

Introduction

Mid Ulster District Council has a statutory duty to screen its policies, procedures, practices/decisions. This Policy Screening Form and Report assists Council Departments to consider the likely equality and good relations impacts of the aforementioned, if any, placed upon our ratepayers, citizens, service users, staff and visitors to the district.

Section 1 – Policy scoping

This asks the Policy Author to provide details on the policy, procedure, practice and/or decision being screened and what available evidence you have gathered to help make an assessment of the likely impact on equality of opportunity and good relations. Reference to policy within this document refers to either of the aforementioned (policy, procedure, practice, and/ or decision).

Section 2 – Screening questions

This asks about the extent of the likely impact of the policy on groups of people within each of the Section 75 categories. Details of the groups consulted and the level of assessment of the likely impact. This includes consideration of multiple identity and issues.

Section 3 – Screening decision

This guides the Council to reach a screening decision as to whether or not there is a need to carry out an equality impact assessment (EQIA), or introduce measures to mitigate the likely impact, or the introduction of an alternative policy to better promote equality of opportunity.

Section 4 – Monitoring

This provides guidance to the Council on monitoring for adverse impact and broader monitoring.

Section 5 – Approval and authorisation

This verifies the Council's approval of a screening decision by a senior manager responsible for the policy.

Appendix AScreening ProcessSection 1Policy Scoping & Information

The first stage of the screening process involves scoping the policy under consideration which sets the context and confirms the aims and objectives for the policy being screened. Scoping the policy helps to identify constraints as well as opportunities and will help the policy author to work through the screening process on a step by step basis.

| 1. Policy Name | | | | | | |
|---|--|-----------------|--|--|--|--|
| Travel & Subsistence Policy | | | | | | |
| 2. Is this an existing, revised or a new policy? | | | | | | |
| Revised Policy for Mid Ulster District Council | | | | | | |
| 3. What is it trying to achieve? (aims/outcomes) | | | | | | |
| This policy sets out clear rules in relation to what costs may be reclai employees incurred in the course of their duties and to make clear th responsibilities of staff in accordance with the principles of good gove explains what constitutes eligible mileage & the procedure for making subsistence claims including NIJC maximum recommended rates for reimbursement of expenditure & NJC car allowance rates for Essenti Casual users. The policy also sets out the criteria for meeting 'Essen allowance. | e roles ernance g travel al and | & e. It & | | | | |
| 4. Are there any Section 75 categories which might be | Yes | Х | | | | |
| expected to benefit from the intended policy? | No | | | | | |
| If so, please explain | | | | | | |
| Policy will provide equality of opportunity to all irrespective of S75 categories | | | | | | |
| 6. Who initiated or wrote the policy? | | | | | | |
| Organisational Development Dept. | | | | | | |
| 7. Who owns and who implements the policy? | | | | | | |
| Mid Ulster District Council | | | | | | |

Implementation factors

| | | Yes | No |
|--|---|---|---------------|
| Are there any factors which could contribute to/ detract from intended aim/ outcome of the policy? | | | |
| If yes, are they financia | l? | х | |
| If yes, are they legislativ | ve? | X | |
| If yes, Please specify | Financial: Budget restrictions (e.g. reduction in la could have impact on resources (finan Pandemic outbreak e.g. COVID 19 re staff working from home – conference Legislative: Changes in legislation (e.g. cleaner/g environment – move to electric cars, n home working etc. | ncial & staf esulting in n e calls etc. reener | fing) nore |
| Other, Please specify | | | |

Stakeholders

The internal and external (actual or potential) that the policy will be impacted upon

| | Yes | No |
|-----------------------------------|-----|----|
| Staff | Х | |
| Service Users | | |
| Other public sector organisations | | |
| Voluntary/community/ trade unions | | |
| Other, please specify | | |

