Policy Arc Limited and
Kremer Consultancy Services Ltd

Section 75 Screening and Equality Impact Assessment:
A Review of Recent Practice

Technical Report

For

The Equality Commission for Northern Ireland

Note: The views expressed in this report are those of the authors and do not necessarily represent the views of the Commission

Further information and advice

For further information and advice on the public sector equality, disability and good relations duties, please contact us at:

Telephone: 028 90 500600
Textphone: 028 90 500589
Email: information@equalityni.org
Website: www.equalityni.org
Twitter: @EqualityCommNI

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

June 2016

Contents

1. Findings of desk research

1.1 Analysis of activity by authority

An analysis of activity was undertaken by each designated public authority (n = 163) in relation to:

- size of authority;
- sector;
- reported screenings;
- online access;
- screenings reviewed;
- screened 'IN';
- type of template;
- use of data;
- mitigating actions;
- type of policy.

1.2 Analysis of screening templates

A separate analysis was undertaken of the 561 screening templates published by authorities in 2014/15 (and available on-line) in relation to the impacts identified (equality of opportunity/good relations, positive/negative, major/minor/none.

1.3 Designation of size of authority and sector

1.3.1 Designation by size

Small	1-25 employees
Medium	25-250 employees
Large	More than 250 employees

1.3.2 Designation by sector

1	NI Government Department and Agencies
2	Local government
3	Policing and justice
4	Housing
5	Health
6	Education
7	Other

1.4 Designation of policy types

Policies were designated as:

1. overarching strategy or high level policy, such as a corporate plan or good relations strategy;
2. single focus operational policy with an external focus, i.e. one with a direct impact on clients/customers, such as data recording procedures or new rules on service delivery;
3. single focus operational policy with an internal focus, i.e. one which affects staff only, such as recruitment procedures and procurement processes;
4. pilot scheme or programme, typically the implementation of a small part of a larger programme;
5. business to business policy, for example, where a public authority makes a grant to a third party service deliverer.

2.   Consultation framework

2.1 Themes and prompts for focus groups and interviews

1.   Carrying out screening

As a starting point, we would like to know who in your authority is responsible for carrying out screening, how the screening process is triggered and what kinds of issues are subjected to screening.

Main prompts:

1.1   What do you understand by 'screening'?
1.2   Does your organisation have a full time equality officer?
1.3   Who usually carries out screening?
1.4   How and when is the screening process triggered in your authority?
1.5   Who ensures consistency between screening processes?
1.6   What happens to the screening template after it has been completed?
1.7   Who receives a report on the outcome of the screening process?
1.8   What sorts of issues are routinely subjected to screening?

Supplementary prompts:

1.9   Is there a role in screening for senior managers?
1.10   How much access does the equality officer have to senior management team?
1.11   Is there a role for elected representatives / Board members / Ministers & advisors in screening?
1.12   Does your authority always screen high level policies?
        If not, why not?
1.13   Are equality and good relations issues always taken into account when high level policies are being developed?

2.   Use of data/evidence when screening

Our desk research showed that just over 50% of screening templates included data or evidence of some kind, but it was not always clear that it was directly relevant to the policy in question. We are therefore interested in how your authority sources and uses data and other evidence when assessing equality and good relations impacts.

Main prompts:

2.1   Do the people carrying out screening usually include some data or other kind of evidence?
2.2   Where does the data come from?
2.3   How is it recorded and presented?

2.4   Is data always necessary?

2.5   What kind of data is useful?

2.6   Is consideration of the likely impacts on equality of opportunity and/or good relations usually included in any consultations or discussions about the proposals?

Supplementary prompts:

2.7   Do you think the data/evidence presented in screening templates is useful in assessing impact?
        If not, why not?

2.8   What sort of data/evidence do you think would be most useful? Is this readily available?

2.9   Is new data ever collected for the screening process?
        If not, why not?

2.10   Does your authority consistently make use of available data/evidence?
        If not, why not?

2.11   Do officers understand the connection between data/evidence and assessing impacts?

3.   Outcomes of screening

Our desk research showed that 203 of the 561 screening templates that we examined identified some kind of likely impact on equality of opportunity and/or good relations. 63 screenings identified likely negative impacts and 36 went on to include proposed mitigating actions. We are interested in exploring further what happens as a result of screening.

Main prompts:

3.1   Does your authority follow the Commission's template and identify likely impacts, the type of impact (positive or negative) and the level of impact (major or minor or none)?

3.2   If you use another method or different terminology, please elaborate.

3.3   What happens when likely negative impacts for either equality of opportunity or good relations are identified? What recommendations are made?

3.4   What do you understand by the term 'mitigating actions'?

3.5   Do officers in your authority find it easy to identify actions to overcome possible negative impacts?

3.6   What happens when opportunities to better promote equality of opportunity or good relations are identified?

3.7   What do you understand by 'opportunities to better promote'? (For example, is this something that has already happened or something that might happen in the future?)

Supplementary prompts:

3.8   In your view, do officers seem to understand what 'impact' actually means?

3.9   Does your authority always identify mitigating actions where likely negative impacts are identified?
If not, why not?

3.10   Are officers reluctant to identify mitigating actions that may require extra work/resources?

3.11   What kind of mitigating actions does your authority tend to identify? For example:
1. changes to the policy as a result of screening/EQIA?
2. equality issues that have already been built into the policy?
3. actions to promote equality of opportunity that are already in place (e.g. provision of documents in alternative formats)?
4. actions which are not part of the implementation of the policy (e.g. bringing more balance to the display of historical artefacts in a public building to mitigate the negative impacts of flying the Union flag daily)?

3.12   What kind of mitigating actions do you think are the most useful and why?

3.13   When are mitigating actions normally carried out?

3.14   Have you ever undertaken any further engagement/consultation based on screening?

3.15   Have you carried out fewer EQIAs since the introduction of the new screening template?

4.   Good relations

During the desk research we noted a low number of policies where good relations were considered relevant to the policy/what was being reviewed or developed. When it was identified, some of the likely impacts identified for good relations either simply repeated what had already been reported under equality of opportunity, or good relations issues were not readily identified. We would be keen to consider these issues in more depth and including officers' understanding of likely good relations impacts.

Main prompts:

4.1   Have you any experience of answering the GR questions in the screening template, or filling in the screening template to conclude that good relations were relevant?

4.2   What sort of policies/functions or areas of your business are relevant for good relations?

4.3   Does screening help you to develop policies/ manage the good relations component?

4.4   What do you understand by the term 'good relations'?

4.5   What sort of likely impacts on good relations are generally identified during screening?

4.6   Do you think the screening template should be expanded to say more about good relations?

Supplementary prompts:

4.7   In your view, are likely impacts for good relations less likely to be identified by screening processes in your authority than equality of opportunity impacts?

4.8   Is there a reluctance to conclude that a policy might have negative impacts on good relations?
    If so, why?

4.9   Do officers know what to do when they decide that there are likely impacts on good relations?
    What sorts of actions are usually recommended?

5.   EQIAs

Our desk research seemed to indicate that overall there is very little activity in terms of EQIAs, and we would like to explore why this is the case.

Main prompts:

5.1   Has your authority carried out any EQIAs in the last two years?

5.2   What sort of consultation was carried out?

5.3   When was the consultation carried out?

5.4   What sort of response did you receive to the consultation?

5.5   How were the results of the consultation published?

Supplementary prompts:

5.6   In your experience, do officers try to avoid undertaking EQIAs?
    If so, why?

5.7   Which type of policy do you think should be subject to EQIA? For example,
1. High level policies/overarching strategies and the like (e.g. corporate plan, good relations strategy);
2. Technical procedures (e.g. data recording, new rules on service delivery);
3. Internal procedures (e.g. recruitment, procurement);
4. Business-to-business issues (e.g. making a grant to a third party service deliverer);
5. Other matters – please elaborate.

5.8   At what stage of policy development should a policy typically be subject to EQIA?

5.9   How are the equality of opportunity and good relations aspects of policies consulted on (if there is no EQIA)?

5.10   Does your authority generally carry out public consultation on the policy and EQIA consultation together or separately and why?

5.11   Have consultees ever asked for an EQIA where none was recommended?

5.12   What happened as a result?

6.   Finally – moving forward

The research to date has revealed a varied landscape of activity with regard to screening and EQIAs, with many examples of good practice but equally large elements of business that appears not to attract scrutiny under Section 75. We are interested in your views on how the Equality Scheme processes are helpful to you in fulfilling the statutory duties, which by turn will assist the Commission in its role going forward.

Main prompts:

6.1   From your experience, which parts of the screening process work well?

6.2   What would you most like to change about the screening process?

6.3   Do you think that the proposal of augmenting the EQIA methodology could help to assess your contribution to meeting the objectives of TBUC?

6.4   From your understanding of what screening/EQIA provides for, or is used for, could you see EQIA being adapted for assessing how you will meet objectives in a strategy?

2.3 EARS questions

1. Carrying out screening

1.1 Does your organisation have a full time equality officer?
1. Yes
2. No
3. Don't know

1.2 Who usually carries out screening?
1. Equality officer(s)
2. Policy officer
3. A team including 1&2
4. Various members of staff
5. Don't know

1.3 When is the screening process triggered in your authority?
1. Every time a policy is produced or revised
2. Only when a significant policy or decision is being made
3. Routinely as a part of consultation
4. Not routinely
5. Don't know

1.4 How is the screening process triggered in your authority?

1. As part of a report on the wider issue under consideration
2. As a separate issue
3. In response to a routine prompt from the equality officer
4. As part of the policy officer's duties
5. As a result of the equality officer being made aware of the wider issue
6. Don't know

1.5 Who ensures consistency between screening processes?
1. Equality officer
2. Senior management
3. Other
4. No-one

1.6 What normally happens to the screening template after it has been completed?
1. Nothing
2. Lodged in central record
3. Returned to equality officer

4. Passed to policy/senior officers
5. Published on website
6. Don't know

1.7   Who receives information or a report on the outcome of the screening process?
1. Equality officer
2. Senior management
3. No-one
4. Other
5. Don't know

1.8   What sort of issues are routinely subjected to screening (press all that apply)?
1. High level policies/overarching strategies and the like (e.g. corporate plan, good relations strategy);
2. Technical procedures (e.g. data recording, new rules on service delivery);
3. Internal procedures (e.g. recruitment, procurement);
4. Business-to-business issues (e.g. making a grant to a third party service deliverer);
5. Other matters.

1.9   Is there a role in screening for senior managers?
1. Yes
2. No
3. Don't know

1.10   How much access does the equality officer have to senior management team?
1. None
2. Some
3. A lot
4. Don't know

1.11   Is there a role for elected representatives / Board members / Ministers & advisors in screening?
1. Yes
2. No
3. Don't know

1.12   Does your authority always screen high level policies?
1. Yes
2. No
3. Don't know

1.13   Are equality and good relations issues always taken into account when high level policies are being developed?

1.   Yes
2.   No
3.   Don't know

2.   Use of data/evidence when screening

2.1   Do the people carrying out screening usually include some data or other kind of evidence?

1.   Yes, always
2.   Yes, often
3.   Yes, sometimes
4.   Never
5.   Don't know

2.2   Where does the data come from?

1.   Internal sources
2.   External sources
3.   Both
4.   Standard database (e.g. equality profile)
5.   Don't know

2.3   Is data always necessary?

1.   Yes, always
2.   Yes, often
3.   Yes, sometimes
4.   Never
5.   Don't know

2.4   Is consideration of the likely impacts on equality of opportunity and/or good relations usually included in any consultations or discussions about the proposals?

1.   Yes, always
2.   Yes, often
3.   Yes, sometimes
4.   Never
5.   Don't know

2.5   Do you think the data/evidence presented in screening templates is useful in assessing impact?

1.   Yes, always

2. Yes, often
3. Yes, sometimes
4. Never
5. Don't know

2.6 Is new data ever collected for the screening process?
1. Yes, always
2. Yes, often
3. Yes, sometimes
4. Never
5. Don't know

2.7 Does your authority consistently make use of available data/evidence?
1. Yes, always
2. Yes, often
3. Yes, sometimes
4. Never
5. Don't know

2.8 Do officers understand the connection between data/evidence and assessing impacts?
1. Yes, completely
2. Yes, partly
3. No
4. Don't know

3. Outcomes of screening

3.1 Does your authority follow the Commission's template?
1. Yes
2. No
3. Don't know

3.2 Does your authority always identify the type of impact (positive or negative)?
1. Yes
2. No
3. Varies
4. Don't know

3.3 Does your authority identify the level of impact as major, minor or none?
1. Yes
2. No

3. Use some other system
4. Don't know

3.4   Are officers in your authority normally able to identify actions to overcome possible negative impacts?
1. Yes, always
2. Yes, often
3. Yes, sometimes
4. Never
5. Don't know

3.5   In your view, do officers seem to understand what 'impact' actually means?
1. Yes, always
2. Yes, often
3. Yes, sometimes
4. Never
5. Don't know

3.6   Does your authority identify mitigating actions where likely negative impacts are identified?
1. Yes, always
2. Yes, often
3. Yes, sometimes
4. Never

3.7   Are officers reluctant to identify mitigating actions that may require extra work/resources?
1. Yes, always
2. Yes, often
3. Yes, sometimes
4. Never
5. Don't know

3.8   What kind of mitigating actions does your authority tend to identify? (press for all that apply)
1. Changes to the policy as a result of screening/EQIA?
2. Equality issues that have already been built into the policy?
3. Actions to promote equality of opportunity that are already in place (e.g. provision of documents in alternative formats)?

