library Boards	15/02/2001	15/02/2006
Dept. of Finance and Personnel	15/02/2001	15/02/2006
Dept. of Regional Development	15/02/2001	15/02/2006
Belfast Education & Library Board	15/03/2001	15/03/2006
North Eastern Education & Library Board	15/03/2001	15/03/2006
Southern Education & Library Board	15/03/2001	15/03/2006
Western Education & Library Board	15/03/2001	15/03/2006
Office of the First Minister & Deputy First Minister	15/03/2001	15/03/2006
Dept. for Social Development	15/03/2001	15/03/2006
Dept. of Culture, Arts and Leisure	15/03/2001	15/03/2006
Dept. of Agriculture and Rural Development	15/03/2001	15/03/2006
South Eastern Education & Library Board	12/04/2001	12/04/2006
Youth Council for Northern Ireland	12/04/2001	12/04/2006
Northern Ireland Guardian Ad Litem Agency	12/04/2001	12/04/2006
Central Services Agency	12/04/2001	12/04/2006
Northern Ireland Health Promotion Agency	12/04/2001	12/04/2006
Northern Ireland Medical and Dental Training Agency	12/04/2001	12/04/2006
Local Government Staff Commission for Northern Ireland	12/04/2001	12/04/2006
Ballymena Borough Council	12/04/2001	12/04/2006

Public Authority	Date Approved	Deadline for Report
Belfast City Council	12/04/2001	12/04/2006
Craigavon Borough Council	12/04/2001	12/04/2006
Derry City Council	12/04/2001	12/04/2006
Dungannon District Council	12/04/2001	12/04/2006
Fermanagh District Council	12/04/2001	12/04/2006
Moyle District Council	12/04/2001	12/04/2006
Council for Catholic Maintained Schools	17/05/2001	17/05/2006
Mater Infirmorum Hospital HSS Trust	17/05/2001	17/05/2006
Eastern Health & Social Services Council	17/05/2001	17/05/2006
Eastern Health & Social Services Board	17/05/2001	17/05/2006
Northern Ireland Regional Medical Physics Agency	17/05/2001	17/05/2006
Green Park HSS Trust	17/05/2001	17/05/2006
Northern Ireland Blood Transfusion Service	17/05/2001	17/05/2006
Northern Ireland Local Government Officers Superannuation Committee	17/05/2001	17/05/2006
Antrim Borough Council	17/05/2001	17/05/2006
Ballymoney Borough Council	17/05/2001	17/05/2006
Coleraine Borough Council	17/05/2001	17/05/2006
Cookstown District Council	17/05/2001	17/05/2006
Limavady Borough Council	17/05/2001	17/05/2006
North Down Borough Council	17/05/2001	17/05/2006
Omagh District Council	17/05/2001	17/05/2006
Rural Development Council for Northern Ireland	14/06/2001	14/06/2006
Northern Ireland Fishery Harbour Authority	14/06/2001	14/06/2006
Arts Council for Northern Ireland	14/06/2001	14/06/2006
Sports Council for Northern Ireland	14/06/2001	14/06/2006
Northern Ireland Council for the Curriculum Examination and Assessment	14/06/2001	14/06/2006

Public Authority	Date Approved	Deadline for Report
Health & Safety Executive for Northern Ireland	14/06/2001	14/06/2006
North & West Belfast HSS Trust	14/06/2001	14/06/2006
Northern Ireland Ambulance Service HSS Trust	14/06/2001	14/06/2006
Newry & Mourne HSS Trust	14/06/2001	14/06/2006
Mental Health Commission for Northern Ireland	14/06/2001	14/06/2006
Northern Health & Social Services Board	14/06/2001	14/06/2006
Homefirst Community HSS Trust	14/06/2001	14/06/2006
Altnagelvin Hospitals HSS Trust	14/06/2001	14/06/2006
Western Health & Social Services Board	14/06/2001	14/06/2006
Foyle HSS Trust	14/06/2001	14/06/2006
Causeway HSS Trust	14/06/2001	14/06/2006
Armagh & Dungannon HSS Trust	14/06/2001	14/06/2006
Southern Health & Social Services Board	14/06/2001	14/06/2006
Craigavon & Banbridge Community HSS Trust	14/06/2001	14/06/2006
Craigavon Area Hospital Group HSS Trust	14/06/2001	14/06/2006
Southern Health & Social Services Council	14/06/2001	14/06/2006
Sperrin Lakeland HSS Trust	14/06/2001	14/06/2006
Armagh City and District Council	14/06/2001	14/06/2006
Carrickfergus Borough Council	14/06/2001	14/06/2006
Down District Council	14/06/2001	14/06/2006
Newtownabbey Borough Council	14/06/2001	14/06/2006
Strabane District Council	14/06/2001	14/06/2006
Office of the Civil Service Commissioners for Northern Ireland	14/06/2001	14/06/2006
Northern Ireland Housing Executive	05/07/2001	05/07/2006
Fisheries Conservancy Board for Northern Ireland	05/07/2001	05/07/2006
Northern Ireland Museums Council	05/07/2001	05/07/2006