Others policies with a bearing on this policy

| Policies | Owners |
|---|----------------------|
| Employee Code of Conduct Terms & Conds of Emplyt | H.R. O.D. department |
| Conference Policy Counter Fraud Policy | " |
| Learning & Development Policy Fleet Safety Policy | " |
| Flexible Working Arrangements Retention & Disposal Policy | " |
| Data Protection Policy | " |
| NJC LGS National Agmt on Pay & Conditions of Service | |
| , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , | |

Available evidence

Information and available evidence (qualitative and quantitative) gathered to inform the policy under each of the Section 75 groups as identified within the Northern Ireland Act 1998.

| Section 75 category | Details of evidence | e/information | | | | |
|---------------------|--|---|---|---|---|---------------|
| Religious belief | 63.77% of the populat or were brought up in religion. Other religio population (Source: 2 | a Protestant and Otl ns comprised 690 (0 | her Christian (ii | ncluding | Christian rel | lated) |
| | Religion or Religio | on brought up in | N | lo. | % | |
| | Catholic | | 88 | ,375 | 63.77 | |
| | Protestant and Othe Christian related) | er Christian (including | | ,372 | 33.46 | |
| | Other religions | | 6 | 90 | 0.5 | |
| | None | | 3, | 153 | 2.28 | |
| | Total | | 138 | ,590 | 100 | |
| | Council (Source: NISI | RA): | | | | |
| | Party | Votes | Percentage | Cou | ncil Seats | 1 |
| | Party SF | Votes 22,587 | Percentage 41.0% | Cou | ncil Seats 18 |] |
| | SF DUP | 22,587 9,723 | 41.0% 17.6% | Cou | 18 8 | |
| | SF DUP UUP | 22,587 9,723 9,573 | 41.0% 17.6% 17.4% | Cou | 18 8 7 | |
| | SF DUP UUP SDLP | 22,587 9,723 9,573 7,600 | 41.0% 17.6% 17.4% 13.8% | Cou | 18 8 7 6 | |
| | SF DUP UUP SDLP Independent | 22,587 9,723 9,573 7,600 2,689 | 41.0% 17.6% 17.4% 13.8% 4.9% | Cou | 18 8 7 6 1 | |
| | SF DUP UUP SDLP Independent TUV | 22,587 9,723 9,573 7,600 2,689 2,380 | 41.0% 17.6% 17.4% 13.8% 4.9% 4.3% | Cou | 18 8 7 6 1 0 | |
| | SF DUP UUP SDLP Independent | 22,587 9,723 9,573 7,600 2,689 | 41.0% 17.6% 17.4% 13.8% 4.9% | Cou | 18 8 7 6 1 | |
| Racial group | SF DUP UUP SDLP Independent TUV Alliance | 22,5879,7239,5737,6002,6892,380250195195I Census the overwhanian and so forth. Sovernment District (L | 41.0% 17.6% 17.4% 13.8% 4.9% 4.3% 0.6% 0.4% elming majority this total will b statistics indicat GD) born outsi | v of the p e migrar e that th de North | 18 8 7 6 1 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 | es, people |
| | SF DUP UUP SDLP Independent TUV Alliance UKIP According to the 2011 (98.48%) were classif such as Polish, Lithua in Mid Ulster Local Go Place of Birth Great Britain Republic of Ireland | 22,5879,7239,5737,6002,6892,380250195195I Census the overwhied as 'white'. Withinanian and so forth. Sovernment District (Lby white, Estonia, | 41.0% 17.6% 17.4% 13.8% 4.9% 4.3% 0.6% 0.4% elming majority this total will b statistics indicat GD) born outsi Hungary, Latvia | v of the p e migrar e that th de North | 18 8 7 6 1 0 <t< td=""><td>es, people</td></t<> | es, people |

