ULSTER UNIVERSITY POLICY SCREENING PRO-FORMA

Information about the policy

Note: 'Policy' includes any strategy, policy (proposed/amended/existing) or practice and/or decision, whether written or unwritten.

Name of the policy

Way Finding Strategy

Is this an existing, revised or a new policy?

New strategy

What is it trying to achieve? (intended aims/outcomes)

The strategy sets out to provide clear, consistent guidance to enable the application/installation of way finding signage across our estate.

Are there any Section 75 categories which might be expected to benefit from the intended policy?
If so, explain how.

Yes. Provision is made for the inclusion of braille in way finding signs, as appropriate.

Who initiated or wrote the policy?

The Acting Director of Estates initiated the strategy.

Who owns and who implements the policy?

The Acting Director of Estates owns this strategy. Estates Services implement this strategy.

Implementation factors

Are there any factors which could contribute to/detract from the intended aim/outcome of the policy/decision? (Please select one answer)

| X | Yes |

| | No |

If yes, are they

| X | Financial: Yes, cost of replacing University signs |

| X | legislative: changes to legislation |

| X | other: University policy |

Main stakeholders affected

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

| X | Staff |

| X | Students |

| X | Other service users (e.g. prospective students, conference delegates) |

| X | Other public sector organisations |

| X | Voluntary/community/trade unions |

| X | Other, please specify: Contractors, visitors |

Other policies with a bearing on this policy

Policy Name	Policy Owner
The University's 5&50 Strategic Plan	Vice Chancellor
Estates Strategy	Acting Director of Estates
People and Culture Strategy	Director of People and Culture
Equality, Diversity and Inclusion Strategy	Director of People and Culture

Equality Scheme	Director of People and Culture
Equal Opportunities Policy	Director of People and Culture
Article 55 Affirmative Action programme	Director of People and Culture
Ulster University Campus Life Strategy	Director of Campus Life
Global Engagement Strategy	PVC (Global Engagement)
Recruitment Policy	Director of People and Culture
Admissions Policy	Chief Finance and Information Officer
Access and Egress for Disabled People	Chief Finance Officer and Deputy Chief Operating Officer
Ulster University's Students' Union Council mandate for bilingual signage	Ulster University's Students' Union

Available evidence

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

Note: evidence can come from many sources. Examples include the University's management information systems, internal or external research, surveys or consultation exercises. Anecdotal evidence such as feedback from service users may also be used.

The following evidence was considered:
- Staff Equal Opportunities (EO) monitoring data (2019, 2014):
- Student EO monitoring data (2018/19)
- The Northern Ireland Census (2011)
- 'Key Inequalities in Education in Northern Ireland', Equality Commission for Northern Ireland, 2015

Section 75 category	Details of evidence/information
Religious belief	Our key equality data is available at: https://www.ulster.ac.uk/hr/employee-benefits/equality-diversity/key-equality-data **STAFF** The University's EO data were reviewed. On 6 February 2019, our staff profile was 50.9% Protestant, 49.1% Catholic. Compared with 6 February 2014, this indicates a 3.2% increase in Catholic staff. The staff profile varies by campus: On 6 February 2019, our staff profile for the Belfast campus was 52% Catholic, 48% Protestant. Compared with 6 February 2014, this indicates a 3% increase in Catholic staff. On 6 February 2019, our staff profile for the Jordanstown campus was 43% Catholic, 57% Protestant. Compared with 6 February 2014, this indicates a 5% increase in Catholic staff. On 6 February 2019, our staff profile for the Coleraine campus was 43% Catholic, 57% Protestant. Compared with 6 February 2014, this indicates a 3% increase in Catholic staff. On 6 February 2019, our staff profile for the Magee campus was 79% Catholic, 21% Protestant. This shows no change compared with 6 February 2014.

STUDENTS

In the Academic Year (AY) 2018/19, 76.5% of our students identified as 'Christian' (i.e. 'Protestant' or 'Roman Catholic') and 13.6% identified as having 'No religion'. This shows little change compared with AY2013/14, when 75.9% identified as Christian and 11.6% identified as having 'No religion'.

Across all campus locations, 'Christian' belief has the largest representation (81.2% at Magee, 78.3% at Jordanstown, 69.8% at Coleraine and 68.5% at Belfast). 'No religious belief' has the second largest representation (10.5% at Magee, 12.4% at Jordanstown, 17.4% at Coleraine and 20% at Belfast).

A closer look at our student 'Christian' profile indicates that on 6 February 2019, 65.3% of 'Christian' students were Catholic whereas 34.7% were Protestant. Compared with 6 February 2014, this indicates a 1% increase in Catholic students.

Similar to staff, the student profile varies by campus.

