**Equality Screening Form**

**INTRODUCTION**

The information contained in this Equality Screening Form has been extracted from the Equality Commission for Northern Ireland’s Guide for Public Authorities (2010). Additional information about the 5 parts of the form and a flowchart to demonstrate the process of completion is detailed in [**Appendix 1**](#Appendix1) of the form.

This template document and further guidance can be found by clicking the following link - [www.equalityni.org/S75duties](https://www.equalityni.org/S75duties)

**PART 1- POLICY SCOPING**

The first stage of the screening process involves scoping the policy under consideration. The purpose of policy scoping is to help prepare the background and context and set out the aims and objectives for the policy, being screened. At this stage, scoping the policy will help identify potential constraints as well as opportunities and will help the policy maker work through the screening process on a step by step basis.

Public authorities should remember that the Section 75 statutory duties apply to internal policies (relating to people who work for the authority), as well as external policies (relating to those who are, or could be, served by the authority).

**Information about the policy**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Name of Policy** | ePayslip |
| **Is it existing, revised or a new policy?** | Existing |[ ]  New |[x]  Revised |[ ]
| **If revised, please outline main updates:** |  |
| **What is it trying to achieve?** **(Intended aims/outcomes)** | Currently employees are provided with a paper copy of their payslip. This is distributed through our internal post system.The aim of this change is to allow employees to access their payslips electronically through either their mobile phone, PC/Laptop or Tablet. This would reduce the large volume of paper that is currently being used to print payslips on a weekly/monthly basis.The benefits for the employee are as follows:* Access to payslip immediately – staff will be able to view their payslips at a time and place that suits them. At present someone who only works a couple of days a week may need to wait until they are back at work to collect their payslip. This particularly affects staff who work part-time, who are predominantly women and men over 55 years.
* Staff on Maternity/Paternity/Sick Leave will also be able to see their pay details at the same time as other staff, at present they need to wait for their payslip to be sent out by their local depot.
* Staff with visual impairments / dyslexia will be able to access their pay details on screen which will be larger and therefore clearer that the current payslip size or through other assistive technology.
* There is also a benefit for people who are reassigning their gender as the current payslips have individual titles which may not correspond with individuals reassigned gender. Even if this information does not change on the online system, at least the individual will have their privacy better protected than having paper payslips being processed by many people.
* Ability to access historical payslips.
* Ability to print historical payslips.
* No more storage of payslips required.
* The new system will enhance individuals right to private life as information will be securely stored and made available to them beyond their employment for a limited period of time.
* Data Security as payslips are sent on mass to depots.

The benefits to the Employer are as follows:* Reduction in processing times for payroll team.
* Reduction in transportation times across Translink.
* Reduction in costs for Stationary and Ink.

The employee will receive an e-mail to let them know that the payslip is ready to be viewed. They will then be able to log onto an on-line account and set up an appropriate password to access their payslips on-line.Paper payslips will be offered as a reasonable alternative to those who have a disability which makes the electronic payslip unsuitable.  |
| **Are there any Section 75 categories which might be expected to benefit from the intended policy? If so, explain how.**  | Applicants with certain disabilities may benefit from using an online portal, e.g. dyslexia, visual impairment. They have the option of using 3rd party software to be able to read out the text from the application form, read out their responses, and change the screen size/resolution to enhance the text.Applicants for whom English is a second language, may also be able to utilise 3rd party software to translate the text if they have any queries regarding translation. |
| **Who initiated or wrote the policy?**  | Payroll Manager |
| **Who owns and who implements the policy?** | Payroll |

**Implementation Factors**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Yes |[x]  No |[ ]

Are there any factors which could contribute to/detract from the intended aim/outcome of the policy/decision?

If yes, are they: (Select all applicable)

|  |
| --- |
|[x]  Financial |
|[ ]  Legislative |
|[x]  Other – please specify:  | Environmental (Paper payslips) |

**Main stakeholders affected**

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

|  |
| --- |
|[x]  Staff |
|[ ]  Service Users |
|[ ]  Other Public Sector Organisations |
|[ ]  Voluntary/ Community/ Trade Unions |
|[ ]  Other – please specify: |  |

##### [Other policies with a bearing on this policy](#Onefour) (please list):

|  |
| --- |
| * Cyber Liability
* Data Protection Policy
 |

**Available Evidence**

Evidence to help inform the screening process may take many forms. Public authorities should ensure that their screening decision is informed by relevant data. The following document should help you source data - [Section 75 - Evidence Signposting Guide](https://www.equalityni.org/ECNI/media/ECNI/Publications/Employers%20and%20Service%20Providers/Public%20Authorities/S75DataSignpostingGuide.pdf)

