

Equality Screening and Impact Assessment

INTRODUCTORY GUIDANCE TO EQUALITY SCREENING AND IMPACT ASSESSMENT

What is it? Equality screening and impact assessment helps us consider the effect of our policies and practices¹ on different people. It helps us minimise negative impact and potential discrimination and promote opportunities to advance equality, inclusion and good relations between different groups of people.

There are two main elements to equality screening and impact assessment. Firstly, a set of equality screening questions are reviewed. These questions help determine whether the policy is relevant to equality and whether it needs to go through an equality impact assessment. The second element, if required, is the equality impact assessment meeting. This is where a panel of people review the proposed policy, particularly thinking about its impact on different groups of people, trying to identify and counter any potential negative impact and promote any opportunities to enhance equality. The panel suggests actions for the policy owner to adopt.

Why do we do it? The process helps us improve our policies and build equality into our work. Equality screening and impact assessment helps us consider the potential impact of what we do on different groups who are susceptible to unjustified discrimination, some of whom are legally protected against this, whether by UK or other law. It helps us demonstrate that we have proactively considered equality when developing our policies.

When should we do it? Assessing the impact on equality should start early in the policy development process, or at the early stage of a review. Assessing the impact on equality should be ongoing rather than a one-off exercise, because circumstances change over time, so equality considerations should be taken into account both as the policy is developed and also as it is implemented. The guidance here is to help assess the impact on equality before the policy is implemented.

It takes some time to properly set up an equality impact assessment meeting if one is needed, so the equality screening questions should be considered as early as possible once the policy is drafted. If an equality impact assessment is required it will take a little time to identify a chair, a note-taker, a diverse panel and to set up the meeting arrangements. In addition once the meeting has taken place there are likely to be actions to be implemented before the policy is launched. All this needs to be considered when determining the best time to address equality screening and impact assessment.

When we are implementing a policy that has been developed elsewhere, for example by a government department, or by a partner organisation we also need to assess the impact on equality. Although responsibility for the policy itself rests with the organisation that developed it, we may have choices in how it is implemented that can help eliminate potential discrimination and promote equality, inclusion and good relations.

How do we do it? Consider the purpose of the policy, the context in which it will operate, who it should benefit and what results are intended from it. Reflect on its potential impact on people with different equality categories and think about which aspects of the policy, if any,

¹ Consistent with its broad definition in Section 75 of the Northern Ireland Act and other equality legislation, this guidance uses the term ‘policy’ as a shorthand for policies, practices, activities and significant decisions about how we work and carry out our functions.

Equality Screening and Impact Assessment

are most relevant to equality. Answer the equality screening questions to determine whether an equality impact assessment meeting is necessary.

Identify someone to chair the equality impact assessment panel meeting, if one is necessary, and someone to take the notes. The chair and note-taker play a crucial role and specific guidance has been developed to support them. A diverse panel should be [approached](#), including a range of colleagues from different teams/departments/countries/regions as appropriate, some of whom should be directly involved in or impacted by the policy. Panel members should be sent the part-completed ESIA form and the policy documents, giving them at least a full week to read them and prepare for the meeting.

We particularly focus on the following equality categories (many of which are protected by equality legislation in the UK and beyond): age, dependant responsibilities (with or without), disability, gender including transgender, marital status/civil partnership, political opinion, pregnancy and maternity, race or ethnic origin, religion or belief and sexual orientation. Invariably there are other areas to consider including full-time/part-time working, geographical location, tribe/caste/clan or language, dependent on the country. We also review what is being proposed against the organisation's values (creativity, integrity, mutuality, professionalism and valuing people).

After the meeting the action points identified by the panel are reviewed by the policy owner and implemented as appropriate. The policy owner confirms implementation of the action points (and outlines a justification for any action points that won't be taken forward) and then signs off and sends the completed form to the ESIA inbox.