On 6 February 2019, our student profile for the Belfast campus was 62.2% Catholic, 37.8% Protestant. Compared with 6 February 2014, this indicates a 1.3% increase in Catholic students.

On 6 February 2019, our student profile for the Jordanstown campus was 65.9% Catholic, 34.1% Protestant. Compared with 6 February 2014, this indicates a 1.6% increase in Catholic students.

On 6 February 2019, our student profile for the Coleraine campus was 53.6% Catholic, 46.4% Protestant. Compared with 6 February 2014, this indicates a 0.9% increase in Catholic students.

On 6 February 2019, our staff profile for the Magee campus was 75.5% Catholic, 24.5% Protestant. Compared with 6 February 2014, this indicates a 3.7% increase in Protestant students.

EXTERNAL DATA

In AY2015/16, there were around one-third more Catholic students than Protestant students in Northern Ireland's higher education institutions (Source: Belfast Telegraph 28 June 2017: https://www.belfasttelegraph.co.uk/news/northern-ireland/revealed-47-of-higher-education-students-are-catholics-and-30-protestants-35874614.html).

Political opinion	The University does not collect information on Political Opinion, or make assumptions regarding Political Opinion based on Community Background.
Racial group	**STAFF** The University's EO data were reviewed. On 6 February 2019, our staff profile was 94.6% White (61.3% White British, 28.5% White Irish, and 4.8% White Other), 5.4% Black and Minority Ethnic (BME). This indicates a 2.2% increase in BME staff compared with 2014. In terms of nationality: • 63.1% of staff identified as British • 28.4% of staff identify as Irish • 2.9% of staff identify as EU/EEA • 5.5% identify as Other **STUDENTS** In AY2018/19, 5.0% of our students identified as BME. This indicates a 1.4% increase in BME students compared with AY2013/14. In terms of nationality: • 90.3% of students identified as British • 6.6% of students identify as Irish • 0.9% of students identify as EU/EEA • 2.1% identify as Other **EXTERNAL DATA** Our BME profile suggests that overall we are almost three times as diverse as the local population. The Northern Ireland Census (2011) suggests that 1.8% of the NI population is BME. Furthermore, the main minority groups were Chinese, Indian, Mixed, Other Asian (each accounting for 0.3% of the usually resident population). According to the Census, the most prevalent language in Northern Ireland other than English was Polish (1.0%), Irish (0.2%), Lithuanian (0.2%), Portuguese (0.1%), Slovak (0.1%), Chinese (0.1%), Tagalog/Filipino (0.1%), Latvian (0.1%), Russian (0.1%), Malayalam (0.1%) and Hungarian (0.1%). Among usual residents aged 3 years and over, 10.65% of respondents indicated that they had some ability in Irish and

	8.1% had some ability in Ulster Scots. The proportion of people in NI aged over 3 years who could speak, read, write and understand Irish (3.74%) was higher than that for Ulster Scots (0.94%). 4.1% said they could understand but not speak, read or write Irish. 5.3% said they could understand but not speak, read or write Ulster Scots.
Age	The University's EO data were reviewed. On 6 February 2019, over one third (34.4%) of our staff were in the '46-55' age band. 26.9% of staff were in the '36-45' age band and 22.5% of staff were aged '56 and above'.
	In AY 2018/19, the majority of students (61.4%) were aged 21 and under 40. This indicates a 0.8% decrease in students within this age band compared with 2013/14. This coincides with a 1.6% increase in students aged under 21 and 0.8% decrease in students aged 40 and over.
Marital status	The University's EO data were reviewed. In 2019, 62% of staff were 'Married or in a Civil Partnership' (no change compared with 2014).
	In AY2018/19, 78.3% of students were 'Single', a 1.2% increase compared with AY2013/14.
Sexual orientation	Although we collect staff data on sexual orientation, this is not considered to be reliable. We do not collect student data on sexual orientation.
Men and women generally	The University's EO data were reviewed. In 2019, 56% of staff were 'Female'. This indicates a 2.4% increase in female staff compared with 2014.
	In AY2018/19, 56.9% of students were 'Female', a 0.2% increase compared with AY2013/14.
Disability	The University's EO data were reviewed. In 2019, 4.8% of staff declared a disability, an increase of 0.6% compared with 2014.
	In AY2018/19, 10.4% of students declared a disability, an increase of 2.1% compared with AY2013/14.
	Our disability declaration rate is lower than expected, compared with the local population. The Northern Ireland Census (2011) found that 20.6% of the NI population stated that their day-to-day activities were limited because of a long-standing health

	problem or disability.
Dependants	The University's EO data were reviewed. In 2019, 47.7% of staff had dependants. This indicates an increase of 2.5% compared with 2014. In AY2018/19, 16% of students declared dependants, similar to AY2013/14.