Public Authority	Date Approved	Deadline for Report
MAGNI	05/07/2001	05/07/2006
General Consumer Council for Northern Ireland	05/07/2001	05/07/2006
Ulster Supported Employment Limited	05/07/2001	05/07/2006
The Office of the Certification Officer Northern Ireland	05/07/2001	05/07/2006
Labour Relations Agency	05/07/2001	05/07/2006
Enterprise Ulster	05/07/2001	05/07/2006
Royal Group of Hospitals & Dental Hospital HSS Trust	05/07/2001	05/07/2006
Ulster Community & Hospitals HSS Trust	05/07/2001	05/07/2006
Down Lisburn HSS Trust	05/07/2001	05/07/2006
United Hospitals HSS Trust	05/07/2001	05/07/2006
Northern Health & Social Services Council	05/07/2001	05/07/2006
Western Health & Social Services Council	05/07/2001	05/07/2006
South & East Belfast HSS Trust	05/07/2001	05/07/2006
Belfast City Hospital HSS Trust	05/07/2001	05/07/2006
Banbridge District Council	05/07/2001	05/07/2006
Larne Borough Council	05/07/2001	05/07/2006
Lisburn City Council	05/07/2001	05/07/2006
Newry and Mourne District Council	05/07/2001	05/07/2006
Community Relations Council	05/07/2001	05/07/2006
Northern Ireland Authority for Energy Regulation	05/07/2001	05/07/2006
Laganside Corporation	08/08/2001	08/08/2006
Agricultural Research Institute of Northern Ireland	08/08/2001	08/08/2006
Livestock and Meat Commission for Northern Ireland	08/08/2001	08/08/2006
The Construction Industry Training Board	08/08/2001	08/08/2006
Fire Authority for Northern Ireland	08/08/2001	08/08/2006
Ards Borough Council	08/08/2001	08/08/2006

Public Authority	Date Approved	Deadline for Report
Magherafelt District Council	12/09/2001	12/09/2006
Northern Ireland Office	20/11/2001	20/11/2006
Loughs Agency	30/10/2001	30/10/2006
British Council Northern Ireland	30/10/2001	30/10/2006
Belfast Harbour Commissioners	18/12/2001	18/12/2006
Warrenpoint Harbour Authority	18/12/2001	18/12/2006
Castlereagh Borough Council	15/01/2002	15/01/2007
Londonderry Port & Harbour Commissioners	22/01/2002	22/01/2007
Probation Board for Northern Ireland	22/01/2002	22/01/2007
Dept of Trade and Industry	22/01/2002	22/01/2007
Trustees of the National Heritage Memorial Fund	22/01/2002	22/01/2007
Northern Ireland Court Service	19/02/2002	19/02/2007
Intertrade Ireland	21/03/2002	21/03/2007
Northern Ireland Human Rights Commission	03/07/2002	03/07/2007
Information Commissioner	03/07/2002	03/07/2007
The Queen's University of Belfast	03/07/2002	03/07/2007
St Mary's University College	03/07/2002	03/07/2007
Stranmillis University College	03/07/2002	03/07/2007
University of Ulster	03/07/2002	03/07/2007

Appendix 2: Five Year Review Reporting Template

EQUALITY COMMISSION FOR NORTHERN IRELAND

Public Authority Five Year Review Report

This report template includes a number of self assessment questions under the twelve key elements of an equality scheme. Please enter information at the relevant part of each Section in the template and ensure that it is submitted to the Commission electronically (by completing this template) **and** in writing, with a signed cover letter from the Chief Executive or, in his/her absence, the Deputy Chief Executive (or equivalent).

Name of public authority (Enter details below)

Equality Officer name and contact details (Enter details below)

Executive Summary

Please provide some main conclusions in terms of:

- a) To what extent has your public authority's approved scheme provided a workable basis for mainstreaming the need to promote equality of opportunity and good relations into policy-making over the past five years?

(Enter text below)

- b) What key lessons have been learnt over the past five years in terms of effectively implementing the approved equality scheme?

(Enter text below)

- c) What more needs to be done to achieve outcomes for individuals from the nine equality categories?

(Enter text below)

1. A general introductory statement specifying the purpose of the scheme and the public authority's commitment to the statutory duties.

- 1a) To what extent were senior management involved in ensuring scheme compliance over the 5 year period and what further steps could be undertaken to ensure effective internal arrangements?