Northern Ireland

There is particular legislation in Northern Ireland which requires a more detailed process of equality screening and impact assessment for policies that are deemed to have high relevance to equality. This includes external consultation with relevant contacts and organisations. Given this, there is a need to confirm whether the proposed policy affects anyone in Northern Ireland. **If it does, all parts of the form need to be completed and the guidance at Annex A must be read and followed.**

Wales

As a public body operating in Wales there is a legal requirement for us to produce any information intended for the general public in Wales in the Welsh language. Therefore there is a section in the form seeking confirmation of whether the Welsh public will be affected by the proposed policy.

Equality Screening and Impact Assessment

EQUALITY SCREENING

POLICY² DETAILS – Please complete

Title of policy	Cultural Engagement Mentoring Scheme matching process
Name of policy owner	Eilidh Hamilton and 5 other CE/WE Champions (Christine Wilson, Richard Sunderland, Martin Hope, Caroline Meaby, Helen Obaje, Clare Sears)
Intended implementation date	May/June 2021

BACKGROUND - Provide brief background information about the policy, or change to it. Include rationale, intended beneficiaries and expected outcomes. (Use as much space as you wish, the text box below will expand as you enter information).

The policy under review here is the **matching process for a new Cultural Engagement mentoring scheme**. The scheme itself is open to all colleagues in CE UK and Wider Europe (WE).

Background context for the actual scheme:

Why mentoring?

Mentors can help colleagues advance their careers and develop professional confidence by offering a sounding board, advice and experience. They can also help colleagues build effective networks. A mentoring scheme supports CE and wider British Council commitments to both learning and development, and wellbeing.

The mutuality principle is central to the proposal. Both mentees and mentors benefit from articulating their experiences and knowledge, hearing from different perspectives within the organisation. exploring opportunities and barriers to enrich their contribution to the organisation, and developing their networks.

Mentoring scheme

We are trialling a pilot 6-month scheme for colleagues from CE UK and Wider Europe initially, which will specifically focus on supporting career development and progress within British Council structures, alongside wider career aspirations. The challenges of navigating complexity, understanding shifts within the British Council and its wider context, and developing capacity to influence are all areas that can be addressed with the support of experienced colleagues.

Regions were asked to volunteer to participate. Wider Europe was chosen for logistical reasons as there is no other mentoring scheme running there currently and it is a smaller region so more manageable to work with the UK for the pilot.

² Consistent with its broad definition in Section 75 of the Northern Ireland Act and other equality legislation, this guidance uses the term ‘policy’ as a shorthand for policies, practices, activities and significant decisions about how we work and carry out our functions.

Equality Screening and Impact Assessment

Summary of the matching process

To ensure the mentoring scheme aligns with commitments outlined in the Greenwich programme, a diverse panel will be used for the matching process and colleagues from a minority ethnic background will be matched first to maximise their benefit from the programme.

Support for the applications and matching will be provided by Education Operations (led by Eilidh Hamilton), building on existing materials from previous schemes. The matching panel will be made up of the scheme's champions.

Broad objectives:

- To enable **mentees** to explore a wide range of ideas with their mentor and take action that will help them develop and to progress in the organisation and in their chosen career pathways
- To provide **mentees** with support, encouragement, guidance, and access to broader experience across the business/organisation
- To enable **mentees** to develop increased confidence, which will help them set personal/professional goals for success.

- To enable **mentors** to gain a wider perspective in a variety of areas, such as career journeys, challenges and barriers, different ways of working, cultural experiences etc from their mentees.
- To enable **mentors** to develop increased reflexivity on perspectives of diversity through discussion and relationship building, potentially facilitating behavioural awareness and/or change

Timeframe

- END APRIL Communicate to pilot regions – deadline 13th May
- MAY Matching exercise
- END MAY Briefing for mentors and mentees
- JUNE Mentoring to commence
- DECEMBER Evaluation

Champions and matching panel

- Christine Wilson, Head of Research, RPI
- Eilidh Hamilton, Operations Lead, Education
- Martin Hope, Director Inclusive Communities team
- Richard Sunderland, Director Education Business Development
- Caroline Meaby, Director Network, Arts
- Helen Obaje, CE Senior Programme Manager EDI
- Clare Sears (Deputy Director, Wider Europe)

Equality Screening and Impact Assessment

IS AN EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT REQUIRED?