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? (Please specify details for each of the Section 75 categories)

Section 75 category	Details of needs/experiences/priorities
Religious belief	None identified
Political opinion	None identified
Racial group	In its 'Key Inequalities in Education in Northern Ireland' (2015) report, the Equality Commission for Northern Ireland reports that minority ethnic school leavers are slightly more likely than white school leavers to enter higher education. The European Charter for Regional or Minority Languages places obligations in the Northern Ireland context to protect and promote both Ulster Scots (in respect of Part 2) and Irish (in respect of Part 2 and 3). **Response by the Equality Commission for Northern Ireland (ECNI) to the consultation by the Department of Culture, Arts and Leisure on Proposals for an Irish Language Bill (May 2015)** In this, the Equality Commission for Northern Ireland (ECNI) states that it considers that the use of minority languages, particularly Irish or Ulster Scots languages in Northern Ireland for common or official purposes would normally and objectively be considered to be a neutral act that would not be discriminatory. The Commission considers that the speaking of any language in Northern Ireland should not be perceived as a threat to any individual or group, nor should it be used on such a manner. The Commission notes the differential context of promoting minority languages in Northern Ireland and welcomes initiatives taken to promote the Irish and the Ulster Scots language to as wide an audience as possible. The Commission also acknowledges the generally reported concerns among some sections of the community regarding the promotion of minority languages, including the reported concern among some sections of the community that the promotion of the Irish language is considered to have a political aim. https://www.equalityni.org/ECNI/media/ECNI/Consultation%20Respon

	ses/2015/DCAL-IrishLangBill-May15.pdf?ext=.pdf On 20 November 2018, the UUSU Student Council has passed a mandate as follows: "The Student Council believes that that the Irish language should be afforded a similar footing to that of the English language and should be promoted in a manner that is not provocative and that shows the usefulness of the Gaelic language. Student Council resolves that the Students' Union provides for bilingual signage on all directional, facilitating and welcoming signs in the Students' Union to replace existing signage over time. And that UUSU executive lobbies the University authorities for Irish language signage on all four campuses." This mandate has been equality screened, and the outcome of this impact assessment will inform this strategy.
Age	None identified
Marital status	None identified
Sexual orientation	None identified
Men and women generally	Transgender people are likely to require more inclusive signs to highlight access to toilet and changing facilities.
Disability	Disabled staff and students are likely to require reasonable adjustments, for example, signs suitably sized and located and inclusion of braille.
Dependants	None identified

Consultation

Consultation with relevant groups, organisations or individuals about the policy can provide useful information about issues/opportunities which are specifically related to them (i.e. evidence to inform the policy). Please indicate whether you carried out (or intend to carry out) any consultation exercises prior to equality screening?

The following groups were consulted regarding the Strategy:
- Marketing & Communications staff
- University Provosts,
- Director of Campus Life
- Students Union
- Chief Operating Officer's Leadership Team
- Trade Unions
- Health, Safety & Wellbeing.

.

Screening

Introduction

The answers to the following screening questions will assist the University in making a decision whether or not there is a need to carry out an equality impact assessment on the policy. The following information is provided to help you to identify and comment on the level of likely impact of the policy in questions 1-4:

Select 'major' impact if:

a) The policy is significant in terms of its strategic importance;

b) Potential equality impacts are unknown, because, for example, there are 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.

Select 'minor' impact if:

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;

e) Differential impact observed and opportunities exist to better promote equality of opportunity and/or good relations.

Select 'none' if:

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.

Taking into account the evidence presented in Part 1, please complete the screening questions (Questions 1-4).

Part 2

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? (Please provide details)		
Section 75 category	Details of policy impact	Level of impact? (minor/major/none)
Religious belief	This strategy is unlikely to have an impact on equality of opportunity for this group.	None
Political opinion	This strategy is unlikely to have an impact on equality of opportunity for this group.	None
Racial group	This strategy is likely to have a positive impact on equality of opportunity for this group.	Minor (+)
Age	This strategy is unlikely to have an impact on equality of opportunity for this group.	None
Marital status	This strategy is unlikely to have an impact on equality of opportunity for this group.	None
Sexual orientation	This strategy is unlikely to have an impact on equality of opportunity for this group.	None
Men and women generally	This strategy is likely to have a positive impact on equality of opportunity for this group.	Minor (+)
Disability	This strategy is likely to have a positive impact on equality of opportunity for this group.	Minor (+)
Dependants	This strategy is unlikely to have an impact on equality of opportunity for this group.	None

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 strategy has no direct impact on equality of opportunity for this group.
Political opinion		No, this strategy has no direct impact on equality of opportunity for this group.
Racial group		No, this strategy has no direct impact on equality of opportunity for this group.
Age		No, this strategy has no direct impact on equality of opportunity for this group.
Marital status		No, this strategy has no direct impact on equality of opportunity for this group.
Sexual orientation		No, this strategy has no direct impact on equality of opportunity for this group.
Men and women generally	The inclusion of more inclusive signs could better promote equality of opportunity for transgender people.	
Disability	The inclusion of braille as appropriate will better promote equality of opportunity for this group.	
Dependants		No, this strategy has no direct impact on equality of opportunity for this group.