4. Actions which are not part of the implementation of the policy (e.g. bringing more balance to the display of historical artefacts in a public building to mitigate the negative impacts of flying the Union flag daily)?
5. Actions relating to other policies
6. Not applicable
7. Don't know

3.9   When are mitigating actions normally identified?
1. Before screening
2. During screening
3. After screening
4. It depends
5. Not applicable
6. Don't know

3.10   Have you carried out fewer EQIAs since the introduction of the new screening template?
1. Yes, a lot fewer
2. Yes, somewhat fewer
3. No
4. Don't know

4.   Good relations

4.1   Does screening help you to develop policies/ manage the good relations component?
1. Yes, completely
2. Yes, partly
3. No
4. Don't know

4.2   Do you think the screening template should be expanded to say more about good relations?
1. Yes
2. No
3. Don't know

4.3   In your view, are likely impacts for good relations less likely to be identified by screening processes in your authority than equality of opportunity impacts?
1. Yes
2. No
3. Don't know

4.4 **Is there a reluctance to conclude that a policy might have negative impacts on good relations?**
1. Yes
2. No
3. Don't know

4.5 **Do officers know what to do when they decide that there are likely impacts on good relations?**
1. Yes, completely
2. Yes, partly
3. No
4. Don't know

5. **EQIAs**

5.1 **Has your authority carried out any EQIAs in the last two years?**
1. Yes
2. No
3. Don't know

5.2 **In your experience, do officers try to avoid undertaking EQIAs?**
1. Yes, always
2. Yes, often
3. Yes, sometimes
4. Never
5. Don't know

5.3 **Which type of policy do you think should be subject to EQIA? (press all that apply)**
1. High level policies/overarching strategies and the like (e.g. corporate plan, good relations strategy);
2. Technical procedures (e.g. data recording, new rules on service delivery);
3. Internal procedures (e.g. recruitment, procurement);
4. Business-to-business issues (e.g. making a grant to a third party service deliverer);
5. Other matters;
6. Don't know

5.4 **At what stage of policy development should a policy typically be subject to EQIA?**
1. At any early stage of policy development;
2. When options are being considered;
3. Prior to implementation;

    4. After implementation.

    5. Don't know

5.5   Does your authority generally carry out public consultation on the policy and EQIA consultation jointly?

    1. Yes, always

    2. Yes, often

    3. Yes, sometimes

    4. Never

    5. Don't know

5.6   Have consultees ever asked for an EQIA where none was recommended?

    1. Yes

    2. No

    3. Don't know

6.   Finally – moving forward

6.1   From your understanding of what screening/EQIA provides for, or is used for, could you see EQIA being adapted for assessing how you will meet objectives in a strategy?

    1. Yes, always

    2. Yes, often

    3. Yes, sometimes

    4. Never

    5. Don't know

2.3 Written questionnaire

A.   Carrying out screening

As a starting point, we would like to know who in your authority is responsible for carrying out screening, how the screening process is triggered and what kinds of issues are subjected to screening.

1. Does your authority have an equality officer?

Yes – full time	
Yes – part time	
Part of the duties of another postholder	
No	
Other – please specify	

2. Who usually carries out screening?

Equality officer(s)	
Policy officer	
A team including the above	
Various members of staff	
Other – please specify	

3. When is the screening process triggered in your authority?

Every time a policy is produced or revised	
When a significant policy or decision is being made	
Routinely as a part of consultation	
Not routinely	
Other – please specify	

4. How is the screening process triggered in your authority (indicate all that apply)?

As part of a report on the wider issue under consideration	
As a separate issue	
In response to a routine prompt from the equality officer	
As part of the policy officer's duties	
Other – please specify	

5. Who ensures consistency between screening processes?

Equality officer	
Senior management	
No-one	
Other – please specify	

6. What normally happens to the screening template after it has been completed?

Nothing	
Lodged in central record	
Returned to equality officer	
Passed to policy/senior officers	
Published on website	
Other – please specify	

7. Who receives information or a report on the outcome of the screening process (indicate all that apply)?

Equality officer	
Senior management	
Elected Representatives, Board/Council Members, etc.	
No-one	
Other – please specify	

8. What sort of issues are routinely subjected to screening (indicate all that apply)?

High level policies/overarching strategies and the like (e.g. corporate plan, good relations strategy)	
Technical procedures (e.g. data recording, new rules on service delivery)	
Internal procedures (e.g. recruitment, procurement)	
Business-to-business issues (e.g. making a grant to a third party service deliverer)	
Other – please specify	

9. Is there anything else you would like to say about the way the screening process operates in your authority?

B.   Use of data/evidence when screening

Our desk research showed that just over 50% of screening templates included data or evidence of some kind, but it was not always clear that it was directly relevant to the policy in question. We are therefore interested in how your authority sources and uses data and other evidence when assessing equality and good relations impacts.

10. Do the people carrying out screening usually include some data or other kind of evidence?

Yes, always	
Yes, often	
Yes, sometimes	
Never	
Other – please specify	

11. Where does the data come from (indicate all that apply)?

Internal sources	
External sources	
Standard database (e.g. equality profile)	
Other – please specify	

12. In your opinion, is the data always necessary?

Yes, always	
Yes, often	
Yes, sometimes	
Never	
Other – please specify	

13. Is consideration of the likely impacts on equality of opportunity/good relations usually included in any consultations or discussions about the proposals?

Yes, always	
Yes, often	

Yes, sometimes	
Never	
Other – please specify	

14. Is there anything else you would like to say about the way data/evidence is used in the screening process?

C. Outcomes of screening

Our desk research showed that 203 of the 561 screening templates that we examined identified some kind of likely impact on equality of opportunity and/or good relations. 63 screenings identified likely negative impacts and 36 went on to include proposed mitigating actions. We are interested in exploring further what happens as a result of screening.

15. Does your authority follow the Commission's screening template?

Yes	
Yes with additional sections	
No	
Don't know	

16. Does your authority always identify the type of impact (positive or negative)?

Yes, always	
Yes, often	
Yes, sometimes	
Never	
Other – please specify	

17. Does your authority always identify the level of impact as major, minor or none?

Yes, always	
Yes, often	
Yes, sometimes	
Never	
Use some other system – please specify	

18. In your opinion, do officers seem to understand what 'impact' actually means?

Yes, always	
Yes, often	
Yes, sometimes	
Never	
Other – please specify	

19. Are officers in your authority normally able to identify mitigating actions to overcome possible negative impacts?

Yes, always	
Yes, often	
Yes, sometimes	
Never	
Other – please specify	

20. Please give us some examples of the type of mitigating actions identified in recent screening templates.

21. In your opinion, do officers seem to understand what 'opportunities to better promote equality of opportunity/good relations' actually means?

Yes, always	
Yes, often	
Yes, sometimes	
Never	
Other – please specify	

22. What happens when 'opportunities to better promote' are identified?

Mitigating actions are triggered	
A separate action plan is developed	
A note is made for future action	
The situation is monitored so that future opportunities can be identified	
Varies	
Other – please specify	

23. Is there anything else you would like to say about what happens in your authority as a result of screening?

```

```

D. Good relations

During the desk research we noted a low number of policies where good relations were considered relevant to the policy/what was being reviewed or developed. When it was identified, some of the likely impacts identified for good relations either simply repeated what had already been reported under equality of opportunity, or good relations issues were not readily identified. We would be keen to consider these issues in more depth and including officers' understanding of likely good relations impacts.

24. What sort of policies/functions or areas of your business are relevant for good relations?

```

```

25. What sort of likely impacts on good relations are typically identified during screening?

```

```

26. Does screening help to develop policies/manage the good relations component?

Yes, completely	
Yes, partly	
No	
Varies	
Other – please specify	

27. Do officers generally know what to do when they decide that there are likely impacts on good relations?

Yes, always	
Yes, often	
Yes, sometimes	
Never	
Other – please specify	

28. Please give us some examples of the type of actions taken/recommended when good relations impacts have been identified in recent screening templates.

```



```

29. Do you think the screening template should be expanded to say more about good relations?

Yes	
No	
Don't know	

30. If you answered yes to Q29, please let us know what sort of expansion you think would be helpful.

```



```

31. Is there anything else you would like to say about the screening process in respect of good relations?

```



```

E.   EQIAs

Our desk research seemed to indicate that overall there is very little activity in terms of EQIAs, and we would like to explore why this is the case.

32. Has your authority carried out any EQIAs in the last two years?

Yes	
No	
Don't know	

Note: If you answered no or don't know, please go to Q39

33. Please list the EQIAs carried out by your authority in the last two years (short titles are sufficient).

```



```

34. What sort of consultation was typically carried out for each EQIA (indicate all that apply)?

Written consultation (e.g. on-line)	

Focus groups or similar	
Public meetings	
Combination of the above	
Other – please specify	

35. When was the EQIA consultation typically undertaken?

At an early stage of the policy development	
When options were being considered	
Prior to implementation	
After implementation	
Other – please specify	

36. What sort of response do you typically receive to an EQIA consultation?

None – or very little	
Reasonable response	
High level of response	
Other – please specify	

37. Please tell us a little more about the sort of response you have received.

38. How were the results of the EQIA consultation published?

Separate EQIA final report	
As part of another report	
Consultees/respondents informed of results	
Some combination of the above	
Not published	
Other – please specify	

39. In your experience, do officers try to avoid undertaking EQIAs?

Yes, always	
Yes, often	
Yes, sometimes	
Never	
Don't know	

40. If you answered yes to Q39, why do you think officers try to avoid undertaking EQIAs (indicate all that apply)?

Takes too much time	
Takes too many resources	
Raises issues that are difficult to address	
Low response to EQIA consultations in the past	
Other – please specify	

41. Is there anything else you would like to say about EQIAs?

F.   Finally – moving forward

The research to date has revealed a varied landscape of activity with regard to screening and EQIAs, with many examples of good practice but equally large elements of business that appears not to attract scrutiny under Section 75. We are interested in your views on how the Equality Scheme processes are helpful to you in fulfilling the statutory duties, which by turn will assist the Commission in its role going forward.

42. From your experience, which parts of the screening process work well?

43. What would you most like to change about the screening process?

44. From your understanding of what screening/EQIA provides for, or is used for, could you see the processes being adapted for assessing how you will meet objectives in a strategy?

Yes, always	
Yes, often	
Yes, sometimes	
Never	
Don't know	

G.   Further comments

45. is there anything else you would like to tell us?

3. Consultation response analysis

3.1 Focus group and interview participants[1]

COUNT	REF	ORGANISATION	SECTOR	SIZE
1	13	Belfast City Council	2	L
2	15	Belfast H&SC Trust	5	L
3	27	Charity Commissioners	7	S
4	28	PSNI	3	L
5	30	Criminal Justice Inspection	3	S
6	33	Clanmil Housing Association	4	L
7	39	Construction Industry Training Board	7	M
8	45	DRD	1	L
9	46	DSD	1	L
10	47	DE	1	L
11	50	DFP	1	L
12	51	DARD	1	L
13	53	DOE	1	L
14	54	DHSSPS	1	L
15	58	Education Authority	6	M
16	63	Fold Group	4	L
17	67	Belfast Metropolitan College	6	L
18	68	North West College	6	L
19	69	Northern College	6	L
20	70	South Eastern College	6	L
21	71	South Western College	6	L
22	72	Southern College	6	L
23	85	Invest NI	1	L
24	87	Lisburn & Castlereagh City Council	2	L
25	90	Local Government Staff Commission	2	S
26	94	Mid & East Antrim Borough Council	2	L
27	100	Newry Mourne & Down District Council	2	L
28	102	North Belfast Housing Association	4	M
29	103	Ards & North Down Borough Council	2	L
30	105	Northern H&SC Trust	5	L
31	107	NI Assembly Commission	1	L
32	110	Blood Transfusion Service	5	M
33	112	Co-ownership Housing	4	M
34	132	Ofcom	7	S

---

[1] Authorities which responded to the written questionnaire have not been listed in this table as a number of respondents requested total anonymity.

35	140	**Probation Board NI**	3	L
36	142	**Public Health Agency**	5	L
37	143	**BSO (Health)**	5	L
38	150	**Southern H&SC Trust**	5	L
39	151	**SEUPB**	7	M
40	156	**Triangle Housing Association**	4	M
41	158	**Ulster University**	6	L

3.2 Summary of all responses by prompts

2.1 Carrying out screening

Main prompts:

2.1.1   What do you understand by 'screening'?

(a) Qualitative analysis

A number of focus group and interview participants indicated that, in their organisations, screening was now cast as no more than a bureaucratic or 'box ticking' chore that was typically carried out at the end of policy development but prior to policy implementation, almost as an 'insurance policy' but with little buy-in from staff to the process. In contrast, to the majority, screening was a term used to describe the entire process whereby s75 was embedded in the policy development process from the earliest stage. This was seen as the ideal but practical impediments to achieving this ideal were described as manifold, including knowing when and how often to screen and, more generally, the demands made on limited resources by the operation of so many parallel regulatory processes. Discussion often touched on the need to have proportionate screening tools depending on the type of policy under scrutiny and the stage of policy development. Some organisations were able to describe sector-wide arrangements, past or present, whereby screening of common policies could be carried out in partnership with equivalent organisations; these arrangements were seen as an efficient and effective use of available expertise and resources.

(b) Quantitative analysis

This question was not included in either the EARS responses or the written questionnaire.

2.1.2   Does your organisation have a full time equality officer?

(a) Qualitative analysis

Apart from large bodies, the number of organisations with dedicated equality officers appears to be in decline, with these duties generally now carried out alongside a range of other HR or policy functions. In smaller organisations the time devoted to s75 was often limited among designated staff, and increasingly this time was becoming scarcer. Many described the work as spasmodic across a typical year, depending on new policy initiatives along with routine functions (e.g. Annual s75 Report).

(b) Quantitative analysis

According to the EARS responses, 50% of focus group participants indicated that their authority had a full time equality officer. 42% of respondents to the written questionnaire indicated that their authority had a full or part-time equality officer while 50% stated that the responsibility was part of the duties of another post-holder.

2.1.3   Who usually carries out screening?

(a) Qualitative analysis

Responses to this prompt varied considerably, with some organisations having s75 staff take the lead role, others giving responsibility to policy owners, while others used a combination of the two. The liaison or exchange ('bouncing') between policy owners and s75 staff was often valued in screening, and, if handled well, led to a growth of experience and expertise over time. 'Buy in' among staff with little s75 background was seen as critical, and it was argued that the temptation to do too much had to be avoided to discourage a dependency culture and instead to grow the skills of a range of staff. Several focus group and interview respondents mentioned that support provided to policy owners must be timely and proportionate.

(b) Quantitative analysis

According to the EARS responses, only 4% of focus group participants stated that the equality officer usually carried out screening, 33% that the policy officer did so, 38% that screening was carried out by a team including these officers and 25% that screening was carried out by various members of staff. Respondents to the written questionnaire indicated a similar level of variance with 12% indicating that the equality officer carried out screening, 23% that the policy officer did so, 31% that screening was carried out by a team including these officers and 35% that screening was carried out by various members of staff.

2.1.4　How and when is the screening process triggered in your authority?

(a) Qualitative analysis

Focus group and interview participants indicated that a few organisations appeared to have tried and tested systems whereby a 'policy template' was adopted for all new policies, and this form often included screening questions to ensure this was an integral part of the policy development process. In many others, the trigger for screening appeared to be more haphazard, with internal/HR policies and procedures more likely to be scrutinised while outward looking policies often escaped the net unless there was a good relationship between policy leads and s75 personnel. Others made mention of policy review cycles that included s75 scrutiny but these tended to be in the minority.