To determine this, please answer the following by ticking yes, no or not sure:

Question	Yes	No	Not sure
Is the policy potentially significant in terms of its anticipated impact on employees, or customers/clients/audiences, or the wider community?	x		
Is it a major policy, significantly affecting how programmes/services/functions are delivered?		x	
Might the policy affect people in particular equality categories in a different way?	x		
Are the potential equality impacts unknown?	x		
Does the policy have the possibility to support or detract from our efforts to promote the inclusion of people from under-represented groups?		x	
Will the policy have an impact on anyone in Northern Ireland?	x		
Will the policy need to be communicated externally in Wales and therefore translated into Welsh?		x	
Total responses Yes/No/Not sure	4	3	

DECIDING IF AN EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT IS NECESSARY

If all the answers to the questions above are 'no' then an equality impact assessment is not needed.

Please move to the **'Record of decision'** section below.

If there are any 'yes' responses then an equality impact assessment is necessary.

Please move to the **'Record of decision'** section below.

If there are no 'yes' responses but there are any 'not sure' responses then please discuss next steps further with the Regional Diversity Lead or with the Diversity Unit, who will help you decide if an equality impact assessment is necessary. Examples of situations where it is not necessary to carry out an equality impact assessment include:

- Producing a team newsletter
- Changing the time of a meeting
- Planning an internal event

In these instances relevant equality issues should still be considered, but there is no need to carry out an equality impact assessment.

RECORD OF DECISION

Equality Screening and Impact Assessment

I confirm an equality impact assessment is required

Policy Owner: _Eilidh Hamilton

Operations Lead, Education

Date: _____16/4/21_____

Note 1: *If an equality impact assessment **is required**, please complete questions 1-3 in the following section and send this part-completed form to the panel along with any relevant background documentation about the policy at least one full week prior to the EIA meeting. This should include the draft policy and any supporting data or relevant papers.*

Note 2: *If an equality impact assessment **is not required**, please send this screening section of the form to the ESIA inbox.*

Equality Screening and Impact Assessment

EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT

PART A: This section is to be completed before the EIA panel meeting and sent at least one week in advance to the panel along with the policy and other relevant documents.

TITLE OF POLICY:	CE Mentoring scheme pilot – selection process
-------------------------	--

(Take as much space as required under each heading below)

- 1. Please summarise the purpose of the policy, the context in which it will operate, who it should benefit and what results are intended from it.**

This is a new process to determine the matching of mentors and mentees in the Cultural Engagement mentoring scheme which is being piloted in the UK and WE.

All colleagues can apply for the scheme – purpose and objectives outlined above.

The purpose of this matching process is to ensure all colleagues seeking a mentor are matched with a mentor who is a good ‘fit’ in terms of stated objectives, and vice versa.

- 2. Please explain any aspects of the policy you’ve been able to identify that are relevant to equality. This will contribute to the equality-focused discussion the panel will have.**

- Matching of colleagues manually is subjective. There is potential for unconscious bias. Should we redact names?
- There may not be enough mentors to match to mentees or vice versa – how do we deal with this fairly?
- Colleagues may have a preference to have a mentor of a specific gender – we have created a broad ‘preference’ area for colleagues to raise anything they want to be considered
- We have committed to matching Minority Ethnic colleagues first as part of the implementation of the Greenwich programme
- As the scheme is international, what is considered a minority background may differ – we have set it up so that colleagues self-identify as minority/majority background with a ‘prefer not to say’ option
- Colleagues at Band 8 may wish to have a mentor rather than be a mentor. Have encouraged colleagues at PB8 to put themselves forward as mentors, if possible, to help balance numbers but have allowed them to choose either/both. Evidence suggests the ideal ‘gap’ in mentoring is only 2-3 pay grades

Equality Screening and Impact Assessment

- Part-time colleagues may feel they don't have time to commit – the mentor/mentee own and direct the relationship/interaction so they can set a timetable which works for them

- 3. Please outline any equality-related supporting data that should be considered. This could include consultation with Trades Union Side or staff associations, equality monitoring data, responses from staff surveys or client feedback exercises, external demographic and benchmarking data or other relevant internal or external material.**

n/a though the initiative is responding to feedback from staff surveys that colleagues would like to have more opportunities for development/to build networks/improve career progression

Equality Screening and Impact Assessment

PART B: *This section captures the notes of the Equality Impact Assessment panel meeting.*

TITLE OF POLICY³:	CE Mentoring scheme pilot – selection process
DATE OF EIA PANEL MEETING:	Friday 7th May at 11am UK time

1. Please list the names, roles/business areas and geographical location of the panel members. If contributions have been received in writing by people who could not attend please list their details too and note 'input in writing' by their name.