Prompts - Identify any changes to arrangements for managing scheme implementation, and what were the lessons learnt in terms of enablers and impediments to monitoring scheme implementation?

(Enter text below)

- 1b) Outline annual **direct** expenditure of resources to ensure that the statutory duties were complied with, in terms of staff and money over the past 5 years, and comment on the extent that all necessary resources were allocated.

Prompts - Identify costs related to equality unit staff, use of consultants, allocation of budgets to training/publications/research, extent of in-year bids and/or reallocation of resources. What were the lessons learnt in terms of enablers and impediments to monitoring resourcing? What could the public authority do in future to ensure effective allocation and monitoring of necessary resources?

Year	Full Time Equivalent Staff	£'s
2001/02		
2002/03		
2003/04		
2004/05		
2005/06		

(Enter text below)

2. An outline of how the public authority intends to assess its compliance with the Section 75 duties and for consulting on matters to which a duty under that section is likely to be relevant.

- 2a) Outline impacts and outcomes (for the public authority and/or individuals from the nine equality categories) over the past five years and what further steps could be undertaken to build on these or address underreporting?

Prompt - Were outcomes delivered for all of the nine equality categories? Were annual progress reports critically reviewed before or after submission to the Commission? What examples of good practice from other public authorities could be adopted?

(Enter text below)

- 2b) Outline the number of equality scheme related consultation exercises undertaken by your authority over the past five years. Set out the number and percentage related to screening exercises and to EQIAs and indicate the extent that your scheme helped you to engage with external stakeholders.

Prompt - Identify your authority's most and least successful means of consultation in relation to s75 categories. Why were some means of consultation more or less successful in relation to particular equality categories?

(Enter text below)

- 2c) Indicate if your list of consultees was amended during the 5 year period and what further steps could be taken to develop your level of engagement and consultation?

Prompt - Outline the extent your authority did or did not move away from formal consultation and on what criteria was any such consultation targeted? To what extent were requests to be included and/or objections from those not included in the consultation process received and how were these addressed?

(Enter text below)

- 2d) To what extent did your authority consult directly with directly affected individuals as well as with representative groups, particularly in relation to young people and those with learning disabilities, and was this sufficient?

Prompt - How effective was your authority at providing feedback to consultees as a result of consultation exercises? What were the lessons learnt in terms of enablers and impediments to consulting directly with affected individuals? What could your authority do in future to provide effective consultee feedback?

(Enter text below)

3. The authority's arrangements for assessing and consulting on the impact of policies adopted or proposed to be adopted on the promotion of equality of opportunity.

- 3a) Outline and discuss the number of policies your authority subject to screening over the past five years, setting out the number and percentage of 'policies screened in' on the basis of equality considerations and the percentage 'screened in' on the basis of the good relations duty.

Prompt - What were the lessons learnt in terms of enablers and impediments to screening in terms of, screening criteria and priority factors? Are there any other criteria which could usefully be included? What lessons are there regarding responsibility for screening at regional level and subsequent screening of local policy? What could your authority do in future to ensure effective screening arrangements? Set out in an appendix a list of all policies screened out during scheme implementation.

(Enter text below)

- 3b) To what extent did your authority's consideration of the screening criteria **not** identify equal opportunity implications on any of s75 categories, but for which consultees then highlighted problems?

Prompt - Identify the extent the collection of quantitative and qualitative data informed screening processes. Outline the extent consultations with representative groups produced data to inform the screening process which was not otherwise available to your authority. Outline any difficulties in identifying policies and equality implications using the definition of policy set out in the Guide to the Statutory Duties.

(Enter text below)

- 3c) Outline over the past five years how many EQIAs your authority commenced as a result of i) initial screening and ii) as a result of screening new/revised policies subsequently, and discuss the extent that your authority has become more effective at identifying equality of opportunity dimensions in its policies.

Prompt - Were changes made to the screening process? Outline any examples of any changes made to policies to better promote equality of opportunity and/or good relations, rather than to address any perceived differential impact, as a result of screening policies that were 'screened out'?

(Enter text below)

- 3d) Outline over the past five year period the percentage of your authority's initial EQIA timetable that reached i) stage 6 of the EQIA process i.e. decision making, and ii) stage 7 of the EQIA process i.e. annual monitoring & publication of results, and indicate the extent that your authority has become more effective at progressing EQIAs.

Prompt - Explain any slippage that occurred and what was done to rectify it. To what extent did you notify representative groups of this slippage and what was their reaction? What were the lessons learnt in terms of enablers and impediments to monitoring EQIAs?

(Enter text below)

4. The authority's arrangements for monitoring any adverse impact of policies adopted by the authority on the promotion of equality of opportunity.

- 4a) To what extent were sufficient arrangements put in place to collect data relating to the nine equality categories to monitor the impact of policies and what could your authority do in future to develop monitoring arrangements?