(b) Quantitative analysis

According to the EARS responses, 50% of focus group participants indicated that the screening process was triggered every time a policy was produced or revised. Similarly, the majority of respondents to the written questionnaire (53%) indicated that this was the case in their authority.

In terms of how the screening process was triggered, the EARS responses showed that 50% of focus group participants indicated that screening was part of the policy officer's duties. Similarly, 41% of respondents to the written questionnaire indicated that screening was part of the policy officer's duties; 22% of respondents said that screening formed part of the wider issue under consideration.

2.1.5　Who ensures consistency between screening processes?

(a) Qualitative analysis

Focus group and interview participants indicated that, in the main, the designated s75 person(s) scrutinised the screening templates prior to sign off, and would often 'bounce back' the template to policy makers if there were any issues. However, it was disconcerting that in a small number of organisations there was no clearly defined quality control system, instead screening templates were simply signed off without further scrutiny. Rarely were senior management involved in this process.

(b) Quantitative analysis

According to the EARS responses, 71% of focus group participants indicated that the equality officer ensured consistency between screening processes and only 8% indicating that senior management was involved. The majority of respondents to the written questionnaire (56%) indicated that the equality officer (or the person with s75 responsibility) ensured consistency between screening processes with 37% indicating that senior management was involved. The written questionnaire analysis showed that senior management was more likely to be involved in the Government Department sector (50%) and Health sector (60%).

2.1.6　What happens to the screening template after it has been completed?

(a) Qualitative analysis

Many organisations lodged either the templates themselves or the screening decisions on to their website. (However, it was not clear if all had designated s75 or 'equality' areas on the website, making access potentially problematic.) Others passed the template 'up the line' for sign-off by senior officers and/or the Board, and many appeared to value the opportunity for others to look over the template prior to publication of the screening decision ('a challenge function'). It would appear that the level of scrutiny provided by senior management was generally low unless issues of significance or reputational threat came forward. Quarterly reports of screening activity to senior management appeared to be commonplace among larger organisations in particular or those with good administrative systems in place.

(b) Quantitative analysis

Only 4% of focus group participants and 12% of respondents to the written questionnaire indicated that the template was passed to senior officers. According to the EARS responses, 21% of focus group participants indicated that the screening template was returned to the equality officer and 63% indicated that it was published on the website. 27% of respondents to the written questionnaire indicated that the template was returned to the equality officer, 27% said it was lodged in the central record and 33% stated that it was published on the website.

2.1.7　Who receives a report on the outcome of the screening process?

(a) Qualitative analysis

It was rare for Senior Management Teams (SMTs) or Boards etc. to consider individual screening forms but instead screening activity would typically be reported to SMT on a regular basis (e.g. quarterly reports) unless a matter of urgency or significance came

forward. A small number appeared unsure as to the reporting mechanism that was in place, suggesting that routine scrutiny may not have been the norm and in particular this was the case in smaller organisations.

(b) Quantitative analysis

In contrast to verbally stated evidence, according to the EARS responses, 50% of focus group participants indicated that a report on the outcome of the screening process was made to senior management. 31% of respondents to the written questionnaire indicated that a report was made to senior management and 21% indicated that a report was made to Elected Representatives, Board/Council Members etc.. Respondents from the Education sector indicated that it was less likely that reports would be made to the latter group with none of the respondents indicating that this would happen.

2.1.8   What sorts of issues are routinely subjected to screening?

(a) Qualitative analysis

Responses to this prompt varied considerably. Some claimed that all new or revised policies and programmes were routinely screened while others had applied screening only to large policy areas along with significant decisions, while others appeared unclear as to how areas of business were selected for screening; the suspicion must be that here the selection process was somewhat haphazard. While some focused attention on outward looking or service-user policies, others appeared to regard inward looking or HR policies as the primary business of s75. Even within sectors, variability in activity was noteworthy with examples of considerable and committed activity sitting alongside those who appeared to screen infrequently at best.

(b) Quantitative analysis

According to the EARS responses, around one third of focus group participants indicated that most types of policy were routinely subjected to screening, with 29% citing high level policies, 29% citing technical procedures and 24% citing internal procedures. Similarly, respondents to the written questionnaire indicated that most types of policy were routinely subjected to screening, with 29% citing high level policies, 22% citing technical procedures and 29% citing internal procedures.

Supplementary prompts

2.1.9   Is there a role in screening for senior managers?

(a) Qualitative analysis

In some bodies (and especially small and medium sized organisations), senior managers adopted an active, overseeing role and would either sign off screening forms or be kept apprised of s75 activity generally, with regular contact with s75 staff. In other organisations it was clear that, while there may be s75 activity going on within the organisation, senior management knew little of this work unless a significant or contentious matter threatened the reputation of the organisation, and equality matters were rarely raised at SMT or Board level.

(b) Quantitative analysis

According to the EARS responses, 75% of focus group participants thought that there was a role in screening for senior managers. This question was not included in the written questionnaire.

2.1.10 How much access does the equality officer have to senior management team?

(a) Qualitative analysis

Generally, access was seen as good but somewhat ad hoc and certainly dependent on a good working relationship having been built up between s75 staff and management over a considerable period of time. When staff moved, this could cause a problem or hiatus which damaged s75 work and took some time to re-establish.

(b) Quantitative analysis

According to the EARS responses, 67% of focus group respondents indicated that the equality staff had a lot of access to the senior management team, with 33% saying that the equality officer has some access. This question was not included in the written questionnaire.

2.1.11   Is there a role for elected representatives / Board members / Ministers & advisors in screening?

(a) Qualitative analysis

In some organisations, elected representatives were given regular updates on s75 activity and including screening, and were up to speed with any developments, often also having been trained in s75. Unfortunately, these organisations tended to be in the minority, the norm was more likely to be infrequent engagement with s75 unless a significant issue had come forward for special attention.

(b) Quantitative analysis

According to the EARS responses, 63% of focus group participants thought that there was a role for elected representatives, Board members, Ministers or advisors in screening, a figure which was higher than the discussions suggested was the case. This question was not included in the written questionnaire.

2.1.12 Does your authority always screen high level policies?

(a) Qualitative analysis

While the majority stated that all policies were routinely screened and including high level strategies, a significant minority maintained that this was not always the case. S75 was frequently described as more effective in addressing practical policies and procedures and that while some did screen high level policies (e.g. Corporate Plan), this work was rarely insightful. The vague, projective nature of these policies often did not lend itself to screening in the view of some respondents.

(b) Quantitative analysis

According to the EARS responses, 50% of focus group participants indicated that their authority always screened high level policies, with 38% indicating that they did not. This question was not included in the written questionnaire.

2.1.13 Are equality and good relations issues always taken into account when high level policies are being developed?

(a) Qualitative analysis

A number of participants argued that public consultation on high level policies routinely included these issues. In others, it was maintained that these issues were taken into account but often in an intuitive and non-systematic way, and screening was not routinely cited. Instead a general awareness of the importance of the issues ensured that they were afforded due regard. For many, a distinction was made between the two issues, with good relations less likely to be routinely taken into account. A minority argued that there was a keen awareness of s75 issues generally among senior management.

(b) Quantitative analysis

According to the EARS responses, 50% of focus group participants indicated that equality of opportunity and good relations issues were always taken into account when high level policies were being developed; 42% said they were not and 8% indicated that they did not know. This question was not included in the written questionnaire.

2.2 Use of data/evidence when screening

Main prompts:

2.2.1   Do the people carrying out screening usually include some data or other kind of evidence?

(a) Qualitative analysis

Responses tended to vary considerably. The majority of focus group and interview participants did include some data although often this was seen as being far from comprehensive or insightful. There were some examples of elaborate and sophisticated systems for capturing data involving both internal and external sources while others described narrow internal and/or external sources that were routinely included in screening but were not always of immediate relevance to the policy in question. Others argued that data itself was not generally relevant to certain policy areas where guidance notes, for example, were more germane.

(b) Quantitative analysis

According to the EARS responses, the majority of focus group participants (84%) indicated that the people carrying out screening included some data or other kind of evidence always or often. The corresponding figure for respondents to the written questionnaire was only 46%, although 31% indicated that they sometimes included data.

2.2.2   Where does the data come from?

(a) Qualitative analysis

Focus group and interview participants indicated that while larger organisations may have had dedicated statistical units, these were exceptional and becoming even rarer. Some also had developed good data management systems for both service users and staff but these were once more infrequent. More often the data came from a range of internal and external sources including benchmarking of populations and some profiling of service users and staff monitoring data. NISRA (and less frequently NINIS) was often cited as a useful data source. A number mentioned that qualitative data (e.g. asking colleagues or representatives) was invaluable, or being imaginative in terms of potential data sources (e.g. complaints, harassment advisors). Overall it was not commonplace to gather new data for screening but instead to rework existing data.

(b) Quantitative analysis

According to the EARS responses, the majority of focus group participants (89%) said that data came from both internal and external sources. The most frequent response from respondents to the written questionnaire was that data was sourced from internal and external sources and standard databases, although the Government Department and Education sectors were more likely to rely on internal data sources.

2.2.3   How is it recorded and presented?

(a) Qualitative analysis

Respondents reported that this was either by way of a catalogue of the data sources referenced, or a summary of key or headline statistics. It was seen as less likely that the data would be used to tell a coherent story relating to the specifics of the policy in question.

(b) Quantitative analysis

This question was not included in either the EARS responses or the written questionnaire.

2.2.4   Is data always necessary?

(a) Qualitative analysis

While many focus group and interview participants would initially say yes to this question, for example 'to make you think', on further reflection it was more likely that the majority went on to argue that screening could be carried out without data on occasion, and in particular if the issues were already known or glaringly obvious, or the policy had yet to be enacted and modelling data was not available or appropriate. In these occasions some described using pilot projects to gather data before final implementation. Others argued that common sense and intuition was often sufficient to screen effectively.

(b) Quantitative analysis

According to the EARS responses, 50% of focus group participants thought that data was always or often necessary, with 50% saying that it was sometimes necessary. Only 30% of respondents to the written questionnaire said that, in their opinion, data was always or often necessary, with 40% saying that it was sometimes necessary. 25% of respondents in the Government Department sector said that data was never necessary.

2.2.5   What kind of data is useful?

(a) Qualitative analysis

Typically, focus group and interview respondents would say that the kind of data that was useful depends entirely on the policy area. However, on further probing a significant number argued that qualitative data (e.g. how people thought about and experienced an issue) was often much more valuable than numbers alone. It was argued that the actual percentage of people experiencing an adverse effect was often irrelevant but their experience was relevant.

(b) Quantitative analysis

This question was not included in either the EARS responses or the written questionnaire.

2.2.6   Is consideration of the likely impacts on equality of opportunity and/or good relations usually included in any consultations or discussions about the proposals?

(a) Qualitative analysis

There were varied responses to this prompt from focus group and interview participants. In some bodies, and especially larger organisations or those operating in politically sensitive domains, public consultation included specific sections/reference to EO and GR, while others maintained that almost inevitably these issues emerged naturally during the course of consultation when people were describing differential impacts of new proposals. For others, it was stated that EO and/or GR issues were raised infrequently.

(b) Quantitative analysis

According to the EARS responses, 33% of focus group participants indicated that consideration of the likely impacts on equality of opportunity/good relations was always included in any consultation or discussions about the proposals, with 38% indicating that it was often included and 25% saying it was sometimes included.

Only 19% of respondents to the written questionnaire indicated that consideration of the likely impacts on equality of opportunity/good relations was always included in any consultation or discussions about the proposals, with 35% indicating that it was often included and 42% saying it was sometimes included.

Supplementary prompts:

2.2.7   Do you think the data/evidence presented in screening templates is useful in assessing impact? If not, why not?

(a) Qualitative analysis

Across the sample, it was frequently argued that data was often merely included for its own sake but in reality was not critical in assessing adverse impacts. The disconnect between these two parts of the template was often alluded to, where officers may have gathered data but then saw the identification of adverse impacts as a separate enterprise. Others argued that specific types of data had the potential to be useful including benchmarking and

profiling data. Where representative groups may have alternative views then data was seen as valuable in countering these arguments.

(b) Quantitative analysis

According to the EARS responses, 100% of focus group participants indicated that data was often or sometimes useful in assessing impact, but none thought it was always useful. This question was not included in the written questionnaire.

2.2.8   What sort of data/evidence do you think would be most useful? Is this readily available?

(a) Qualitative analysis

Up to date benchmarking and profiling data of service users was regularly cited but seen as difficult and resource intensive to gather and to keep current. A number did argue that qualitative data was often the most useful type of data, sometimes derived from consultative exercises (including Consultative Panels), while others argued that the type of data which was relevant varied considerably and depended entirely on the policy in question.

(b) Quantitative analysis

This question was not included in either the EARS responses or the written questionnaire.

2.2.9   Is new data ever collected for the screening process? If not, why not?

(a) Qualitative data

The majority did maintain that new data was gathered, and some stated that this was common practice but were perhaps less forthcoming in giving concrete examples. Some described the use of pilot schemes during screening while others argued that existing data sets were often reworked during screening.

(b) Quantitative analysis

According to the EARS responses, the majority of focus group participants (80%) indicated that new data was often or sometimes collected for the screening process; only 4% said it was always collected and 17% said it was never collected. This question was not included in the written questionnaire.

2.2.10 Does your authority consistently make use of available data/evidence?

(a) Qualitative analysis

The overwhelming majority of those interviewed argued that data was useful in helping inform decision-making but the quality of that data, and the effort devoted to gathering it, varied considerably. While some had robust systems in place, others maintained that their data sources were not strong or broad in scope and in all honesty were not always of great relevance to the policy in question.

(b) Quantitative analysis

Without reference to the quality of the data itself, according to the EARS responses, all the focus group participants indicated that their authority consistently made use of available data/evidence always (21%), often (50%) or sometimes (29%). This question was not included in the written questionnaire.

2.2.11 Do officers understand the connection between data/evidence and assessing impacts?

(a) Qualitative analysis

The majority stated that officers generally did, and especially experienced staff in business areas where s75 was of particular concern. However, on closer examination it often appeared that on many occasions officers needed support from s75 staff to help recognise this link, and those policy officers with less experience rarely saw this connection without considerable help. At the same time, a number of participants argued that there were signs of some improvement with growing evidence that these links were becoming better understood among younger staff in particular.