Eilidh Hamilton (policy owner), Operations lead, Education, UK - Edinburgh
 Katie Jellicoe, Centre of Excellence, UK- Manchester
 Cameron Davies, Schools, UK-Manchester
 Roy Cross, EES, UK-London
 Maja Mandekic, Cultural Engagement – Wider Europe
 Natalie Arnold, Non formal Education – UK - Edinburgh
 Damian Ross (chair), EES, UK - London
 Baseer Omaid, GCBS, UK- London
 Anna Capon (notes), Education, UK-Edinburgh
 Stephanie Idusogie, HR, UK -London: input in writing, in advance of the panel

2. Summarise the main points made in the discussion, noting which documents were reviewed. Note any points relating to clarity/quality assurance as well as points relating to equality issues.

Attached documents

- The draft process for matching mentors/mentees which is the process/policy being examined through this ESIA
- The application forms – to see what information will be available at the matching stage

Eilidh presenting ESIA CE Mentoring May 2021 document

- Eilidh discussed the mentoring scheme being developed from requests in UK and colleagues informally asking for mentoring. Eilidh commented HR recommend the UK was paired with just one region and WE size is advantageous for a pilot scheme, additionally they do not have any other mentoring schemes running currently. Eilidh added that the Education Operations team will manage the practicalities of the scheme.
- Mentoring has taken place in the past, but this scheme will incorporate elements from the Greenwich report. Eilidh commented Helen Obaje has provided input and is a champion for this scheme. The scheme will notably prioritise matching

³ Consistent with its broad definition in Section 75 of the Northern Ireland Act and other equality legislation, this guidance uses the term 'policy' as a shorthand for policies, practices, activities and significant decisions about how we work and carry out our functions.

Equality Screening and Impact Assessment

colleagues who self-identify as Minority Ethnic (ME) first and then colleagues in lower pay bands PB6.

- Eilidh added she is asking the ESIA panel for comments on how we should match mentees and mentors.

Discussions about matching process

- Eilidh shared some thoughts about the matching process and whether this should be manually or automatically sorted. If matching is automatically done there is a risk of subjectivity. Eilidh suggested redacting names to reduce the risk.
- Eilidh discussed the potential of more mentees than mentors and how this could fairly be dealt with. Colleagues who identify as ME will be matched first as part of implementing the Greenwich programme. There may also be some variations in Wider Europe and what they consider ME hence the need to self-identify. Also, it has been stated that more junior colleagues will be matched first is there is an issue with numbers. Eilidh noted that the mentoring champions are committed to encouraging additional mentors as needed with a view to matching everyone who wants a mentor, if at all possible.
- Eilidh asked colleagues themselves to think of how they would like to be matched etc.

Comments

- Natalie added that if matching is to be automated in any way e.g. through excel matching, more information would need to be added to the application form.
- No strong views either way about redacting names though Maja noted the information provided would probably identify colleagues in WE anyway.
- Maja commented that we need to be clear in our comms that not everyone who applies may be able to be matched and develop a sensitive strategy around this.
- Damian discussed the document emphasising career progression opposed to professional assessment. The panel need to think of British Council values and personal values and how they are subjective.
- Roy expressed concern over the scheme becoming over-corporatized and the focus needs to be on the individual and not on targets and measures etc. Roy suggested a speed dating style matching exercise. Katie commented this could be intimidating for introverted colleagues.
- Natalie added not sorting in an alphabetically order, because this will be preferential to some colleagues. Natalie also asked about whether they will sort by teams in CE and highlighted not starting with the smallest team. Katie agreed with this and added equal opportunities need to be spread across teams (i.e. if the scheme cannot match everyone) and included in contingency planning.