| | The minority ethnic language profile wi of the Black & Minority Ethnic (BME) c composition of language groups in Mic census by NISRA as: | ommunity profi | le within th | ne district. 1 | The |
|-----|---|-----------------|--------------|----------------|--------|
| | Main Languages of residents in Mi | d Ulster Coun | cil area | No. | |
| | English | | | 125,715 | |
| | Polish | | | 2,008 | |
| | Lithuanian | | | 2,039 | |
| | Portuguese | | | 903 | |
| | Irish (Gaelic) | | | 404 | |
| | Slovak | | | 477 | |
| | Russian | | | 297 | |
| | Latvia | | | 261 | |
| | Hungarian | | | 117 | |
| | Chinese | | | 64 | |
| | Tagalog/Filipino | | | 38 | |
| | Malaysian | | | | |
| | Other | | | 922 | |
| Age | The age profile of Mid Ulster Local Gov NISRA) | vernment Distri | ct area as | at 2015 (So | ource, |
| | | Mid Ulster | Northe | rn Ireland | |
| | Total Population | 144,002 | 1,851,6 | 21 | |
| | 0-15 years | 33,123 | 385,200 |) | |
| | 16-39 years | 47,646 | 583,116 | | |
| | 40-64 years | 43,621 | 591,481 | | |
| | 65+ years | 19,612 | 291,824 | | |
| | | 10,012 | 231,02- | T | |
| | Population Change % (2005-2015) | 15.3% | 7.2% | | |
| | | | | | |

| Marital status | | d from results o | | | | | | | |
|-----------------------|--|---|--|---|--|-------------------------------|---------------------------------|--------------------------------------|------------|
| | | | | | lid Ulster | | | | d |
| | | | | No. | | | lo | % | |
| | registered | ver married or a same sex ci p) (Aged 16+) | | 38,353 | 35.97 | 7 5 | 17,393 | 36.14 | |
| | Married (Ag | ged 16+) | | 54,192 | 50.82 | 2 6 | 80,831 | 47.56 | |
| | In a registered same sex civil partnership (Aged 16+) | | 62 | 0.06 | 1 | ,243 | 0.09 | | |
| | or still lega | l (but is still leg ally in a same s p) (Aged 16+) | | d 3,369 | 3.16 | 5 | 6,911 | 3.98 | |
| | civil partne | or formerly in a ership which is (Aged 16+) | | | 3.88 | 7 | 8,074 | 5.45 | |
| | Widowed o | r surviving par | tner from a | 6,523 | 6.12 | 9 | 7,088 | 6.78 | |
| | same sex o | ivil partnership | o (Aged 16- | -) | | | | | |
| Sexual orientation | Category and of different include betw due to the r | statistics are a nd there are the sexual orientat veen 3% and 4 ature of 'disclo ay be closer to | erefore no ion. Howe 4% would b osure' in thi | official sta ver, the In e either g | itistics ava itegrated F ay, lesbiar | ilable i louseh n and/c | n relati nold Su or bisex | on to pers rvey woul ual. Howe | d ever, |
| | Region | Heterosexual / Straight | Gay/ Lesbian | Bisexual | Gay/ Lesbian/ Bisexual | Other | Don knov /refu | w No | onse |
| | England | 92.54% | 1.10% | 0.51% | 1.61% | 0.33% | | | |
| | Wales | 93.93% | 1.04% | 0.48% | 1.52% | 0.45% | | | |
| | Scotland | 94.65% | 0.82% | 0.33% | 1.14% | 0.26% | | | |
| | N Ireland | 93.00% | 0.64% | 0.96% | 1.60% | 0.26% | | | |
| | Total | 92.80% | 1.06% | 0.51% | 1.57% | 0.32% | | | |
| | Research a population i | lso conducted dentify themse red and transvo | by the HM lves as gay | Treasury /, lesbian, | shows that | t betw | een 5% | 5-7% of th | |