(b) Quantitative analysis

According to the EARS responses, the majority of focus group participants (75%) indicated that officers partly understand the connection between data/evidence and assessing impacts; only 8% said that officers understood the connection completely. This question was not included in the written questionnaire.

2.3 Outcomes of screening

Main prompts:

2.3.1   Does your authority follow the Commission's template and identify likely impacts, the type of impact (positive or negative) and the level of impact (major or minor or none)?

(a) Qualitative analysis

The majority of focus group and interview participants did appear to follow the Commission's template although a number went on to describe dissatisfaction with the layout, structure and language adopted in the form and also mentioned local variants that had emerged over time. For example, one sector had recently adopted a two-tier approach that allowed more technical policies and procedures with few s75 considerations to be 'fast tracked' through screening, while others applied an abbreviated form in early stages of policy development and prior to using the full form before full implementation. Given the general variability across the sample, the strong consensus that a 'one size fits all' approach to screening did not work was noteworthy.

(b) Quantitative analysis

According to the EARS responses, 96% of the focus group participants indicated that their authority followed the Commission's template. 83% indicated that their authority always identified the type of impact (positive or negative) and 100% indicated that their authority always identified the level of impact as major, minor or none. Respondents to the written

questionnaire indicated that they either followed the Commission's screening template (56%) or used the Commission's template with additional sections (40%). 71% of respondents indicated that their authority always identified the type of impact (positive or negative) and 58% indicated that their authority always identified the level of impact as major, minor or none. The remaining 42% indicated that they did so either often or sometimes.

2.3.2   If you use another method or different terminology, please elaborate.

(a) Qualitative analysis

A small number of focus group and interview participants had developed their own screening forms without elaborating as to their form or content. Some variants had included additional guidance, adapted language used to make it more user friendly, or had introduced new sections, for example to clarify the decision made at the end of the screening process.

(b) Quantitative analysis

This question was not included in either the EARS responses or the written questionnaire.

2.3.3   What happens when likely negative impacts for either equality of opportunity or good relations are identified? What recommendations are made?

(a) Qualitative analysis

The majority of focus group and interview participants stated that this triggered the identification of mitigating measures, although the timing of this process was less clear. Discussion often revealed that the mitigating measures had already been introduced prior to screening but that the template did not allow for acknowledgment of the introduction of these previous positive actions. Where it was not considered practical or feasible to mitigate then justifications for not proceeding would be outlined. The political nature of policy development was alluded to by some respondents, often constraining the range of actions available considerably.

(b) Quantitative analysis

This question was not included in either the EARS responses or the written questionnaire.

2.3.4   What do you understand by the term 'mitigating actions'?

(a) Qualitative analysis

While various terms were offered by focus group and interview participants, there was a strong consensus focusing around positive actions to alleviate, ease, remove, lessen or mitigate adverse effects. There was less agreement as to whether this referred to past, present, or future actions in the screening form, with once more some debate as to whether the existing template adequately captures historical activities or only looks towards proposed actions.

(b) Quantitative analysis

This question was not included in either the EARS responses or the written questionnaire.

2.3.5   Do officers in your authority find it easy to identify actions to overcome possible negative impacts?

(a) Qualitative analysis

The majority of focus group and interview participants felt that this was not problematic in itself but practicalities often stood in the way of progressing positive actions. Others argued that officers could spot obvious examples but were less adept at thinking creatively or 'outside the box', while others stated that this depended crucially on the experience of officers and the policy areas they were dealing with. The use of 'sounding boards', both internal and external, were seen as useful in this regard.

(b) Quantitative analysis

According to the EARS responses, the majority of focus group participants (65%) indicated that officers in their authority were always or often able to identify actions to overcome possible negative impacts. Among respondents to the written questionnaire, just over half (52%) indicated that officers in their authority were always or often able to identify mitigating actions to overcome possible negative impacts, with 38% stating that officers could sometimes do this.

2.3.6   What happens when opportunities to better promote equality of opportunity or good relations are identified?

(a) Qualitative analysis

Many focus group and interview participants argued that actions were often taken to address perceived inequalities but this was not inevitable. Many obstacles could stand in the way of translating good intent to action and in particular where resources or politics were involved. It was also argued that there could be a reluctance to identify further opportunities as it could be construed as an admission of 'guilt' that should have been remedied earlier, once more raising the issue of whether screening is looking forwards, backwards or both.

(b) Quantitative analysis

30% of respondents to the written questionnaire indicated that mitigating actions were triggered when 'opportunities to better promote equality of opportunity/good relations' were identified, with 22% indicating that the situation was monitored so that future opportunities could be identified. This question was not included in the EARS responses.

2.3.7   What do you understand by 'opportunities to better promote'? (For example, is this something that has already happened or something that might happen in the future?)

(a) Qualitative analysis

To most focus group and interview respondents this referred to things that remained to be done and had yet to be addressed through policy development. Less frequently it was taken to mean all actions, past, present and future, with frustration that the Commission's

template allowed no opportunity to take credit for positive actions that had already been taken.

(b) Quantitative analysis

68% of respondents to the written questionnaire indicated that, in their opinion, officers always or often understood what 'opportunities to better promote equality of opportunity/good relations' meant with a further 23% stating that officers sometimes understood the term. Respondents from the Education sector were more positive with 100% indicating that officers often understood the term. This question was not included in the EARS responses.

Supplementary prompts:

2.3.8 In your view, do officers seem to understand what 'impact' actually means?

(a) Qualitative analysis

Mixed views were presented with the majority unwilling to state categorically that their officers did not understand the construct. On closer examination it appeared that those with experience will have developed a repertoire of responses but less practised colleagues often struggled with identifying the extent of impact from data and how this translated into mitigating measures.

(b) Quantitative analysis

According to the EARS responses, 30% of focus group participants indicated that, in their view, officers always seemed to understand what 'impact' actually means, with a further 43% saying officers understood often and 22% stating that they understood sometimes. None of the participants indicated that officers never understood the term. Only 13% of respondents to the written questionnaire indicated that, in their view, officers always seemed to understand what 'impact' actually means, with a further 44% saying officers understood often and 44% maintaining they understood sometimes. None of the respondents indicated that officers never understood the term.

2.3.9 Does your authority always identify mitigating actions where likely negative impacts are identified?

(a) Qualitative analysis

There was a consensus among focus group and interview participants that this was almost always the case but once more some maintaining that by the time of screening, these actions were already in place. The practical issues attaching to the introduction of mitigations were identified by a number of respondents, including resourcing.

(b) Quantitative analysis

According to the EARS responses, the majority of focus group participants indicated that their authority always (13%) or often (48%) identified mitigating actions where likely negative impacts were identified, with 26% indicating that they were sometimes identified and 4% indicating that they were never identified. Among respondents to the written questionnaire, 14% indicated that their authority always identified mitigating actions where

likely negative impacts were identified, with 38% indicating that they were often identified and the same percentage (38%) indicating that they were sometimes identified.

2.3.10 Are officers reluctant to identify mitigating actions that may require extra work/resources?

(a) Qualitative analysis

The majority argued that this was not likely to be a reflection on reluctance but more a combination of circumstances, including lack of experience and/or guidance, lack of time and complexity of policy area, that made the identification of mitigations more difficult.

(b) Quantitative analysis

According to the EARS responses, the majority of focus group participants indicated that officers were often (35%) or sometimes (30%) reluctant to identify mitigating actions that may require extra work/resources. No participants indicated that officers were always reluctant but only 4% said that they were never reluctant.   30% stated that they did not know. This question was not included in the written questionnaire.

2.3.11 What kind of mitigating actions does your authority tend to identify?

(a) Qualitative analysis

All types of mitigation were identified by focus group and interview participants, including in particular those attaching to access and communication.

(b) Quantitative analysis

Respondents to the written questionnaire were asked to give examples of the type of mitigating actions identified in recent screening templates; examples included:

- users signposted to sources of assistance;
- provision of computer terminal for lodging on-line forms, with assistance from staff;
- removal of unnecessary questions from forms;
- payment of travel warrants to disabled people (when an office was closed);
- development of a policy on communicating with those for whom English is not the first language;
- ongoing consultation with stakeholders.

The EARS responses included a question on the kind of mitigating actions that authorities tended to identify. The most frequent answer (32%) was that the actions identified were those already in place to promote equality of opportunity. 24% indicated that their authorities made changes to the policy as a result of screening.

2.3.12 What kind of mitigating actions do you think are the most useful and why?

(a) Qualitative analysis

There was no strong consensus on this question among focus group and interview participants with all of the types routinely cited. For some, actions that had already been

taken predominated while for others it was about future mitigations. Access and communication issues tended to be those raised most often during discussion.

(b) Quantitative analysis

This question was not included in the EARS responses or the written questionnaire.

2.3.13 When are mitigating actions normally carried out?

(a) Qualitative analysis

While a number of focus group and interview participants mentioned that these actions occurred further to screening, it was argued by a significant number of respondents that these actions had already been put in place prior to screening, thus significantly reducing any further opportunities. Lengthy discussions often then followed on the nature of the template and its future orientation that precluded recognition of previous actions that may have been taken to mitigate adverse effects.

 (b) Quantitative analysis

The EARS responses included a question on when mitigating actions are normally identified. The most frequent response (43%) was that they were normally identified during screening, but the same number responded 'it depends'. This question was not included in the written questionnaire.

2.3.14   Have you ever undertaken any further engagement/consultation based on screening?

(a) Qualitative analysis

A typical response from the focus group and interview participants was 'yes but infrequently'. A small number of organisations mentioned limited engagement that had been triggered by screening but these tended to be exceptional. Use of Consultation Panels and pilot projects was mentioned in this regard.

(b) Quantitative analysis

This question was not included in either the EARS responses or the written questionnaire.

2.3.15 Have you carried out fewer EQIAs since the introduction of the new screening template?

(a) Qualitative analysis

While the majority of focus group and interview participants argued that the number had reduced, some stated that this was a positive reflection on the mainstreaming of s75 work into the business of the organisation over recent years while others suggested that it allowed EQIAs to focus on matters for which they were originally designed, and was therefore a positive development. The use of the new screening template as a policy development tool was highlighted as a significant and positive advance in this context, with the opportunity to mitigate adverse impacts at the stage of screening inevitably reducing the flow of policies going forward for EQIA.

(b) Quantitative analysis

According to the EARS responses, the majority of focus group participants (52.0%) indicated that they had carried out a lot fewer EQIAs since the introduction of the new screening template; 17% stated that they had not carried out fewer EQIAs. This question was not included in the written questionnaire.

2.4 Good relations

Main prompts:

2.4.1   Have you any experience of answering the GR questions in the screening template, or filling in the screening template to conclude that good relations were relevant?

(a) Qualitative analysis

Almost all of those interviewed had experience of answering GR questions but many admitted that they struggled with this part of the template and they were aware that policy officers likewise found this difficult. A small number argued that their core business had little to do with GR and so these questions typically attracted little attention. A 'fear factor' among officers was mentioned on a number of occasions as this domain was not well understood by officers.

(b) Quantitative analysis

This question was not included in either the EARS responses or the written questionnaire.

2.4.2   What sort of policies/functions or areas of your business are relevant for good relations?

(a) Qualitative analysis

Not unexpectedly, responses from focus group and interview participants varied considerably between organisations. While some regarded GR as a core element of their work, others selected specific functional areas where it was seen as especially relevant (e.g. community development, communications, choice of venues, outreach), while many others saw it as peripheral to their day-to-day work and often struggled to identify GR issues.

(b) Quantitative analysis

Respondents to the written questionnaire listed funding, relocation of services, development of new facilities, recruitment, engagement, community development, procurement, policies relating to dignity and respect, flags and emblems and codes of conduct (including dress codes) as all being relevant to good relations.

2.4.3   Does screening help you to develop policies/ manage the good relations component?

(a) Qualitative analysis

Those focus group and interview participants with day-to-day involvement with GR issues had a range of devices in place for integrating and managing GR into their business but it

was noteworthy that screening was not seen as a key component in these systems. It was argued that the screening questions did not 'work' as well for GR as for EO. In many larger organisations there was a structural divide between EO and GR work, and those in the latter domain rarely had a direct engagement with screening or s75 more generally. The primary focus of screening was seen to fall on EO with GR in the main considered to be a 'tag on'.

(b) Quantitative analysis

According to the EARS responses, 59% of focus group participants indicated that screening partly helped to develop policies/manage the good relations component; no respondents considered that it completely helped and 27% maintained that it did not help. Similarly, the majority of respondents to the written questionnaire (55%) indicated that screening partly helped to develop policies/manage the good relations component; no respondents considered that it completely helped and 27% stated that it did not help. Both the Health and Education sectors were more positive with none of the respondents saying that it did not help.

2.4.4 What do you understand by the term 'good relations'?

(a) Qualitative analysis

A variety of definitions were offered by focus group and interview participants including promoting respect for difference, promoting cross-community engagement, not favouring one community, promotion of projects with a cross-community element, positive actions, collaboration, promotion of better understanding, HR issues and needs. There was a widespread view that the term was often misconstrued and was often applied too narrowly and exclusively to community relations. An alternative view was that GR should be applied generally across all nine grounds, and that the mystique around the term should be stripped away to encourage genuine engagement with practical concerns.

(b) Quantitative analysis

This question was not included in either the EARS responses or the written questionnaire.

2.4.5 What sort of likely impacts on good relations are generally identified during screening?

(a) Qualitative analysis

Some focus group and interview participants maintained that officers rarely found examples while others were more specific in suggesting policy areas where GR issues were more likely to be noted (e.g. accessibility, community engagement, interfaces, shared service delivery). The context within which issues were being reflected on was seen as critical in determining whether issues were significant or not.

(b) Quantitative analysis

Respondents to the written questionnaire listed a number of types of impact on good relations identified through screening, including chill factors, reluctance to travel to certain areas, different perceptions of cultural/historical aspects of Northern Ireland life and lack of (or opportunities to develop) shared space.

This question was not included in the EARS responses.

2.4.6   Do you think the screening template should be expanded to say more about good relations?

(a) Qualitative analysis

Among the focus group and interview sample there was little enthusiasm for expanding the template yet further as it was already seen as too longwinded and cumbersome. Instead it was maintained that there was a need for greater clarity around terminology and in this regard the use of worked examples was seen as potentially valuable. Some argued that the existing questions constrained more creative thinking and conversations about what could be achieved.