Discussions about panel

- Eilidh asked the ESIA panel to think about the current panel suggested and whether we should consider multiple panels and different colleagues.
- Eilidh suggested multiple panels, the first panel could do the original sift and the second panel could cross check.

Comments

Equality Screening and Impact Assessment

- Roy commented that the panel is not very diverse and is too senior. Roy suggested including a potential recipient of the scheme in the panel. Eilidh added the panel is formed of (EDI) champions.
- Baseer agreed with Roy about the panel not being diverse enough. Baseer suggested including PB7 who have been in the role a while and who might be keen to benefit from scheme.
- Maja added the current panel is very senior and the scheme could appear top-down.
- Natalie highlighted from experience with Language Assistant making sure someone else or enough team checks everyone has been matched because it's easy to lose track of this on Excel.
- Katie commented the panel is UK focused and Claire who represents WE is UK appointed. Damian suggested asking other regions who are not participating this time to help with matching.
- Roy raised whether the Greenwich programme should be separate from the mentoring scheme with the Greenwich programme being UK focused and mentoring involving WE. Eilidh commented most of the Greenwich recommendations align with Anti-Racism plan which is global.
- Maja commented about the issue of applications being anonymous with Clare being able to identify colleagues, even if names were redacted, as the team in WE is small.

Other comments

- Maja added that the application form states that mentors should be PB8 when some senior colleagues (e.g. country managers) in WE are PB7 which could send the wrong message about their experience not being valued.
- Cameron suggested adding benchmarking to the application. Baseer similarly highlighted a base-line, mid-line and end-line evaluation process.
- Roy asked about further material for participants and a mentor pack which he had seen previously and felt was comprehensive. Eilidh commented she received this from Stephanie yesterday and the champions will amend as needed to ensure it reflects the current scheme. Colleagues can decide whether they would like to use this and make the process more formal. There is a strong focus on the mentee driving the discussion and approach.
- Baseer raised concern that by only having WE as overseas region in the pilot, this was not good for colleagues interested in other regions. Eilidh commented that anyone can arrange mentoring informally and should do that in the first instance through their manager, who could support them in reaching out to someone in an overseas region, and that for the pilot stage HR had strongly advised against using more than one region from an administrative perspective.

To consider...

- Adapting the panel – the panel needs to be more diverse, include PB7 and include other regional colleagues if possible.
- Getting advice from colleagues who do this in their 'day job' e.g. language assistants' programme

Equality Screening and Impact Assessment

- Extending the matching period, if necessary, to allow for two panels to review the applications fully
- PB7 being able to mentor in WE – Maja highlighted many PB7 are senior in WE. This would need to be changed on the application form although there is currently an 'other' option which would allow for it.
- All ESIA panellist agree with matching ME colleagues first. Concerns focused on matching by teams in CE and this needing to be equal.
- Developing a contingency plan for colleagues who are not able to be matched on this occasion. Comms need to be sensitive.
- Potential networking events such as 'speed dating' in future schemes or having mentors form a living library who can be borrowed for mentoring like the existing Diversity Unit scheme.

Equality Screening and Impact Assessment

3. **Capturing information about the protected groups/characteristics** - Based on the notes of the discussion (section above), record here any potential for negative impact identified and any opportunity to promote equality, inclusion and good relations.