| Womon | - 9 | d Ulster LGD is | detailed as; | | |
|------------|---|--|---|--|-----------------------------|
| women | | Mid Ulster | | Northern I | reland |
| generally | N | F | % | No. | % |
| | | | .05 8 | 887,323 | 49.00 |
| | Female 69,2 | 228 49 | .95 95 | 923,540 | 51.00 |
| Disability | According to the 2011 N health problem or disabi people within the district | ility that limited t | their day-to-da | ay activities wl | hilst 80.43% of |
| | | M | lid Ulster | North | ern Ireland |
| | | No. | % | No. | % |
| | Disability / long term health | 26,870 | 19.39 | 374,646 | 20.69 |
| | No disability / long term health problem | 111,720 | 80.61 | 1,436,217 | 79.31 |
| Dependants | 52,000 persons with Persons with dependent | ts may be peopl | | | |
| | care of a child (or childred person. The below table | | ith a disability, | , and/ or a dep | pendent older |
| | care of a child (or childre | e provides a sur | ith a disability, mmary with re | , and/ or a dep spect Mid Uls | bendent older ter LGD. |
| | care of a child (or childre | e provides a sur | ith a disability, | , and/ or a dep spect Mid Uls | pendent older |
| | care of a child (or childred person. The below table Households with dependent children | e provides a sur Mid No. 18,626 | ith a disability, mmary with re I UIster 8 38.99 | , and/ or a dep spect Mid Uls Northe No. 238,094 | rn Ireland 33.86 |
| | care of a child (or childred person. The below tabled Households with dependent children Lone parent household with dependents | e provides a sur Mid No. 18,626 Is 3,485 | ith a disability, mmary with re I Ulster % | , and/ or a dep espect Mid Uls Northe 238,094 63,921 | rn Ireland 33.86 9.09 |
| | care of a child (or childred person. The below table Households with dependent children Lone parent household | e provides a sur Mid No. 18,626 Is 3,485 | ith a disability, mmary with re I UIster 8 38.99 | , and/ or a dep spect Mid Uls Northe No. 238,094 | rn Ireland 33.86 |

Needs, experiences and priorities

Taking into account the information referred to above, what are the different needs, experiences and priorities of each of the following categories, in relation to the particular policy/decision? Specify details for each of the Section 75 categories

| Section 75 category | Details of needs/experiences/priorities |
|-------------------------|---|
| Religious belief | None in relation to this policy |
| Political opinion | None in relation to this policy |
| Racial group | Some minorities, for example, people who do not have English as a first language may need to have information explained or for someone to take more time to help them understand a policy. |
| Age | Some older people may need information explained to them or for someone to take more time to help them understand a policy or procedure. |
| Marital status | None in relation to this policy |
| Sexual orientation | None in relation to this policy |
| Men and women generally | None in relation to this policy |
| Disability | Some disabled staff may need more help to understand the policy or information in alternative formats etc |
| Dependants | None in relation to this policy |

Section 2 – Screening Questions

In making a decision as to carry out an Equality Impact Assessment (EQIA), the Council should consider its answers to the questions 1- 3 detailed below.

If the Council's conclusion is <u>none</u> in respect of all of the Section 75 equality of opportunity categories, then the Council may decide to screen the policy out. If a policy is 'screened out' as having no relevance to equality of opportunity, the Council should give details of the reasons for the decision taken.

If the Council's conclusion is <u>major</u> in respect of one or more of the Section 75 equality of opportunity, then consideration should be given to subjecting the policy to the equality impact assessment procedure.

If the Council's conclusion is <u>minor</u> in respect of one or more of the Section 75 equality categories, then consideration should still be given to proceeding with an equality impact assessment, or to:

- measures to mitigate the adverse impact; or
- the introduction of an alternative policy to better promote equality of opportunity.

In favour of a 'major' impact

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

In favour of 'minor' impact

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

In favour of none

- a) The policy has no relevance to equality of opportunity.
- b) The policy is purely technical in nature and will have no bearing in terms of its likely impact on equality of opportunity for people within the equality categories.