(b) Quantitative analysis

According to the EARS responses, the majority of focus group participants (55%) said that they did not think the screening template should be expanded to say more about good relations. Similarly, the majority of respondents to the written questionnaire (69%) stated that they did not think the screening template should be expanded in this way, although two respondents commented that simplified, more user friendly questions and a mix of open and closed questions would be useful.

Supplementary prompts:

2.4.7   In your view, are likely impacts for good relations less likely to be identified by screening processes in your authority than equality of opportunity impacts?

(a) Qualitative analysis

There tended to be a division of opinion among focus group and interview participants with the majority arguing that EO impacts were simpler to identify, others maintaining that there were fewer negative impacts attaching to GR which made them more likely to be identified while others felt both were afforded equal attention.

(b) Quantitative analysis

According to the EARS responses, the majority of focus group participants (68%) indicated that, in their view, the likely impacts for good relations were less likely to be identified by screening processes in their authority than equality of opportunity issues, with 18% indicating that this was not the case and 14% responding that they did not know. This question was not included in the written questionnaire.

2.4.8   Is there a reluctance to conclude that a policy might have negative impacts on good relations? If so, why?

(a) Qualitative analysis

The majority of focus group and interview respondents maintained that there was no resistance *per se* among staff but instead the lack of understanding, and indeed anxiety, around GR issues made officers hesitant to identify negative impacts. It was suggested that

more work was needed to raise confidence among staff to recognise and remedy these issues.

(b) Quantitative analysis

According to the EARS responses, 36% of focus group participants indicated that there was reluctance to conclude that a policy might have negative impacts on good relations, while 45% thought that there was no reluctance. This question was not included in the written questionnaire.

2.4.9   Do officers know what to do when they decide that there are likely impacts on good relations? What sorts of actions are usually recommended?

(a) Qualitative analysis

While focus group and interview respondents did not offer many examples of actions taken, the support systems available for staff should issues come to light were routinely cited. Typically, this would involve a s75 specialist working with the policy officer to identify positive actions unless the solutions were straightforward. The experience of the officer was again seen as important in triggering this process. Respondents to the written questionnaire listed a number of examples of the type of action taken including open days, tours, welcome packs, welcoming art work, mediation, providing neutral spaces, encouraging social interaction, exhibitions to promote awareness of cultural diversity and developing relationships with schools in under-represented communities (to encourage the recruitment of a more diverse workforce).

(b) Quantitative analysis

According to the EARS responses, 59% of focus group participants indicated that officers partly knew what to do when they decided that there were likely impacts on good relations, with 5% indicating that officers completely knew what to do and 23% indicating that they did not know what to do. 25% of respondents to the written questionnaire indicated that officers always or often knew what to do when they decided that there were likely impacts on good relations, with 65% stating that officers sometimes knew what to do and none suggesting that officers did not know what to do.

2.5 EQIAs

Main prompts:

2.5.1   Has your authority carried out any EQIAs in the last two years?

(a) Qualitative analysis

Of those interviewed face-to-face, only a small minority (2) had experience of carrying out EQIAs within the last two years. Within focus groups, experience was likewise very limited. It was suggested that there was still some confusion as to what was an actual EQIA and what was screening, with many officers mislabelling screening forms as EQIAs. Of those who had carried out EQIAs, it was not clear that many had followed the 7-step approach, for example it was argued that if consultation did not yield a response or feedback then the final decision report was rarely produced.

(b) Quantitative analysis

According to the EARS responses, the authorities of 32% of focus group participants had carried out EQIAs in the last two years. Nine out of 26 respondents to the written questionnaire (35%) indicated that their authorities had carried out EQIAs in the last two years.

2.5.2   What sort of consultation was carried out?

(a) Qualitative analysis

Of the small number of focus group and interview respondents who had carried out EQIAs, all followed the ECNI guidance on public consultation (i.e. at least 12 weeks) but some did suggest that this period could be cut short if it overlapped with an implementation deadline.

(b) Quantitative analysis

The nine respondents to the written questionnaire who indicated that their authorities had carried out EQIAs, described a wide range of consultation techniques (although with an emphasis on written consultation at 40%). This question was not included in the EARS responses.

2.5.3   When was the consultation carried out?

(a) Qualitative analysis

Focus group and interview participants indicated that consultation was carried out typically following production of the EQIA consultation report setting out preliminary recommendations on mitigating measures. Prior to this, there was some evidence or 'pre-consultation' with selected parties to help inform the emerging EQIA.

(b) Quantitative analysis

Almost half (47%) of the respondents to the written questionnaire whose authorities had carried out EQIAs in the last two years stated that the EQIA consultation was typically undertaken when options were being considered. This question was not included in the EARS responses.

2.5.4   What sort of response did you receive to the consultation?

(a) Qualitative analysis

Among focus group and interview participants, there was a clear divide where the EQIA either generated no interest at all or only a small number of 'the usual suspects' (i.e. major representative groups), or an orchestrated response from different political parties or communities, often involving multiple responses and petitions. It was remarked that it was difficult to predict beforehand whether an EQIA would spark interest or not.

(b) Quantitative analysis

43% of respondents to the written questionnaire, whose authorities had carried out EQIAs in the last two years, indicated that they had received a reasonable response to the

consultation, 14% said that they had received a high level of response and 29% no or very little response. One respondent indicated that they had received a high response rate from an on-line questionnaire. This question was not included in the EARS responses.

2.5.5   How were the results of the consultation published?

(a) Qualitative analysis

Normally these would be made available on line and those on the organisation's s75 consultation list would be informed by email.

(b) Quantitative analysis

One third of respondents to the written questionnaire whose authorities had carried out EQIAs in the last two years, indicated that they published a separate EQIA final report including the results of the EQIA consultation. This question was not included in the EARS responses.

Supplementary prompts:

2.5.6   In your experience, do officers try to avoid undertaking EQIAs? If so, why?

(a) Qualitative analysis

While some focus group and interview participants did suggest that officers would opt to avoid an EQIA if possible given the amount of work involved, the majority argued that there was not a culture of avoidance but instead either the new screening process made EQIAs less inevitable, or there was confusion and anxiety over the process which inhibited action.

(b) Quantitative analysis

According to the EARS responses, the most frequent answer by focus group participants (45%) was that, in their experience, officers always tried to avoid undertaking EQIAs, with 9% saying that they often did, 32% saying they sometimes did and only 14% stating that they never did. The results of the written questionnaire were inconclusive, with the largest percentage (34%) indicating that they did not know. Among those who said that, in their opinion, officers always (4%), often (9%) or sometimes (26%) tried to avoid undertaking EQIAs, a wide range of factors was cited including that EQIAs took up too much time, too many resources or raised issues that were difficult to address. Respondents also commented that there was less need for EQIAs when policies are screened appropriately and when policies are drawn up carefully. It was also suggested that there was less need for EQIAs as organisations learn from earlier ones.

2.5.7   Which type of policy do you think should be subject to EQIA?

(a) Qualitative analysis

The majority of focus group and interview participants tended to identify high level policies that involved either significant resources or an impact on a significant number of people. Others maintained that any policy should be subject to EQIA if screening had revealed that there is a genuine need and irrespective of its scope, or even in the absence of screening

when monitoring had triggered a concern (e.g. service user profile) beyond the domain of a single policy.

(b) Quantitative analysis

According to the EARS responses, when asked which type of policy they thought should be subject to EQIA, 46% of focus group participants identified high level policies, 6% technical procedures, 17% internal procedures and 14% business-to-business issues. This question was not included in the written questionnaire but under 'other comments' four respondents indicated that technical procedures should not be screened.

2.5.8 At what stage of policy development should a policy typically be subject to EQIA?

(a) Qualitative analysis

There were a variety of responses from focus group and interview participants. Some suggested that it should be carried out prior to implementation, others suggested at the earliest possible stage of policy development, others when concerns first came to light, and others at the particular stage of policy development that was most appropriate depending on the policy under consideration.

(b) Quantitative analysis

According to the EARS responses, the majority of focus group participants (55%) indicated that a policy should typically be subject to EQIA when options are considered with 27% stating at the early stages of policy development. This question was not included in the written questionnaire.

2.5.9 How are the equality of opportunity and good relations aspects of policies consulted on (if there is no EQIA)?

(a) Qualitative analysis

Focus group and interview participants indicated that this was often seen as a routine part of either screening, pre-consultation or public consultation exercises generally (e.g. community planning), although there were different experiences as regards whether specific EO and GR questions were posed or not. Many allowed these issues to emerge naturally during the engagement process.

(b) Quantitative analysis

This question was not included in either the EARS responses or the written questionnaire.

2.5.10 Does your authority generally carry out public consultation on the policy and EQIA consultation together or separately and why?

(a) Qualitative analysis

Of the small number of focus group and interview participants with experience of EQIAs, almost all carried out consultation separately.

(b) Quantitative analysis

According to the EARS responses, when asked if their authority generally carried out public consultation on the policy and EQIA consultation separately, 41% of focus group participants indicated that they always did so, with a further 14% indicating that they often did so and 18% indicating that they sometimes did so. Only 5% indicated that they never did so. This question was not included in the written questionnaire.

2.5.11 Have consultees ever asked for an EQIA where none was recommended?

(a) Qualitative analysis

There were very few examples where this was the case. More often there was a lack of feedback on any s75 work including screening other than from major representative groups.

(b) Quantitative analysis

According to the EARS responses, 45% of focus group participants indicated that consultees had asked for an EQIA where none was recommended while the same number (45%) stated that they had not. This question was not included in the written questionnaire.

2.5.12 What happened as a result?

(a) Qualitative analysis

Focus group and interview participants indicated that, on one occasion this triggered an EQIA but more often an explanation was set out as to why an EQIA was not necessary and this explanation was sufficient.

(b) Quantitative analysis

This question was not included in either the EARS responses or the written questionnaire.

2. 6 Moving forwards

Main prompts:

2.6.1 From your experience, which parts of the screening process work well?

(a) Qualitative analysis

The new version of the template was generally welcomed as a positive improvement by focus group and interview participants, and in particular the opportunity it provided to build s75 into the policy during successive drafting. The process helped provide clarity as to the scope and aim of the policy and the four screening questions can 'make people think' in a structured and systematic way about adverse impact. Screening as a whole encourages evidence-based policy making which was seen as a positive, and can lead to increased engagement. When integrated into decision-making, screening is straightforward and can genuinely help mainstream s75 considerations into routine business, and this is especially true with established and experienced staff who have 'bought-in' to screening.

(b) Quantitative analysis

Six out of 26 respondents (23%) to the written questionnaire indicated that s75 processes encourage consideration of equality issues; other respondents commented that screening provides a useful record and encourages the use of data in decision making.

This question was not included in the EARS responses.

2.6.2   What would you most like to change about the screening process?

(a) Qualitative analysis

Among focus group and interview participants, the length of the template was seen as off-putting, it was often described as repetitive and the language was characterised as inaccessible. While the links in the document were understandable to experienced staff, for others these connections were not explicit and led to a discontinuity between sections. The tendency was for staff to drift into a 'box ticking' mentality to screening, with little thought involved in the process. What appeared to cause considerable confusion among respondents was knowing when was the best time to screen during policy development, and how often should a policy be re-screened during redrafting. The current definition of 'policy' was seen by some as too broad in scope and further guidance would be welcomed in order to clarify which policies should be subject to scrutiny and at what level. The use of one template to scrutinise all policies was seen as excessive and opportunities to adopt a more flexible approach dependent on the policy in question were welcomed i.e. 'make screening SMARTER'. A form that is more diagrammatic may help understanding, including a decision-making flow chart. The may lend itself to an e-form with appropriate trip outs for technical policies with no s75 issues. The primary goal of screening should be the identification of adverse impacts, and this could be lost when the process in itself is allowed to take precedence. It was also seen as important to record the history and context of the policy, including any mitigating measures that had already been introduced, rather than assuming that actions will be taken after screening. The present form does not accommodate the dynamism of policy development.

(b) Quantitative analysis

Respondents to the written questionnaire also favoured the introduction of a document that was shorter and could be completed more quickly (11 out of 26 respondents; 42%). Four of the respondents (15%) suggested that technical issues and those policies determined by other authorities should no longer be screened. This question was not included in the EARS responses.

2.6.3   Do you think that the proposal of augmenting the EQIA methodology could help to assess your contribution to meeting the objectives of TBUC?

(a) Qualitative analysis

For the majority of focus group and interview respondents there was insufficient knowledge about TBUC to be able to offer an informed answer to this question. Many made clear that a great many policies had no TBUC implications and so this process could be redundant while others suggested that the existing EQIA methodology was sufficiently robust if applied rigorously to both EO and GR considerations. In the past, the former tended to predominate.

(b) Quantitative analysis

This question was not included in either the EARS responses or the written questionnaire.

2.6.4 From your understanding of what screening/EQIA provides for, or is used for, could you see EQIA being adapted for assessing how you will meet objectives in a strategy?

(a) Qualitative analysis

The overwhelming majority of focus group and interview respondents struggled with this question as it appeared to lie outside their day-to-day experience of working with s75 on policies and procedures that operated below the strategic level. Answers to earlier questions would suggest that the processes appear to work best for concrete, operational policies and procedures where tangible outcomes can be identified.

(b) Quantitative analysis

According to the EARS response, 29% of focus group participants indicated that they could see EQIA being adapted for assessing how the objectives in a strategy would be met sometimes, none of the respondents thought this could happen always or often; 62% of respondents said that they did not know. Among respondents to the written questionnaire, 43% stated that they could see screening and EQIA processes being adapted for assessing how the objectives in a strategy would be met sometimes, 5% thought this could happen often and 14% thought it could happen always; 29% of respondents said that they did not know. Respondents from the Education sector were more positive, with 50% saying that this could happen always or often.

3.3 EARS results by question

Q 0.1. Which focus group are you participating in today?

	Responses	
	Percent	**Count**
Government Departments	25%	6
Health	21%	5
Local Government	8%	2
Education	29%	7
Housing	17%	4
Totals	**100%**	**24**

Q 0.2. What size is your organisation, approximately?

	Responses	
	Percent	**Count**
Small (1-24 employees)	4%	1
Medium (25-250 employees)	21%	5
Large (251+ employees)	75%	18
Totals	**100%**	**24**

Q 1.1. Does your organisation have a full time equality officer?

	Responses	
	Percent	**Count**
Yes	50%	12
No	50%	12
Don't know	0%	0
Totals	**100%**	**24**

Q 1.2. Who usually carries out screening?