3	To what extent is the policy likely to impact on good relations between people of different religious belief, political opinion or racial group? (Please provide details)	
Good relations category	**Details of policy impact**	**Level of impact (minor/major/none)**
Religious belief	The strategy is unlikely to impact on good relations for this category.	None
Political opinion	The strategy is unlikely to impact on good relations for this category.	None
Racial group	The strategy is unlikely to impact on good relations for this category.	None

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, the strategy has no relevance to good relations.
Political opinion		No, the strategy has no relevance to good relations.
Racial group		No, the strategy has no relevance to good relations.

Additional considerations

Multiple identity

5	Generally speaking, people can fall into more than one Section 75 category. Taking this into consideration, please provide details of 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).* Please include details of any data which you have used to determine/identify this impact
Section 75 categories (please specify)	Details of policy impact and details of data which describes the policy impact
Disability, transgender	This strategy is likely to have a positive impact on equality of opportunity for these groups.

Disability Duties

6.	Does the policy provide an opportunity to encourage disabled people to participate in University life?	
If **Yes**, provide details	If **No**, provide reasons	
Including braille improves access and encourages greater participation by disabled people.		

7.	Does the policy provide an opportunity to promote positive attitudes towards disabled people?	
If **Yes**, provide details	If **No**, provide reasons	
Including braille promotes positive attitudes towards disabled people.		

Screening decision

Based on the evidence considered and outlined in Part 1 and the responses to the screening questions (Part 2), please indicate the screening decision for this policy:

Note: The University should take particular care not to screen out policies that have a procurement aspect if there is potential to promote equality of opportunity through the procurement of services.

Screen in the policy (subject the policy to an Equality Impact Assesment)
*i.e. the likely impact is '**major**' in respect of one, or more of the equality of opportunity and/or good relations categories*

Screen out the policy without mitigation or an alternative policy proposed to be adopted (no Equality Impact Assessment)
*i.e. the likely impact is '**none**' in respect of all of the equality of opportunity and/or good relations categories*

X | **Screen out** the policy and **mitigate the impacts on equality** by **amending or changing the policy**, or by **developing an alternative policy or action** (no Equality Impact Assessment)
*i.e. the likely impact is '**minor**' in respect of one, or more of the equality of opportunity and/or good relations categories*

If the decision is to subject the policy to an equality impact assessment (i.e. 'screen in' the policy), please provide details of the reasons.

If the decision is not to conduct an equality impact assessment (i.e. 'screen out' the policy), please provide details of the reasons.

If the decision is not to conduct an equality impact assessment (i.e. 'screen out' the policy) and mitigate the impacts on equality by amending or changing the policy, or by developing an alternative policy or action, please provide reasons to support your decision, together with the proposed changes/amendments or alternative policy:

The likely impact is '**minor**' in respect of one, or more of the equality of opportunity and/or good relations categories.

The strategy sets out to provide clear, consistent guidance to enable the application/installation of way finding signage across our estate.

In line with University policy, the strategy will be reviewed two years after it has been implemented, and if necessary amended. If required, necessary amendment will be made before this, to reflect the outcome of the equality impact assessment relating to the Students' Union Council for bilingual signs.

Timetabling and prioritising

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	
Social need	
Effect on people's daily lives	
Relevance to the University's functions	

Note: The Total Rating Score will 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 University in timetabling. Details of the University's Equality Impact Assessment Timetable will be included in its quarterly Screening Reports.

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

Yes

No

If yes, please provide details:

Approval and authorisation

	Position/Job Title	Date
Screened by: Michael Fitzpatrick	Acting Director of Estates	01 October 2019
Approved by: **Damian McAlister**	Director of People and Culture	02 September 2020

Note: Following approval by the Senior Leadership Team/Senate, the policy owner must inform the University Secretary that the policy has been approved. Once the Council of the University has been informed of the policy (either directly of through an appropriate Committee), the policy owner can then promulgate the policy and develop appropriate training or awareness raising material in relation to the policy.

A copy of the screening pro-forma will be made available on the University's website and be made available on request.

Review

Note: Policies must be reviewed at least every two years, but sooner if changes in legislation or other variables require review.

This policy is due for review (in terms of its impact on equality of opportunity and good relations) by the policy owner on:

　　　　　　　　　　　 2 September 2022 　　　　　　　
　　　　　　　　　　　　 (Insert date)