Equality categories (with prompts to guide full consideration)	Potential for negative impact	Opportunity to promote equality, inclusion and/or good relations between different groups
Different ages (older, middle-aged, young adult, teenage, children; authority generation; vulnerable adults)		
Different dependant responsibilities (childcare, eldercare, care for disabled and/or extended family)		
Disabled people (physical, sensory, learning, hidden, mental health, HIV/AIDS, other)	Colleagues could feel less confident in accessing the mentoring opportunity	Mentoring briefing to include reference to neurodiversity in workplace and need to allow mentee to suggest approaches which work best for them and mentor to also be open about their needs
Different ethnic and cultural groups (majority and minority, including Roma people, people from different tribes/castes/clans)	Unconscious bias/subjectivity at any stage of the matching or review process could lead to colleagues from an ME background being considered as not as good a 'fit' for a mentoring match	We have committed to matching requests from colleagues who self-identify as minority ethnic first to ensure they benefit from the mentoring opportunity
Different genders (men, women, transgender, intersex, other)	Colleagues may feel more/less comfortable having a mentor of a specific gender	Open opportunity for colleagues to identify any preferences on the application form
Different languages (Welsh and/or other UK languages, local languages, sign language/s)		
Different marital status (single, married, civil partnership, other)	Colleagues may feel more/less comfortable having a mentor of a specific gender and building a trusted relationship with them	Open opportunity for colleagues to identify any preferences on the application form

Equality Screening and Impact Assessment

Equality categories (with prompts to guide full consideration)	Potential for negative impact	Opportunity to promote equality, inclusion and/or good relations between different groups
Different political views or community backgrounds (particularly relevant to Northern Ireland)		
Pregnancy, maternity, paternity and adoption (before/during/after)	Colleagues may feel they cannot participate if they will have a break during the mentoring period	The pace of the mentoring can be flexibly agreed to accommodate some extended leave during this six-month period; if colleagues cannot participate on this occasion, they will have the opportunity to get involved in a future iteration.
Different or no religious or philosophical beliefs (majority/ minority/ none)		
Different sexual orientations (gay, lesbian, bisexual, heterosexual)		
Additional equality grounds (such as full-time/part-time working, geographical location, other ⁴)		The pace and duration of the mentoring can be flexibly agreed to accommodate part time working and/or different time zones.
British Council values (open & committed; expert & inclusive; optimistic & bold)		The scheme aims to provide an inclusive opportunity for colleagues to learn from each other

⁴ Any other categories people share that might impact on how the policy affects them.

Equality Screening and Impact Assessment

4. Agreed actions

Action identified by Panel	Agreed by Policy Owner (Yes/No)	Justification if not agreed	Date to be implemented	Confirmation of implementation
1. Adapting the panel – the panel needs to be more diverse, include PB7 and other regional/non-involved colleagues if possible.	Yes		by mid-May 2021	New panel was convened of 8 colleagues on 14 th May (diverse by grade, location, nationality, gender and including colleagues self-identifying with other protected characteristics (disability/LGBT+). All themselves applicants to the scheme as a mentor or mentee. NB. The 2 participants who were not at that stage applicants for the scheme made a late application and are now also involved.
2. Getting advice from colleagues who do this in their 'day job' e.g. language assistants' programme	Yes		immediate	Meeting with rep from Language Assistants programme on 11 th May; she was recommended by head of programme as most experience in Matching. She reviewed all principles and approach and endorsed the plan indicating it covered all the considerations she would expect to see
3. Two panels to review the matching and extending the matching period, if necessary, to allow for two panels to review the applications fully	Yes		May 2021	Initial new matching panel met on 14 th May. Submitted matches to CE EDI champions panel for review on 17 th May. Matches were generally endorsed. 3 changes made to reflect additional insights the panel were able to offer and ensure best match.

Equality Screening and Impact Assessment

				<p>NB. All applicants for a mentor were matched. 67 at the initial stage; this had increased to 72 by mid-June. Some mentors who had also applied to be mentees were held on a reserve list, with their agreement, so all applicants could participate in the scheme in some way. Since then 5 of those people have been allocated a mentee through late applications. We have 4 mentors in reserve to accommodate any withdrawals during the pilot phase.</p>
<p>4. Explicitly offering PB7/F colleagues in Wider Europe the opportunity to mentor if they prefer</p>	<p>Yes</p>		<p>Before applications for scheme close on 13th May</p>	<p>Actioned on 7th May – communication sent in WE and application form updated to reflect change.</p>
<p>5. As part of the pilot review and programme planning, review alternative methods for matching mentors with mentees e.g. through networking events such as 'speed dating' in future schemes or having mentors form a living library who can be borrowed for mentoring like the existing Diversity Unit scheme.</p>	<p>Yes -for a future programme</p>	<p>There is a balance to be found here as we are committed to implementing the pilot scheme from June-Dec and establishing an alternative or multiple matching process, which will also have</p>	<p>During Jan-March 2022 when the pilot is evaluated if a future iteration is being planned.</p>	<p>We will explore this as part of the evaluation of the pilot</p>