	Responses	
	Percent	**Count**
Equality officer(s)	4%	1
Policy officer	33%	8
A team including 1&2	38%	9
Various members of staff	25%	6
Don't know	0%	0
Totals	**100%**	**24**

Q 1.3. When is the screening process triggered in your authority?

	Responses	
	Percent	**Count**
When a policy is produced	50%	12
When decision is being made	21%	5
Routinely as a part of consultation	17%	4
Not routinely	8%	2
Don't know	4%	1
Totals	**100%**	**24**

Q 1.4. How is the screening process triggered in your authority?

	Responses	
	Percent	**Count**
Part of wider issue	13%	3
As a separate issue	0%	0
On prompt from equality officer	8%	2
As part of policy officer's duties	50%	12
Made aware of wider issue	25%	6
Don't know	4%	1
Totals	**100%**	**24**

Q 1.5. Who ensures consistency between screening processes?

	Responses	
	Percent	**Count**
Equality officer	71%	17
Senior management	8%	2
Other	17%	4
No-one	4%	1
Totals	**100%**	**24**

Q 1.6. What normally happens to the screening template after it has been completed?

	Responses	
	Percent	**Count**
Nothing	0%	0
Lodged in central record	8%	2
Returned to equality officer	21%	5
Passed to policy/senior officers	4%	1
Published on website	63%	15
Don't know	4%	1
Totals	**100%**	**24**

Q 1.7. Who receives information or a report on the outcome of the screening process?

	Responses	
	Percent	**Count**
Equality officer	13%	3
Senior management	50%	12
No-one	0%	0
Other	38%	9
Don't know	0%	0
Totals	**100%**	**24**

Q 1.8. What sort of issues are routinely subjected to screening (press all that apply)?

	Responses	
	Percent	**Count**
High level policies	29%	18
Technical procedures	29%	18
Internal procedures	24%	15
Business-to- business	14%	9
Other matters	5%	3
Totals	**100%**	**63**

Q 1.9. Is there a role in screening for senior managers?

	Responses	
	Percent	**Count**
Yes	75%	18
No	21%	5
Don't know	4%	1
Totals	**100%**	**24**

Q 1.10. How much access does the equality officer have to senior management team?

	Responses	
	Percent	**Count**
None	0%	0
Some	33%	8
A lot	67%	16
Don't know	0%	0
Totals	**100%**	**24**

Q 1.11. Is there a role for elected representatives / Board members etc. in screening?

	Responses	
	Percent	**Count**
Yes	38%	9
No	63%	15
Don't know	0%	0
Totals	**100%**	**24**

Q 1.12. Does your authority always screen high level policies?

	Responses	
	Percent	**Count**
Yes	50%	12
No	38%	9
Don't know	13%	3
Totals	**100%**	**24**

Q 1.13. Are EO & GR issues always taken into account when high level policies are being developed?

	Responses	
	Percent	**Count**
Yes	50%	12
No	42%	10
Don't know	8%	2
Totals	**100%**	**24**

Q 2.1. Do the people carrying out screening usually include some data or other kind of evidence?

	Responses	
	Percent	**Count**
Yes, always	38%	9
Yes, often	46%	11
Yes, sometimes	17%	4
Never	0%	0
Don't know	0%	0
Totals	**100%**	**24**

Q 2.2. Where does the data come from?

	Responses	
	Percent	**Count**
Internal sources	8%	2
External sources	0%	0
Both	88%	21
Standard databases	4%	1
Don't know	0%	0
Totals	**100%**	**24**

Q 2.3. Is data always necessary?

	Responses	
	Percent	**Count**
Yes, always	8%	2
Yes, often	42%	10
Yes, sometimes	50%	12
Never	0%	0
Don't know	0%	0
Totals	**100%**	**24**

Q 2.4. Is consideration of the likely impacts on EO and/or GR usually included in any consultations or discussions about proposals?

	Responses	
	Percent	**Count**
Yes, always	33%	8
Yes, often	38%	9
Yes, sometimes	25%	6
Never	0%	0
Don't know	4%	1
Totals	**100%**	**24**

Q 2.5. Do you think the data/evidence presented in screening templates is useful in assessing impact?

	Responses	
	Percent	**Count**
Yes, always	0%	0
Yes, often	46%	11
Yes, sometimes	54%	13
Never	0%	0
Don't know	0%	0
Totals	**100%**	**24**

Q 2.6. Is new data ever collected for the screening process?

	Responses	
	Percent	**Count**
Yes, always	4%	1
Yes, often	17%	4
Yes, sometimes	63%	15
Never	17%	4
Don't know	0%	0
Totals	**100%**	**24**

Q 2.7. Does your authority consistently make use of available data/evidence?

	Responses	
	Percent	**Count**
Yes, always	21%	5
Yes, often	50%	12
Yes, sometimes	29%	7
Never	0%	0
Don't know	0%	0
Totals	**100%**	**24**

Q 2.8. Do officers understand the connection between data/evidence and assessing impacts?

	Responses	
	Percent	**Count**
Yes, completely	8%	2
Yes, partly	75%	18
No	13%	3
Don't know	4%	1
Totals	**100%**	**24**

Q 3.1. Does your authority follow the Commission's template?

	Responses	
	Percent	**Count**
Yes	96%	22
No	4%	1
Don't know	0%	0
Totals	**100%**	**23**

Q 3.2. Does your authority always identify the type of impact (positive or negative)?

	Responses	
	Percent	**Count**
Yes	83%	19
No	4%	1
Varies	13%	3
Don't know	0%	0
Totals	**100%**	**23**

Q 3.3. Does your authority identify the level of impact as major, minor or none?

	Responses	
	Percent	**Count**
Yes	100%	23
No	0%	0
Use other system	0%	0
Don't know	0%	0
Totals	**100%**	**23**

Q 3.4. Are officers in your authority normally able to identify actions to overcome possible negative impacts?

	Responses	
	Percent	**Count**
Yes, always	13%	3
Yes, often	52%	12
Yes, sometimes	35%	8
Never	0%	0
Don't know	0%	0
Totals	**100%**	**23**

Q 3.5. In your view, do officers seem to understand what 'impact' actually means?

	Responses	
	Percent	**Count**
Yes, always	30%	7
Yes, often	43%	10
Yes, sometimes	22%	5
Never	0%	0
Don't know	4%	1
Totals	**100%**	**23**

Q 3.6. Does your authority identify mitigating actions where likely negative impacts are identified?

	Responses	
	Percent	**Count**
Yes, always	13%	3
Yes, often	48%	11
Yes, sometimes	26%	6
Never	4%	1
Don't know	9%	2
Totals	**100%**	**23**

Q 3.7. Are officers reluctant to identify mitigating actions that may require extra work/resources?

	Responses	
	Percent	**Count**
Yes, always	0%	0
Yes, often	35%	8
Yes, sometimes	30%	7
Never	4%	1
Don't know	30%	7
Totals	**100%**	**23**

Q 3.8. What kind of mitigating actions does your authority tend to identify? (Press all that apply)

	Responses	
	Percent	**Count**
Changes as a result of screening	24%	15
Equality actions already in policy	19%	12
Actions to promote EO already	32%	20
Actions outside policy	10%	6
Actions relating to other policies	16%	10
Not applicable	0%	0
Don't know	0%	0
Totals	**100%**	**63**

Q 3.9. When are mitigating actions normally identified?

	Responses	
	Percent	**Count**
Before screening	9%	2
During screening	43%	10
After screening	4%	1
It depends	43%	10
Not applicable	0%	0
Don't know	0%	0
Totals	**100%**	**23**

Q 3.10. Have you carried out fewer EQIAs since the introduction of the new screening template?

	Responses	
	Percent	**Count**
Yes, a lot fewer	52%	12
Yes, somewhat fewer	26%	6
No	17%	4
Don't know	4%	1
Totals	**100%**	**23**

Q 4.1. Does screening help you to develop policies/ manage the good relations component?

	Responses	
	Percent	**Count**
Yes, completely	0%	0
Yes, partly	59%	13
No	27%	6
Don't know	14%	3
Totals	**100%**	**22**

Q 4.2. Do you think the screening template should be expanded to say more about good relations?

	Responses	
	Percent	**Count**
Yes	27%	6
No	55%	12
Don't know	18%	4
Totals	**100%**	**22**

Q 4.3. In your view, are likely impacts for GR less likely to be identified by screening processes in your authority than EO issues?

	Responses	
	Percent	**Count**
Yes	68%	15
No	18%	4
Don't know	14%	3
Totals	**100%**	**22**

Q 4.4. Is there a reluctance to conclude that a policy might have negative impacts on good relations?

	Responses	
	Percent	**Count**
Yes	36%	8
No	45%	10
Don't know	18%	4
Totals	**100%**	**22**

Q 4.5. Do officers know what to do when they decide that there are likely impacts on good relations?

	Responses	
	Percent	**Count**
Yes, completely	5%	1
Yes, partly	59%	13
No	23%	5
Don't know	14%	3
Totals	**100%**	**22**

Q 5.1. Has your authority carried out any EQIAs in the last two years?

	Responses	
	Percent	**Count**
Yes	32%	7
No	68%	15
Don't know	0%	0
Totals	**100%**	**22**

Q 5.2. In your experience, do officers try to avoid undertaking EQIAs?

	Responses	
	Percent	**Count**
Yes, always	45%	10
Yes, often	9%	2
Yes, sometimes	32%	7
Never	14%	3
Don't know	0%	0
Totals	**100%**	**22**

Q 5.3. Which type of policy do you think should be subject to EQIA? (press all that apply)

	Responses	
	Percent	**Count**
High level policies	46%	16
Technical procedures	6%	2
Internal procedures	17%	6
Business-to-business issues	14%	5
Other matters	14%	5
Don't know	3%	1
Totals	**100%**	**35**

Q 5.4. At what stage of policy development should a policy typically be subject to EQIA?

	Responses	
	Percent	**Count**
Early stage of policy devel't	27%	6
When options are considered	55%	12
Prior to implementation	18%	4
After implementation	0%	0
Don't know	0%	0
Totals	**100%**	**22**

Q 5.5. Does your authority generally carry out public consultation on the policy and EQIA consultation separately?

	Responses	
	Percent	**Count**
Yes, always	41%	9
Yes, often	14%	3
Yes, sometimes	18%	4
Never	5%	1
Don't know	23%	5
Totals	**100%**	**22**

Q 5.6 . Have consultees ever asked for an EQIA where none was recommended?

	Responses	
	Percent	**Count**
Yes	45%	10
No	45%	10
Don't know	9%	2
Totals	**100%**	**22**

Q 6.1. From your understanding of what screening/EQIA provides for, or is used for, could you see EQIA being adapted for assessing how you will meet objectives in a strategy?

	Responses	
	Percent	**Count**
Yes, always	0%	0
Yes, often	0%	0
Yes, sometimes	29%	6
Never	10%	2
Don't know	62%	13
Totals	**100%**	**21**

3.4 Written questionnaire – analysis of responses

1: OVERALL ANALYSIS

A. Carrying out screening

As a starting point, we would like to know who in your authority is responsible for carrying out screening, how the screening process is triggered and what kinds of issues are subjected to screening.

1. Does your authority have an equality officer?

	Responses	
	Percent[2]	**Count**[3]
Yes, full time	34.6	9
Yes, part time	7.7	2
Part of the duties of another postholder	50.0	13
No	7.7	2
Other	0	0
Totals	**100.0**	**26**

2. Who usually carries out screening?

	Responses	
	Percent	**Count**
Equality officer(s)	11.5	3
Policy officer	23.1	6
A team including the above	30.8	8
Various members of staff	34.6	9
Other	0	0
Totals	**100.0**	**26**

---

[2] **May not total 100% because of rounding**
[3] **Some respondents did not answer all questions**

3. When is the screening process triggered in your authority? (*Multiple response*)

	Responses	
	Percent	**Count**
Every time a policy is produced or revised	53.3	16
When a significant policy or decision is being made	23.3	7
Routinely as part of consultation	13.3	4
Not routinely	3.3	1
Other	6.7	2
Totals	**99.9**	**30**

Other responses included:
- as part of the business case process
- annually

4. How is the screening process triggered in your authority? (*Multiple response*)

	Responses	
	Percent	**Count**
As part of a report on the wider issue under consideration	21.9	7
As a separate issue	6.3	2
In response to a routine prompt from the equality officer	18.8	6
As part of the policy officer's duties	40.6	13
Other	12.5	4
Totals	**100.1**	**32**

Other responses included:
- as part of a checklist for policy development
- as part of a checklist for tenders
- identification of potential screenings at start of each year

5. Who ensures consistency between screening processes? (*Multiple response*)

	Responses	
	Percent	**Count**
Equality officer	55.6	15
Senior management	37.0	10
No-one	0	0
Other	7.4	2
Totals	**100.0**	**27**

Other responses included:
- officer with equality responsibility does random sampling
- HR and Equality Working Group

6. What normally happens to the screening template after it has been completed? (*Multiple response*)

	Responses	
	Percent	**Count**
Nothing	0	0
Lodge in central record	19.5	8
Returned to equality officer	26.8	11
Passed to policy/senior officers	12.2	5
Published on website	39.0	16
Other	2.4	1
Totals	**99.9**	**41**

7. Who within your authority receives information or a report on the outcome of the screening process? (*Multiple response*)

	Responses	
	Percent	**Count**
Equality officer	20.5	8
Senior management	30.8	12
Elected Representatives, Board/Council Members, etc.	20.5	8
No-one	20.5	8
Other	7.7	3
Totals	**100.0**	**39**

Other responses included:
- the manager who leads on the policy
- depends on the screening exercise
- Equality Working Group

8. What sort of issues are routinely subjected to screening? (*Multiple response*)

	Responses	
	Percent	**Count**
High level policies/overarching strategies and the like (e.g. corporate plan, good relations strategy)	29.1	16
Technical procedures (e.g. data recording, new rules on service delivery)	21.8	12
Internal procedures (e.g. recruitment, procurement	29.1	16
Business-to-business issues (e.g. making a grant to a third party service deliverer	14.5	8
Other	5.5	3
Totals	**100.0**	**55**

9. Is there anything else you would like to say about the way the screening process operates in your authority?

Responses included:
- the process is embedded in our authority (3 responses)
- we do not screen model policies provided by others (e.g. model policies published by the Equality Commission)
- we are improving the screening process so that more people are involved
- minutes from management and committee meetings are scrutinised by the equality officer to ensure that policies are not missed
- many officers do not understand the definition of policy and strategies are often overlooked
- need more clarification from the Commission on what should be screened

B.   Use of data/evidence when screening

Our desk research showed that just over 50% of screening templates included data or evidence of some kind, but it was not always clear that it was directly relevant to the policy in question. We are therefore interested in how your authority sources and uses data and other evidence when assessing equality and good relations impacts.