What evidence/information (both qualitative and quantitative) have you gathered to inform this policy? Specify details for each of the Section 75 categories.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Section 75 category** | **Details of evidence/information****Based on Employee Diversity data from 1st Jan 2023** |
| Religious belief | 44% Roman Catholic53% Protestant3% Other Approx. 44% of households in N.I. are Roman Catholic and 53% are Protestant. Approx. 75% of households in N.I. have access to the internet at home and approx. 72% of households in N.I. have home broadband access.An OFCOM report from 2011 provides statistics to show that 92% of people in N.I. use a mobile phone, and almost ¼ of these are Smartphones. Email can be set up on smartphones.  |
| Political opinion | Approx. 53% of our applicants perceive themselves as Protestant and approx. 44% as Roman Catholic |
| Racial group | 96.5% White0.6% BAME2.8% Unknown Approx. 0.6% of our employees are from a non-white backgroundOFCOM’s 2011 research indicates high levels of internet usage among ethnic minority groups across the UK. |
| Age | 8.4% 30 years and younger 46.6% 31 years to 50 years45% 51 years and older Approx. 10.5% of our applicants are aged 50+ with 2.2% aged 60+; approx. 40.5% of our applicants are aged 29 or less.Approx. 45% of our employees are aged 50+ 8.4% of our employees are aged 30 or less.The NISRA data shows that while internet access is highest among the youngest age bands, there are high levels of internet access at all age bands up to and including the 50+ band. Internet access decreases sharply from 70 onwards. It is important to note that the last year for which NISRA data is available is 2009/10. OFCOM’s 2013 research highlights significant growth in internet and the use of social media among the 55-64 age group. The report notes that there has been no significant growth in use  |
| Marital status |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Married, Civil Partnership or Living with someone as a couple | Divorced or Separated  | Single, never married | widowed | Not known/Prefer not to say |
| 23.3% | 1.7% | 20.8% | <1% | 54% |

 |
| Sexual orientation |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| A different sex | Same sex | Both | Not known/Prefer not to say |
| 39.1% | 1.7% | <1% | 59% |

Approx. 39.1% of our employees prefer someone of a different sex; however, we do not know/they prefer not to say the sexual orientation of approx. 59% of our employees. |
| Men and women generally | 14.6% Female85.4% Male Approx. 14.6% of our applicants are female and approx. 85.4% are male.The NISRA data shows similar levels of mobile phone ownership and internet access among men and women. This is supported by the OFCOM research which shows similar levels of internet usage by men and women. |
| Disability | 1.8% have a Disability30.9% No Disability67.3% Not known / Prefer not to sayApprox. 1.8% of our employees have stated that they have a disability.OFCOM’s research shows also shows lower levels of internet usage by people with disabilities, although the researchers acknowledge the sample size for the data is too low to be entirely reliable. DEL’s Disability Employment Services provides dedicated support to people with disabilities to find and retain work.  |
| Dependants |  23.3% have dependents17.8% don’t have dependents58.9% Not known / Prefer not to say Approx. 17.8% of our employees do not have caring responsibilities. 23.3% of our employees do have caring responsibilities, and we do not have data/they prefer not to say for the remaining 58.9% of our employees.The NISRA Continuous Household Survey of 2013/2014 shows that of the N.I. households with 1 person living in them, 47% have home internet access. Where NI households have 5 or more people living in them, 99% have internet access. However, it is not clear from this information if there is a dependant relationship in such households. The NISRA data shows that levels of internet access is above the Northern Ireland average for households containing three or more people, just below the Northern Ireland average for two people households and substantially below the NI average for single person households. This figure is likely to be heavily influenced by the lower number of over 65s who access the internet. Over 65s make up 40% of all single person households in Northern Ireland (Census 2011). OFCOM’s data shows lower rates of internet access and usage by people of state pension age. NISRA’s data shows a similar pattern for those over 70. |

**Needs, Experiences and Priorities**

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

Specify details for each of the Section 75 categories

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Section 75 category** | **Details of needs/experiences/priorities** |
| Religious belief |  Data does not suggest that those in this section 75 category will have different needs or priorities linked to this policy. |
| Political opinion | Data does not suggest that those in this section 75 category will have different needs or priorities linked to this policy. |
| Racial group | Data does not suggest that those in this section 75 category will have different needs or priorities linked to this policy. |
| Age | Data suggests that those in the 70+ category may not have as readily available internet access than those in other age categories.  |
| Marital status | Data does not suggest that those in this section 75 category will have different needs or priorities linked to this policy. |
| Sexual orientation | Data does not suggest that those in this section 75 category will have different needs or priorities linked to this policy. |
| Men and women generally | Data does not suggest that those in this section 75 category will have different needs or priorities linked to this policy. |
| Disability | Whilst assistive technology may help those with specific needs this data suggests that those in this category may not have as readily available internet access. |
| Dependants | Data does not suggest that those in this section 75 category will have different needs or priorities linked to this policy. |