Equality Screening and Impact Assessment

		<p>some pros and cons, risks delaying the start. We feel the additional improvements suggested by the panel reduce the risks of any negative equality impact within the current process.</p>		
--	--	--	--	--

5. Sign off by policy owner

I confirm that the policy has been amended as identified in the **Agreed actions** table above.

If the policy has an impact on people or functions in Northern Ireland, I confirm Annex A has also been completed.

____ Eilidh Hamilton _____ (Name) ____ Operations lead, Education _____ (Role) __25/6/21____ (Date)

6. Record keeping

The Policy Owner (or their agent) must email the completed ESIA form to the ESIA inbox

POLICIES WITH AN IMPACT IN NORTHERN IRELAND

In accordance with the Guide for Public Authorities, policies which have a MAJOR impact on equality will share some of the following factors:

- they are deemed to be significant in terms of strategic importance;
- the potential equality impacts are unknown;
- the potential equality and/or good relations impacts are likely to be adverse or experienced disproportionately by groups who are marginalised or disadvantaged;
- the policy is likely to be challenged by a judicial review;
- the policy is significant in terms of expenditure.

Policies which have a MINOR impact on equality will share some of the following factors:

- they are not unlawfully discriminatory and any residual potential differential impact is judged to be negligible;
- aspects of the policy are potentially unlawfully discriminatory but this possibility can readily and easily be eliminated by making the changes identified in the action points at Section 4;
- any differential equality impact is intentional because the policy has been designed specifically to promote equality for particular groups of disadvantaged people;
- by amending the policy there are opportunities to better promote equality, inclusion and/or good relations.

Policies which have NO impact on equality will share some of the following factors:

- they have no relevance to equality, inclusion or good relations;
- they are purely technical in nature and have no bearing in terms of the impact on equality, inclusion or good relations for people in different equality groups.

For policies impacting on people or functions in Northern Ireland, you must identify whether any of the issues identified by the EIA panel in the table at Section 3 are likely to have a MAJOR, MINOR or NO impact on equality. This consideration must be given to all the items listed in the table at section 3 whether they have potential for negative impact or the opportunity to promote equality, inclusion and good relations.

Equality categories	Negative/Positive impact on equality, inclusion or good relations		
	NO	MINOR	MAJOR
Age	x		
Dependants	x		
Disability		x	
Ethnicity		x	
Gender		x	
Marital status		x	
Political opinion	x		
Religious belief	x		
Sexual orientation	x		

If the answer to the above questions is NO, no further action is needed.

Equality Screening and Impact Assessment

If MINOR impact is identified and the actions listed at Section 4 will address this, no further action is needed. Where the actions listed at Section 4 will not sufficiently address the impact, additional measures that might mitigate the policy impact as well as alternative policies that might better achieve the promotion of equality of opportunity and/or good relations should be considered. If mitigating measures and/or an alternative approach cannot be taken then the policy should be subject to full Equality Impact Assessment (EQIA) aligned to Northern Ireland's equality legislation.

If a MAJOR impact is identified in any of the answers above then the policy should be subject to full Equality Impact Assessment (EQIA) aligned to Northern Ireland's equality legislation.

For guidance on completing full EQIA aligned to Northern Ireland's equality legislation, see <http://www.equalityni.org/archive/pdf/S75GuideforPublicAuthoritiesApril2010.pdf>.

A member of the Diversity Unit should be involved in any EQIAs that take place.

RECORD OF DECISION AND SIGN OFF BY POLICY OWNER:

I confirm that a full EQIA is not needed and no further action needs to be taken.

Signed by:

__Eilidh Hamilton____ (Name) __Operations lead, Education____ (Role)

__25/6/21____ (Date)

RECORD KEEPING

The Policy Owner (or their agent) must email the completed ESIA form to the ESIA inbox