10. Do the people carrying out screening usually include some data or other kind of evidence?

	Responses	
	Percent	**Count**
Yes, always	15.4	4
Yes, often	30.8	8
Yes, sometimes	30.8	8
Never	11.5	3
Other	11.5	3
Totals	**100.0**	**26**

Other responses included:
- rarely
- varies greatly
- data usually included except for screening of technical or admin. issues

11. Where does the data come from? (*Multiple response*)

	Responses	
	Percent	**Count**
Internal sources	36.0	18
External sources	34.0	17
Standard database (e.g. equality profile)	28.0	14
Other	2.0	1
Totals	**100.0**	**50**

Other responses included:
- varies

12. In your opinion, is the data always necessary?

	Responses	
	Percent	**Count**
Yes, always	12.0	3
Yes, often	28.0	7
Yes, sometimes	40.0	10
Never	8.0	2
Other	12.0	3
Totals	**100.0**	**25**

Other responses included:
- rarely
- data tends to be generic and does not add to the evaluation process
- always, except for technical policies

13. Is consideration of the likely impacts on equality of opportunity/good relations usually included in any consultation or discussions about the proposals?

	Responses	
	Percent	Count
Yes, always	19.2	5
Yes, often	34.6	9
Yes, sometimes	42.3	11
Never	0	0
Other	3.8	1
Totals	**99.9**	**26**

Other responses included:
- very rarely conduct consultations

14. Is there anything else you would like to say about the way data/evidence is used in the screening process?

Responses included:
- examples would be helpful
- the Commission should establish a bank of resources
- evidence is useful for large organisation but not for small arms-length bodies
- difficult to see relevance of data for certain policies, e.g. data protection, environmental policy
- equality monitoring data is only useful for policies affecting staff or service users; as monitoring is voluntary, there are significant gasp
- monitoring of service users should be introduced and made mandatory

C.   Outcomes of screening
Our desk research showed that 203 of the 561 screening templates that we examined identified some kind of likely impact on equality of opportunity and/or good relations. 63 screenings identified likely negative impacts and 36 went on to include proposed mitigating actions. We are interested in exploring further what happens as a result of screening.

15. Does your authority follow the Commission's screening template?

	Responses	
	Percent	**Count**
Yes	56.0	14
Yes, with additional sections	40.0	10
No	0	0
Don't know	4.0	1
Totals	**100.0**	**25**

16. Does your authority always identify the type of impact (positive or negative)?

	Responses	
	Percent	**Count**
Yes, always	70.8	17
Yes, often	12.5	3
Yes, sometimes	16.7	4
Never	0	0
Other	0	0
Totals	**100.0**	**24**

17. Does your authority always identify the level of impact as major, minor or none?

	Responses	
	Percent	**Count**
Yes, always	57.7	15
Yes, often	26.9	7
Yes, sometimes	15.4	4
Never	0	0
Use some other system	0	0
Totals	**100.0**	**26**

18. In your opinion, do officers seem to understand what 'impact' actually means?

	Responses	
	Percent	Count
Yes, always	13.0	3
Yes, often	43.5	10
Yes, sometimes	43.5	10
Never	0	0
Other	0	0
Totals	100.0	23

19. Are officers in your authority normally able to identify mitigating actions to overcome possible negative impacts?

	Responses	
	Percent	Count
Yes, always	14.3	3
Yes, often	38.1	8
Yes, sometimes	38.1	8
Never	0	0
Other	9.5	2
Totals	100.0	21

Other responses included:
- all efforts are made to avoid negative impacts in the development of the policy
- mitigating actions are identified during policy development not screening

20. Please give us some examples of the type of mitigating actions identified in recent screening templates.

Examples included:
- users signposted to sources of assistance
- provision of computer terminal for lodging on-line forms, with assistance from staff
- removal of unnecessary questions from forms
- payment of travel warrants to disabled people (when an office was closed)
- development of a policy on communicating with those for whom English is not the first language
- ongoing consultation with stakeholders

21. In your opinion, do officers seem to understand what 'opportunities to better promote equality of opportunity/good relations' actually means?

	Responses	
	Percent	**Count**
Yes, always	9.1	2
Yes, often	59.1	13
Yes, sometimes	22.7	5
Never	4.5	1
Other	4.5	1
Totals	**99.9**	**22**

Other responses included:
- often confused

22. What happens when 'opportunities to better promote' are identified? (*Multiple response*)

	Responses	
	Percent	**Count**
Mitigating actions are triggered	30.4	7
A separate action plan is developed	4.3	1
A note is made for future action	8.7	2
The situation is monitored so that future opportunities can be identified	21.7	5
Varies	13.0	3
Other	21.7	5
Totals	**99.8**	**23**

Other responses included:
- opportunities are identified and acted upon during the development of the policy so there are no further opportunities
- opportunities are recorded on the screening template

23. Is there anything else you would like to say about what happens in your authority as a result of screening?

Responses included:
- screening helps officers to take a step back from 'their' policy
- each equality analysis includes an action plan for current and future actions

D.   Good relations

During the desk research we noted a low number of policies where good relations were considered relevant to the policy/what was being reviewed or developed. When it was identified, some of the likely impacts identified for good relations either simply repeated what had already been reported under equality of opportunity, or good relations issues were not readily identified. We would be keen to consider these issues in more depth and including officers' understanding of likely good relations impacts.

24. What sort of policies/functions ore areas of your business are relevant for good relations?

Examples included:
- funding policies
- relocation of services
- development of new facilities
- policies relating to dignity and respect
- recruitment policies
- engagement policies
- community development policies
- flags and emblems
- procurement
- codes of conduct, dress codes

25. What sort of impacts on good relations are typically identified during screening?

Examples included:
- chill factors
- reluctance to travel to certain areas
- different perceptions of cultural/historical aspects of Northern Ireland life
- lack of shared space, opportunity to develop shared space

26. Does screening help to develop policies/manage the good relations component?

	Responses	
	Percent	**Count**
Yes, completely	0	0
Yes, partly	54.5	12
No	27.3	6
Varies	18.2	4
Other	0	0

	Responses	
	Percent	Count
Totals	**100.0**	**22**

27. Do officers generally know what to do when they decide that there are likely impacts on good relations?

	Responses	
	Percent	**Count**
Yes, always	0	0
Yes, often	25.0	5
Yes, sometimes	65.0	13
Never	0	0
Other	10.0	2
Totals	**100.0**	**20**

Other responses included:
- they have difficulty if the impacts are negative
- rarely

28. Please give us some examples of the type of actions taken/recommended when good relations impacts have been identified in recent screening templates.

Examples included:
- open days and tours
- welcome pack
- welcoming art work
- mediation to resolve issues easily
- developing relationships with schools in under-represented communities
- providing neutral spaces
- encouraging social interaction
- exhibitions to promote awareness of cultural diversity

29. Do you think the screening template should be expanded to say more about good relations?

	Responses	
	Percent	**Count**
Yes	7.7	2
No	69.2	18
Don't know	23.1	6
Totals	**100.0**	**26**

30. If you answered yes to Q29, please let us know what sort of expansion you think would be helpful.

Responses included:
- simplified questions, more user friendly
- a mix of open and closed questions

31. Is there anything else you would like to say about the screening process in respect of good relations?

Responses included:
- examples of good relations impacts would be useful (2 responses)
- T:BUC might make it easier to decide whether there are good relations impacts
- good relations is overshadowed by equality of opportunity
- the same impacts come up repeatedly
- process is perceived as onerous and officers tend to need guidance from equality officers
- the concept is difficult for people to grasp in the absence of an agreed definition
- can be ambiguous – 'none' implies that the policy benefits good relations and 'impact' implies an adverse effect

E.   EQIAs

Our desk research seemed to indicate that overall there is very little activity in terms of EQIAs, and we would like to explore why this is the case.

32. Has your authority carried out any EQIAs in the last two years?

	Responses	
	Percent	**Count**
Yes	34.6	9
No	65.4	17
Don't know	0	0
Totals	**100.0**	**26**

Respondents who answered no or don't know were directed to go to Q39.

33. Please list the EQIAs carried out by authority in the last two years.
Note: This information was used to enhance the desk research.

34. What sort of consultation was typically carried out for each EQIA? (*Multiple response*)

	Responses	
	Percent	**Count**
Written consultation (e.g. on-line)	40.0	6
Focus groups or similar	20.0	3
Public meetings	13.3	2
Combination of the above	26.7	4
Other	0	0
Totals	**100.0**	**15**

35. When was the EQIA consultation typically undertaken? (*Multiple response*)

	Responses	
	Percent	**Count**
At an early stage of the policy development	20.0	3
When options were being considered	46.7	7
Prior to implementation	20.0	3
After implementation	6.7	1
Other	6.7	1
Totals	**100.1**	**15**

Other responses included:
- consultation is ongoing during the whole process

36. What sort of response do you typically receive to an EQIA consultation?

	Responses	
	Percent	**Count**
None or very little	28.6	2
Reasonable response	42.9	3
High level of response	14.3	1
Other	14.3	1
Totals	**100.1**	**7**

Other responses included:
- varies

37. Please tell us a little more about the response you received.

Responses included:
- on-line questionnaires attract a high response rate
- recently we have received a lot of petitions in response to EQIA consultations

38. How were the results of the EQIA consultation published? (*Multiple response*)

	Responses	
	Percent	Count
Separate EQIA final report	33.3	3
As part of another report	11.1	1
Consultees/respondents informed of results	11.1	1
Some combination of the above	22.2	2
Not published	0	0
Other	22.2	2
Totals	**99.9**	**9**

Other responses included:
- EQIA and policy are published on the website
- published on website as a table of responses

39. In your experience, do officers try to avoid undertaking EQIAs?

	Responses	
	Percent	Count
Yes, always	4.3	1
Yes, often	8.7	2
Yes, sometimes	26.1	6
Never	26.1	6
Don't know	34.8	8
Totals	**100.0**	**23**

40. If you answered yes to Q39, why do you think officers try to avoid undertaking EQIAs? (*Multiple response*)

	Responses	
	Percent	Count
Takes too much time	28.6	6
Takes too many resources	23.8	5
Raises issues that are difficult to address	23.8	5
Low response to EQIA consultations in the past	19.0	4

Other	4.8	1
Totals	**100.0**	**21**

41. Is there anything else you would like to say about EQIAs?

Responses included:
- less need for EQIAs when policies are screened appropriately
- less need for EQIAs when policies are drawn up carefully
- less need for EQIAs as organisations learn from earlier ones
- very time and resource intensive (4 responses)
- separate process is confusing – should be embedded in the policy process
- should be just a chapter of the consultation documents

F.   Finally – moving forward
The research to date has revealed a varied landscape of activity with regard to screening and EQIAs, with many examples of good practice but equally large elements of business that appears not to attract scrutiny under Section 75. We are interested in your views on how the Equality Scheme processes are helpful to you in fulfilling the statutory duties, which by turn will assist the Commission in its role going forward.

42. From your experience, which parts of the screening process work well?

Responses included:
- encourages consideration of equality issues (6 responses)
- all of it
- initial screening
- use of data in making decisions (2 responses)
- provides a record
- assessment of impacts
- partnership between equality officers and policy makers

43. What would you most like to change about the screening process?

Responses included:
- policy developers would appreciate a document that was shorter and could be completed quicker (11 responses)
- stop screening technical issues and those policies determined by another authority (4 responses)
- screening form should be tailored to suit smaller organisations (3 responses)
- stop publishing all templates – make them available on request

- need a tiered process, dependent on the likely impact
- need a section on what the policy is already doing to mitigate impacts and promote equality
- not always appropriate to consult widely
- make the template more accessible, use less jargonistic language
- need more guidance on how to complete the template
- need guidance on how to screen higher level strategies
- need more guidance on dealing with multiple identities
- place importance on making the right decision rather than completing a process

44. From your understanding of what screening/EQIA provides for, or is used for, could you see the processes being adapted for assessing how you will meet objectives in a strategy?

	Responses	
	Percent	**Count**
Yes, always	14.3	3
Yes, often	4.8	1
Yes, sometimes	42.9	9
Never	9.5	2
Don't know	28.6	6
Totals	**100.1**	**21**

45. Is there anything else you would like to tell us?

Responses included:
- labour intensive process that achieves very little
- there should be greater regard for the impact of organisations not fulfilling their obligations
- proportionality and working smarter are the keys to ensuring screening remains relevant in an environment of diminishing resources
- screening should focus on key policies, not every policy
- lack of screening by NI Departments causes difficulties for arms-length bodies

2: SECTOR ANALYSIS[4]
(MULTIPLE CHOICE QUESTIONS ONLY)

A.   Carrying out screening

1. Does your authority have an equality officer?

	Govt Depts.		Health		Education	
	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count
Yes, full time	12.5	1	80.0	4	60.0	3
Yes, part time	12.5	1	0	0	20.0	1
Part of duties of another postholder	62.5	5	20.0	1	20.0	1
No	12.5	1	0	0	0	0
Other	0	0	0	0	0	0
Totals	**100.0**	**8**	**100.0**	**5**	**100.0**	**5**

2. Who usually carries out screening?

	Govt Depts.		Health		Education	
	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count
Equality officer(s)	25.0	2	0	0	0	0
Policy officer	25.0	2	60.0	3	20.0	1
A team including the above	12.5	1	20.0	1	80.0	4
Various members of staff	37.5	3	20.0	1	0	0
Other	0	0	0	0	0	0
Totals	**100.0**	**8**	**100.0**	**5**	**100.0**	**5**

3. When is the screening process triggered in your authority? (*Multiple response*)

	Govt Depts.		Health		Education	
	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count
Every time a policy is produced or revised	25.0	2	28.6	2	66.7	4
When a significant policy or decision is being made	37.5	3	28.6	2	33.3	2
Routinely as part of consultation	25.0	2	14.3	1	0	0
Not routinely	0	0	0	0	0	0
Other	12.5	1	28.6	2	0	0
Totals	**100.0**	**8**	**100.1**	**7**	**100.0**	**6**

[4] **Only sectors with more than 4 respondents were included to ensure anonymity.**