**PART 2 - SCREENING QUESTIONS**

**Introduction**

In making a decision as to whether or not there is a need to carry out an equality impact assessment, the public authority should consider its answers to the questions 1-4 which are given on pages 66-68 of the Guide: [Guide for Public Authorities April 2010](https://www.equalityni.org/ECNI/media/ECNI/Publications/Employers%20and%20Service%20Providers/S75GuideforPublicAuthoritiesApril2010.pdf)

Taking into account the evidence presented above, consider and comment on the likely impact on equality of opportunity and good relations for those affected by this policy, in any way, for each of the equality and good relations categories, by applying the screening questions given overleaf and indicate the level of impact on the group i.e. minor, major or none.

**Impact: Major / Minor / None**

If the public authority’s conclusion is **major** in respect of one or more of the Section 75 equality of opportunity and/or good relations categories, then consideration should be given to subjecting the policy to the equality impact assessment procedure.

**In favour of ‘MAJOR’ impact**

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

If the public authority’s conclusion is **minor** in respect of one or more of the Section 75 equality categories and/or good relations categories, then consideration should still be given to proceeding with an equality impact assessment, or to:

* Measures to mitigate the adverse impact; or
* The introduction of an alternative policy to better promote equality of opportunity and/or good relations.

**In favour of ‘MINOR’ impact**

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

If the public authority’s conclusion is **none** in respect of all of the Section 75 equality of opportunity and/or good relations categories, then the public authority may decide to screen the policy out. If a policy is ‘screened out’ as having no relevance to equality of opportunity or good relations, a public authority should give details of the reasons for the decision taken.

**In favour of ‘NONE’**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **A** | The policy has no relevance to equality of opportunity or good relations. |
| **B** | The policy is purely technical in nature and will have no bearing in terms of its likely impact on equality of opportunity or good relations for people within the equality and good relations categories.  |

**Screening Questions 1 - 4**

|  |
| --- |
| **Screening Question 1**  |
| What is the likely impact on equality of opportunity for those affected by this policy, for each of the Section 75 equality categories? Minor/ Major/ None |
| Section 75 category | Details of policy impact | Level of impact? Minor/Major/None |
| Religious belief |  | None |
| Political opinion |  | None |
| Racial group |  | None |
| Age | Evidence suggests that those in 70+ age category may have access issues. With any access issues the depot will assist the employee to try and resolve. The employee will be able to raise the issue with the Manager and agree a way forward | Minor |
| Marital status |  | None |
| Sexual orientation |  | None |
| Men and women generally |  | None |
| Disability | Evidence suggests that those with a disability may have a lower internet usage level. With any access issues the depot will assist the employee to try and resolve. The employee will be able to raise the issue with the Manager and agree a way forward | Minor |
| Dependants |  | None |

|  |
| --- |
|  **Screening Question** **2**  |
| Are there opportunities to better promote equality of opportunity for people within the Section 75 equalities categories? |
| Section 75 category | If **Yes**, provide details | If **No**, provide reasons |
| Religious belief |  | No, this is a technical policy and no specific needs were identified for this S75 category. There are no opportunities to promote equality of opportunity  |
| Political opinion |  | Not impacted |
| Racial group |  | Not impacted |
| Age | Depots to assist employees that will have difficulty getting the payslip. The employee will be able to raise the issue with the Manager and agree a way forward |  |
| Marital status |  | Not impacted |
| Sexual orientation |  | Not impacted |
| Men and women generally |  | Not impacted |
| Disability | Depots to assist employees that will have difficulty getting the payslip. The employee will be able to raise the issue with the Manager and agree a way forward |  |
| Dependants |  | Not impacted |

|  |
| --- |
| **Screening Question** **3**  |
| To what extent is the policy likely to impact on good relations between people of different religious belief, political opinion or racial group? Minor/ Major/ None |
| Good relations category | Details of policy impact | Level of impact Minor/Major/None |
| Religious belief |  | None |
| Political opinion |  | None |
| Racial group |  | None |

|  |
| --- |
| **Screening Question 4**  |
| Are there opportunities to better promote good relations between people of different religious belief, political opinion or racial group? |
| Good relations category | If **Yes**, provide details | If **No**, provide reasons |
| Religious belief |  | No, this is a technical policy and no specific needs were identified for this S75 category. There are no opportunities to promote equality of opportunity |
| Political opinion |  | Not impacted |
| Racial group |  | Not impacted |