Screening questions

| 1. What is the likely impact on equality of opportunity for those affected by this |
|--|
| policy, for each of the Section 75 equality categories (minor/ major/ none) |

| Section 75 category | Details of policy impact | Level of impact? minor/major/none |
|-------------------------------|--|--------------------------------------|
| Religious belief | This policy will be implemented on an equal basis. | None |
| Political opinion | This policy will be implemented on an equal basis. | None |
| Racial group | This policy will be implemented on an equal basis. | None |
| Age | This policy will be implemented on an equal basis | None |
| Marital status | This policy will be implemented on an equal basis. | None |
| Sexual orientation | This policy will be implemented on an equal basis. | None |
| Men and women generally | This policy will be implemented on an equal basis | None |
| Disability | This policy will be implemented on an equal basis | None |
| Dependants | This policy will be implemented on an equal basis | None |

| | pportunities to better promote equal 75 equality categories? (Yes/ No) | ity of opportunity for people |
|-------------------------------|---|-------------------------------|
| Section 75 category | If Yes, provide details | If No, provide reasons |
| Religious belief | | Νο |
| Political opinion | | Νο |
| Racial group | | Νο |
| Age | | Νο |
| Marital status | | Νο |
| Sexual orientation | | Νο |
| Men and women generally | | Νο |
| Disability | | Νο |
| Dependants | | Νο |

| . Are there opportunities without prejudice, to the equality of opportunity uty, to better promote good relations between Section 75 equality ategories, through tackling prejudice and/ or promoting understanding? Yes/ No) | | | | |
|--|-----|---|--|--|
| | No | Х | | |
| | Yes | | | |
| If yes, please detail the opportunities below: | | | | |
| | | | | |

If yes is concluded to Question 3, then the policy will be referred to the Council's Good Relations Working Group for consideration. The Group will consider the potential opportunities and assess if and how the overall impact of a decision/policy can better promote good relations.

Additional Considerations - Multiple identity

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

No

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

Section 3 – Screening Decision

In light of answers provided to the questions within Section 3 select one of the following with regards the policy:

| | | Select One |
|---|---|---------------|
| 1 | Shall not be subject to an EQIA - with no mitigating measures required | x |
| 2 | Shall not be subject to an EQIA - <i>mitigating measures/ alternative policies introduced</i> | |
| 3 | Shall be subject to an EQIA | |

If 1 or 2 above (i.e. not to be subject to an EQIA) please provide details of reasons why.

No equality issues have been identified that warrant a further inspection of equality issues in relation to this policy.

If 2 above (i.e. not to subject to an EQIA) in what ways can adverse impacts attaching to the policy be mitigated or an alternative policy be introduced. N/A

If 3 above (i.e. shall be subject to an EQIA), please provide details of the reasons.

N/A

Mitigation

When it is concluded that the likely impact is 'minor' and an equality impact assessment is not to be conducted, you may consider mitigation to lessen the severity of any equality impact, or the introduction of an alternative policy to better promote equality of opportunity.

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

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

N/A

Timetabling and prioritising

If the policy has been screened in for equality impact assessment, please answer the below to determine its priority for timetabling the equality impact assessment.

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

| Priority criterion | Rating (1-3) |
|------------------------------------|-----------------|
| Effect on equality of opportunity | |
| Social need | |
| Effect on people's daily lives | |
| Relevance to a Council's functions | |

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

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

| Yes | |
|-----|---|
| No | X |

Section 5 – Monitoring

Effective monitoring will help identify any future adverse impact arising from the policy which may lead the Council to conduct an equality impact assessment, as well as help with future planning and policy development. Please detail proposed monitoring arrangements below:

Implementation of this policy will be monitored & reviewed in line with any changes in government policy and a formal review undertaken 24 months from its effective date. Any changes made will be communicated in the Policy & Resources Committee in a timely manner.

Section 6 – Approval and authorisation

| Screened by: | Position/ Job Title | Date |
|--------------|--|---------|
| | Corporate Learning & Development Manager | 31/1/20 |
| | | |
| Approved by: | Position/ Job Title | Date |
| | Director of O.D. | 31/1/20 |

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