Prompt - What were the lessons learnt in terms of enablers and impediments to monitoring and developing new/additional quantitative data over the past five years? Did your authority consult its own employees or collaborate with other authorities to collect data? Did your authority engage with representative groups to develop monitoring arrangements?

(Enter text below)

5. The authority's arrangements for publishing the results of equality impact assessments and of monitoring any adverse impact of policies adopted by the authority on the promotion of equality of opportunity.

- 5a) Indicate the number of reports published outlining the results of EQIAs and monitoring over the past five years, and outline what your authority could do in future in relation to improving the publication of EQIA results and monitoring.

Prompt - Identify the number of reports that were provided in alternative formats. What were the lessons learnt in terms of enablers and impediments to publishing the results of EQIAs and monitoring?

(Enter text below)

6. A commitment that in making any decision with respect to a policy adopted or proposed to be adopted by it, that the public authority shall take into account any equality impact assessment and consultation carried out in relation to the policy.

- 6a) In terms of the number of EQIAs that reached stage 6 i.e. decision making to what extent were mitigation measures and alternative policies adopted?

*Prompt - Outline the extent to which your authority produced EQIAs that did **not** identify adverse impact on any of s75 categories, but which consultees then gave an indication of adverse impact of s75 category and/or proposed mitigation measures or alternative policies.*

(Enter text below)

- 6b) To what extent did consideration of EQIAs and consultations contribute to a change in policy, as opposed to policy decisions which would probably have been made in any event by your authority?

Prompt - Set out any key examples. What were the lessons learnt in terms of enablers and impediments to making a decision and taking into account an EQIA and consultation? What could your authority do in future to ensure decision making effectively takes these issues into account?

(Enter text below)

7. The authority's arrangements for training staff on issues relevant to the duties.

- 7a) To what extent were sufficient arrangements put in place to develop and deliver a training programme in accordance with scheme commitments?

Prompt - Was the training programme focused on the initial period of scheme implementation or did it effectively cover all five years? To what extent were outside trainers from representative groups used in designing or delivering training?

Was focused training for staff in management and roles associated with aspects of scheme implementation provided on an ongoing basis?

(Enter text below)

- 7b) Have all staff received awareness training and what could your authority do in future to deliver an effective training programme?

Prompt - Does the authority have evidence that over the past five years staff understood their role in implementing the scheme? What were the lessons learnt in terms of enablers and impediments to communication and training?

(Enter text below)

8. The authority's arrangements for ensuring and assessing public access to information and to services provided by the authority.

- 8a) To what extent were sufficient arrangements put in place to ensure and assess public access to information and to services provided by the authority?

Prompt - Was an audit of information provision undertaken? To what extent did you provide accessible formats without specific requests? What were the lessons learnt in terms of enablers and impediments to ensuring and assessing public access to information and to services? What could your authority do in future to ensure equality of opportunity in public access to information and to services?

(Enter text below)

9. The authority's timetable for measures proposed in the scheme.

- 9a) Outline the extent to which measures set out in the original timetable have been implemented. Any detailed information

should be included as an appendix to the report.
Prompt - Update any progress previously reported as underway or delayed. Has a mechanism been developed to report by exception i.e. on specific issues that have not been progressed?

(Enter text below)

- 9b) If your authority was to be reconstituted in the next five years what would be the main scheme actions/equality considerations that an incoming authority should address? Any detailed information should be included as an appendix to the report.
Prompt - Outline what arrangements could be put in place to transfer equality scheme knowledge.

(Enter text below)

10. Details of how the scheme will be published.

- 10a) Were scheme commitments in this section delivered and what evidence supports this view?

(Enter text below)

11. The authority's arrangements for dealing with complaints arising from a failure to comply with the scheme.

- 11a) Outline the number and nature of complaints received by your authority, and what your authority could do in future to develop its complaints handling process and learn from complaints.
Prompt - Outline the nature of complaints and scheme element e.g. screening, consultation. What effect did complaints have on the operation of your scheme?

(Enter text below)

12. A commitment to conducting a review of the scheme within five years of its submission to the Equality Commission and to forwarding a report of this review to the Equality Commission.

12a) What has been your authority's experience of conducting this review? To what extent has the Commission's guidance been useful in undertaking the review?

(Enter text below)

If you would like copies of this report in other languages or formats. Please contact:

Enquiry Line: 028 90 890 890
Reception: 028 90 500 600
Textphone: 028 90 500 589
Fax: 028 90 331 544
Email: section75@equalityni.org
Website: www.equalityni.org

Equality Commission for Northern Ireland
Equality House
7-9 Shaftesbury Square
Belfast
BT2 7DP

ISBN 978-1-906414-00-9