4. How is the screening process triggered in your authority? (*Multiple response*)

	Govt Depts.		Health		Education	
	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count
As part of a report on the wider issue under consideration	12.5	1	14.3	1	20.0	1
As a separate issue	0	0	14.3	1	20.0	1
In response to a routine prompt from the equality officer	12.5	1	14.3	1	40.0	2
As part of the policy officer's duties	75.0	6	28.6	2	20.0	1
Other	0	0	28.6	2	0	0
Totals	**100.0**	**8**	**100.1**	**7**	**100.0**	**5**

5. Who ensures consistency between screening processes? (*Multiple response*)

	Govt Depts.		Health		Education	
	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count
Equality officer	50.0	4	40.0	2	83.3	5
Senior management	50.0	4	60.0	3	16.7	1
No-one	0	0	0	0	0	0
Other	0	0	0	0	0	0
Totals	**100.0**	**8**	**100.0**	**5**	**100.0**	**6**

6. What normally happens to the screening template after it has been completed? (*Multiple response*)

	Govt Depts.		Health		Education	
	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count
Nothing	0	0	0	0	0	0
Lodge in central record	26.7	4	12.5	1	0	0
Returned to equality officer	26.7	4	25.0	2	42.9	3
Passed to policy/senior officers	13.3	2	12.5	1	14.3	1
Published on website	33.3	5	50.0	4	42.9	3
Other	0	0	0	0	0	0
Totals	**100.0**	**15**	**100.0**	**8**	**100.1**	**7**

7. Who within your authority receives information or a report on the outcome of the screening process? (*Multiple response*)

	Govt Depts.		Health		Education	
	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count
Equality officer	9.1	1	0	0	44.4	4
Senior management	36.4	4	20.0	1	33.3	3
Elected Representatives, Board/Council etc.	27.3	3	20.0	1	0	0
No-one	27.3	3	60.0	3	11.1	1
Other	0	0	0	0	11.1	1
Totals	**100.1**	**11**	**100.0**	**5**	**99.9**	**9**

8. What sort of issues are routinely subjected to screening? (*Multiple response*)

	Govt Depts.		Health		Education	
	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count
High level policies/ strategies etc (e.g. corporate plan, gr strategy)	38.5	5	27.3	3	38.5	5
Technical procedures (e.g. data recording, new rules on service delivery)	23.1	3	18.2	2	15.4	2
Internal procedures (e.g. recruitment, procurement	23.1	3	27.3	3	30.8	4
Business-to-business issues (e.g. making a grant to a third party service deliverer)	15.4	2	27.3	3	15.4	2
Other	0	0	0	0	0	0
Totals	**100.1**	**13**	**100.1**	**11**	**100.1**	**13**

B. Use of data/evidence when screening

10. Do the people carrying out screening usually include some data or other kind of evidence?

	Govt Depts.		Health		Education	
	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count
Yes, always	0	0	30.0	3	0	0
Yes, often	12.5	1	20.0	1	40.0	2
Yes, sometimes	62.5	5	0	0	40.0	2
Never	12.5	1	0	0	20.0	1
Other	12.5	1	20.0	1	0	0
Totals	**100.0**	**8**	**100.0**	**5**	**100.0**	**5**

11. Where does the data come from? (*Multiple response*)

	Govt Depts.		Health		Education	
	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count
Internal sources	43.8	7	30.8	4	55.6	5
External sources	37.5	6	30.8	4	22.2	2
Standard database (e.g. equality profile)	18.8	3	38.5	5	22.2	2
Other	0	0	0	0	0	0
Totals	**100.1**	**16**	**100.1**	**13**	**100.0**	**9**

12. In your opinion, is the data always necessary?

	Govt Depts.		Health		Education	
	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count
Yes, always	0	0	40.0	2	20.0	1
Yes, often	25.0	2	20.0	1	40.0	2
Yes, sometimes	37.5	3	20.0	1	40.0	2
Never	25.0	2	0	0	0	0
Other	12.5	1	20.0	1	0	0
Totals	**100.0**	**8**	**100.0**	**5**	**100.0**	**5**

13. Is consideration of the likely impacts on equality of opportunity/good relations usually included in any consultation or discussions about the proposals?

	Govt Depts.		Health		Education	
	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count
Yes, always	25.0	2	40.0	2	20.0	1
Yes, often	25.0	2	20.0	1	20.0	1
Yes, sometimes	50.0	4	20.0	1	60.0	3
Never	0	0	0	0	0	0
Other	0	0	20.0	1	0	0
Totals	**100.0**	**8**	**100.0**	**5**	**100.0**	**5**

C.   Outcomes of screening

15. Does your authority follow the Commission's screening template?

	Govt Depts.		Health		Education	
	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count
Yes	62.5	5	20.0	1	80.0	4
Yes, with additional sections	25.0	2	60.0	3	20.0	1
No	0	0	20.0	1	0	0
Don't know	12.5	1	0	0	0	0
Totals	**100.0**	**8**	**100.0**	**5**	**100.0**	**5**

16. Does your authority always identify the type of impact (positive or negative)?

	Govt Depts.		Health		Education	
	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count
Yes, always	62.5	5	20.0	1	80.0	4
Yes, often	12.5	1	80.0	4	20.0	1
Yes, sometimes	25.0	2	0	0	0	0
Never	0	0	0	0	0	0
Other	0	0	0	0	0	0
Totals	**100.0**	**8**	**100.0**	**5**	**100.0**	**5**

17. Does your authority always identify the level of impact as major, minor or none?

	Govt Depts.		Health		Education	
	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count
Yes, always	50.0	4	100.0	3	100.0	5
Yes, often	25.0	2	0	0	0	0
Yes, sometimes	25.0	2	0	0	0	0
Never	0	0	0	0	0	0
Use some other system	0	0	0	0	0	0
Totals	**100.0**	**8**	**100.0**	**3**	**100.0**	**5**

18. In your opinion, do officers seem to understand what 'impact' actually means?

	Govt Depts.		Health		Education	
	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count
Yes, always	14.3	1	33.3	1	20.0	1
Yes, often	42.9	3	33.3	1	60.0	3
Yes, sometimes	42.9	3	33.3	1	20.0	1
Never	0	0	0	0	0	0
Other	0	0	0	0	0	0
Totals	**100.1**	**7**	**99.9**	**3**	**100.0**	**5**

19. Are officers in your authority normally able to identify mitigating actions to overcome possible negative impacts?

	Govt Depts.		Health		Education	
	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count
Yes, always	14.3	1	0	0	0	0
Yes, often	28.6	2	50.0	1	40.0	2
Yes, sometimes	57.1	4	50.0	1	20.0	1
Never	0	0	0	0	0	0
Other	0	0	0	0	40.0	2
Totals	**100.0**	**7**	**100.0**	**2**	**100.0**	**5**

21. In your opinion, do officers seem to understand what 'opportunities to better promote equality of opportunity/good relations' actually means?

	Govt Depts.		Health		Education	
	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count
Yes, always	14.3	1	33.3	1	0	0
Yes, often	28.6	2	66.7	2	100.0	4
Yes, sometimes	28.6	2	0	0	0	0
Never	14.3	1	0	0	0	0
Other	14.3	1	0	0	0	0
Totals	**100.1**	**7**	**100.0**	**3**	**100.0**	**4**

22. What happens when 'opportunities to better promote' are identified? (*Multiple response*)

	Govt Depts.		Health		Education	
	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count
Mitigating actions are triggered	20.0	1	60.0	3	0	0
Separate action plan is developed	0	0	0	0	14.3	1
A note is made for future action	0	0	0	0	14.3	1
Situation monitored for future opportunities	0	0	20.0	1	42.9	3
Varies	40.0	2	20.0	1	14.3	1
Other	40.0	2	0	0	14.3	1
Totals	**100.0**	**5**	**100.0**	**5**	**100.1**	**7**

D. Good relations

26. Does screening help to develop policies/manage the good relations component?

	Govt Depts.		Health		Education	
	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count
Yes, completely	0	0	0	0	0	0
Yes, partly	28.6	2	100.0	2	60.0	3
No	42.9	3	0	0	40.0	2
Varies	28.6	2	0	0	0	0
Other	0	0	0	0	0	0
Totals	**100.1**	**7**	**100.0**	**2**	**100.0**	**5**

27. Do officers generally know what to do when they decide that there are likely impacts on good relations?

	Govt Depts.		Health		Education	
	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count
Yes, always	0	0	0	0	0	0
Yes, often	25.0	1	0	0	60.0	3
Yes, sometimes	50.0	2	100.0	2	40.0	2
Never	0	0	0	0	0	0
Other	25.0	1	0	0	0	0
Totals	**100.0**	**4**	**100.0**	**2**	**100.0**	**5**

29. Do you think the screening template should be expanded to say more about good relations?

	Govt Depts.		Health		Education	
	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count
Yes	0	0	0	0	0	0
No	75.0	6	100.0	5	80.0	4
Don't know	25.0	2	0	0	20.0	1
Totals	**100.0**	**8**	**100.0**	**5**	**100.0**	**5**

E. EQIAs

32. Has your authority carried out any EQIAs in the last two years?

	Govt Depts.		Health		Education	
	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count
Yes	37.5	3	60.0	3	20.0	1
No	62.5	5	40.0	2	80.0	4
Don't know	0	0	0	0	0	0
Totals	**100.0**	**8**	**100.0**	**5**	**100.0**	**5**

34. What sort of consultation was typically carried out for each EQIA? (*Multiple response*)

	Govt Depts.		Health		Education	
	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count
Written consultation (e.g. on-line)	100.0	3	16.7	1	50.0	1
Focus groups or similar	0	0	16.7	1	50.0	1
Public meetings	0	0	16.7	1	0	0
Combination of the above	0	0	50.0	3	0	0
Other	0	0	0	0	0	0
Totals	**100.0**	**3**	**100.1**	**6**	**100.0**	**2**

35. When was the EQIA consultation typically undertaken? (*Multiple response*)

	Govt Depts.		Health		Education	
	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count
At an early stage of the policy development	25.0	1	33.3	2	0	0
When options were being considered	50.0	2	50.0	3	33.3	1
Prior to implementation	25.0	1	16.7	1	33.3	1
After implementation	0	0	0	0	33.3	1
Other	0	0	0	0	0	0
Totals	**100.0**	**5**	**100.0**	**6**	**99.9**	**3**

36. What sort of response do you typically receive to an EQIA consultation?

	Govt Depts.		Health		Education	
	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count
None or very little	50.0	1	0	0	100.0	1
Reasonable response	0	0	100.0	1	0	0
High level of response	50.0	1	0	0	0	0
Other	0	0	0	0	0	0
Totals	**100.0**	**2**	**100.0**	**1**	**100.0**	**1**

38. How were the results of the EQIA consultation published? (*Multiple response*)

	Govt Depts.		Health		Education	
	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count
Separate EQIA final report	66.7	2	0	0	0	0
As part of another report	0	0	33.3	1	0	0
Consultees/respondents informed of results	0	0	33.3	1	0	0
Some combination of the above	0	0	33.3	1	100.0	1
Not published	0	0	0	0	0	0
Other	33.3	1	0	0	0	0
Totals	**100.0**	**3**	**99.9**	**3**	**100.0**	**1**

39. In your experience, do officers try to avoid undertaking EQIAs?

	Govt Depts.		Health		Education	
	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count
Yes, always	14.3	1	0	0	0	0
Yes, often	14.3	1	33.3	1	0	0
Yes, sometimes	0	0	66.7	2	40.0	2
Never	28.6	2	0	0	40.0	2
Don't know	42.9	3	0	0	20.0	1
Totals	**100.1**	**8**	**100.0**	**3**	**100.0**	**5**

40. If you answered yes to Q39, why do you think officers try to avoid undertaking EQIAs? (*Multiple response*)

	Govt Depts.		Health		Education	
	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count
Takes too much time	33.3	1	37.5	3	28.6	2
Takes too many resources	0	0	37.5	3	28.6	2
Raises issues that are difficult to address	33.3	1	12.5	1	14.3	1
Low response to EQIA consultations in the past	0	1	0	0	28.6	2
Other	33.3	0	12.5	1	0	0
Totals	**99.9**	**3**	**100.0**	**8**	**100.1**	**7**

F. Finally – moving forward

44. From your understanding of what screening/EQIA provides for, or is used for, could you see the processes being adapted for assessing how you will meet objectives in a strategy?

	Govt Depts.		Health		Education	
	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count
Yes, always	12.5	1	0	0	25.0	1
Yes, often	0	0	0	0	25.0	1
Yes, sometimes	62.5	5	66.7	2	25.0	1
Never	25.0	2	0	0	0	0
Don't know	0	0	33.3	1	25.0	1
Totals	**100.0**	**8**	**100.0**	**3**	**100.0**	**4**

4. List of published EQIAs: 2013 - 2015

Public Authority	EQIA	Date
Libraries NI	Opening Hours Policy	2015
NI Policing Board	Policing Plan	2015
BSO	eHealth and Care Strategy	2014
BSO	Self-Directed Support	2015
DE	Proposal to End Earmarked CRED Funding	2015
DE	Deferring Compulsory School Starting Age	2015
DE	Reform of NI Teachers' Pension Scheme	2014
Belfast Health Trust	Mental Health Day Opportunities	2015
Belfast Health Trust	Learning Disability Day Opportunities	2015
Belfast Health Trust	Supporting Young People in Their Community	2014
Belfast Health Trust	Closure of Ballyowen (move to supported housing)	2015
DETI	Extension of Gas Network to the West	2014
Belfast City Council	Leisure Transformation Programme	2015
PSNI	Security Vetting procedures	2015
PSNI	Workforce Plan	2015
PSNI	Speedy Justice	2013
PSNI	Alcohol Test Purchasing Procedures	2013
DSD	Laganbank Quarter	2015
DSD	Proposals for a Pensions Bill	2014
DSD	Proposal for a Pension Schemes Bill	2015
NI Assembly Commission	Digital First Strategy	2015
NI Assembly Commission	Flying of the Union Flag	2014
Mid Ulster DC	Irish Language Policy	2015
Derry & Strabane DC	Leisure & Sports Pricing Policy	2014
Derry & Strabane DC	Street Naming Policy	2014
Derry & Strabane DC	Good Relations Strategy	2014
NI Fire & Rescue Service	Revised Emergency Response Standards	2015
Stranmillis University College	Research Excellence Framework Code of Practice	2014
Habinteg HA	Access & Communications	2014
Sport NI	Corporate Plan 2015 - 20	2015