**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).

|  |
| --- |
| Steps will be taken at Depot Level to assist any employees that are having difficulties with the ePayslips. The employee will be able to raise the issue with the Manager and agree a way forwardAge and Disability i.e. those in the ‘older’ age category who also have a disability. |

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

|  |
| --- |
| Age - Issue with access to the internet Disability - Unable to access/use the functionalitySteps will be taken at Depot Level to assist any employees that are having difficulties with the ePayslips. The employee will be able to raise the issue with the Manager and agree a way forward |

**PART 3 - SCREENING DECISION**

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

|  |
| --- |
| Whilst there is potential ‘minor’ impacts on two section 75 categories, a mitigation within the policy has been introduced. Therefore, and equality impact assessment is not required. |

If the decision is not to conduct an equality impact assessment the public authority should consider if the policy should be **mitigated or an alternative policy be introduced**.

|  |
| --- |
| A mitigation within the policy has been introduced to help those employees who may have access issues i.e. they will be supported at a local depot/location by their manager.  |

If the decision **is to** subject the policy to an **equality impact assessment**, please provide details of the reasons.

|  |
| --- |
|  |

All public authorities’ equality schemes must state the authority’s arrangements for assessing and consulting on the likely impact of policies adopted or proposed to be adopted by the authority on the promotion of equality of opportunity. The Commission recommends screening and equality impact assessment as the tools to be utilised for such assessments. Further advice on equality impact assessment may be found in a separate Commission publication: Practical Guidance on Equality Impact Assessment.

**Mitigation**

When the public authority concludes that the likely impact is ‘minor’ and an equality impact assessment is not to be conducted, the public authority may consider mitigation to lessen the severity of any equality impact, or the introduction of an alternative policy to better promote equality of opportunity or good relations.

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

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

|  |
| --- |
| Mitigations will be put in place to assist any employees that are having issues with accessing/using the ePayslip module. This will be done via the Manager at the relevant depot/location |

**Timetabling and Prioritising**

Factors to be considered in timetabling and prioritising policies for equality impact assessment.

If the policy has been **‘screened in’** for equality impact assessment, then please answer the following questions to determine its priority for timetabling the equality impact assessment.

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

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Priority Criterion** | **Rating (1-3)** |
| Effect on equality of opportunity and good relations  | Not Applicable |
| Social need | Not Applicable |
| Effect on people’s daily lives | Not Applicable |
| Relevance to a public authority’s functions | Not Applicable |

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

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

If yes, please provide details:

|  |
| --- |
|  |

**PART 4 - MONITORING**

Public authorities should consider the guidance contained in the Commission’s Monitoring Guidance for Use by Public Authorities (July 2007).

The Commission recommends that where the policy has been amended or an alternative policy introduced, the public authority should monitor more broadly than for adverse impact (See Benefits, P.9-10, paras 2.13 – 2.20 of the Monitoring Guidance).

Effective monitoring will help the public authority identify any future adverse impact arising from the policy which may lead the public authority to conduct an equality impact assessment, as well as help with future planning and policy development.

|  |
| --- |
| The impact of this policy will be monitored through queries raised. The policy will be monitored in line with the policy review process.  |

**PART 5 - APPROVAL AND AUTHORISATION**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Policy Title:** | **Employee Payslip Policy** | **Version No:** | **1** |
| **Print Name** | **Position/Job Title**  | **Signature** | **Date** |
| **Screened By:** |
| Neil Towe | Payroll Manager |  | 14/08/2024 |
| **Approved by:** |
| Ronan O’Doherty | Group CFO |  | 14/08/2024 |

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

**APPENDIX 1**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Part**  | **Part Title** | **Description** |
| **1** | [**Policy Scoping**](#Part1) | Asks public authorities to provide details about the policy, procedure, practice and/or decision being screened and what available evidence you have gathered to help make an assessment of the likely impact on equality of opportunity and good relations |
| **2** | [**Screening Questions**](#Part2) | Asks about the extent of the likely impact of the policy on groups of people within each of the Section 75 categories. Details of the groups consulted and the level of assessment of the likely impact. This includes consideration of multiple identity and good relations issues.  |
| **3** | [**Screening Decision**](#Part3) | Guides the public authority to reach a screening decision as to whether or not there is a need to carry out an equality impact assessment (EQIA), or tointroducemeasures to mitigate the likely impact, or the introduction of an alternative policy to better promote equality of opportunity and/or good relations. |
| **4** | [**Monitoring**](#Part4) | Provides guidance to public authorities on monitoring for adverse impact and broader monitoring. |
| **5** | [**Approval and Authorisation**](#Part5) | Verifies the public authority’s approval of a screening decision by a senior manager responsible for the policy. |
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