

Policy Title: Building name change – BLOCK MS

Decision: Screen out for EQIA

Contact: Nuala Dalcz

Date of Completion: 03 July 2023

## Part 1: Policy Scoping

### Information about the policy

Name of the Policy

The proposal to rename Building MS Block on the Derry~Londonderry campus to the “McNulty Building” is to commemorate Kathleen “Kay” McNulty Mauchly Antonelli - an Irish computer programmer and one of the six original programmers of the ENIAC (Electronic Numerical Integrator And Computer), one of the first general-purpose electronic digital computers. In her native Donegal, the Letterkenny Institute of Technology established the annual Kay McNulty medal and prize for the best computer science student in her memory and in 2016 Dublin City University re-named their computer science building in her honour. Today, Kay is rightly recognised as one of the mothers of modern-day computer programming.

Is this an existing, revised, or new policy?

This is a proposal to rename Building MS Teaching Block on the Derry~Londonderry campus, in line with the Policy on the Naming of Ulster University Buildings and Spaces.

According to this policy, the naming of buildings or spaces is generally associated with the following scenarios:

- To honour individuals for particular achievement;
- To recognise significant benefaction;
- As part of a commercial contract or agreement;
- To reflect the brand, ethos, history and heritage and the connections (local and global) of the University (For example, Aberfoyle House, The Orpheus Building, The Loughview Suite).

The Policy includes specific guidance on honorary naming of buildings and spaces (such as, using names of people from outside the University for building [or space] names where they have been associated with events or achievements of major significance, such as a landmark achievement in an academic discipline or major humanitarian contribution, compatible with the University’s mission and goals.

What is it trying to achieve? (For example, intended aims and outcomes)

This naming proposal aims to honour and commemorate the work of Donegal born computer programmer Kathleen “Kay” McNulty Mauchly Antonelli. After many years of her work being anonymous or attributed to male colleagues, she is now rightly recognised as one of the mothers of modern-day computer programming. With the Derry~Londonderry campus being the primary home of the Athena Swan accredited School of Computing, Engineering and Intelligent Systems, it is fitting that one of the

country's foremost women computer programmers should be acknowledged in this way on a campus that neighbours her birth place and continue to develop her work.

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

No. This Building will continue to be available to all stakeholders regardless of their Section 75 category.

Who initiated or wrote the policy?

The Policy was compiled by the Development and Alumni Relations Office in consultation with the Chief People Officer, Provosts, Director of Marketing and Communications and Deputy Director of Physical Resources.

Who owns and implements the policy?

The Ulster University Provost owns the 'Naming of Building and Spaces Policy'. The Director of Estates Services implements the policy.

## Implementation factors

Are there any factors which could contribute to or weaken the intended aim or outcome of the policy?

No

## Main stakeholders affected

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

- Staff
- Students
- Local Community

## Other policies with a bearing on this policy

What are they and who owns them?

Policy: Statutes and Ordinances

Policy owner: University Secretary

Policy: GDPR Policy

Policy owner: University Secretary

Policy: People, Place and Partnership – Delivering Sustainable Futures for All Strategy

Policy owner: The Vice-Chancellor

Policy: Equal Opportunities Policy

Policy owner: Chief People Officer

Policy: Wayfinding Strategy

Policy owner: Director of Estates Services

Policy: UUSU Student Council Mandate on Bilingual Signage

Policy owner: Students' Union

## Available evidence

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

**Note:** Evidence can come from many sources. Examples include the University's management information systems, internal or external research, surveys or consultation exercises. The Equality Commission has produced a guide to [signpost to S75 data](#). Anecdotal evidence, such as feedback from service users may also be used.

### Religious Belief

The University's EO data were reviewed. On 6 February 2023, our staff profile was 51.4% Catholic and 48.6% Protestant. Compared with 6 February 2018, this indicates a 4.1% increase in Catholic staff.

In the Academic Year (AY) 2022/23, 60.2% of our students identified as Christian and 11.0% identified as having 'No religion'. Compared with AY2017/18, 76.1% identified as Christian and 13.5% identified as having 'No religion'.

---

### Political Opinion

The University does not collect information on Political Opinion or make assumptions regarding Political Opinion based on Community Background.

---

### Racial Group

The University's EO data were reviewed. On 6 February 2023, our staff profile was 93.5% White, 6.5% Black and Minority Ethnic (BME). This indicates a 1.8% increase in BME staff compared with 2018.

In AY2022/23, 11.2% of students identified as BME. This indicates a 6.7% increase in BME students compared with AY2017/18.

Our BME profile suggests that we are twice as diverse as the local population. The Northern Ireland Census 2021 suggests that 3.4% of the NI population is BME.

---

## Age

The University's EO data were reviewed. On 6 February 2023, almost one third (32.1%) of our staff were in the '46-55' age band. 25.4% of staff were in the '36-45' age band and 26.7% of staff were aged '56 and above', which represents a 4.4% increase in '56 and above' compared to 2018 (22.3%).

In AY2022/23, the majority of students (65.7%) were aged 21 and under 40. This indicates a 1.4% increase in students within this age band compared with AY2017/18.

---

## Marital Status

The University's EO data were reviewed. In February 2023, 57.1% of staff were 'Married or in a Civil Partnership', a decrease of 6.7% compared to 2018 (63.8%).

In AY2022/23, 63.2% of students were 'Single', 15.1% decrease compared with AY2017/18 (78.3%).

---

## Sexual Orientation

The University's EO data were reviewed. In 2023, 72.2% of staff were 'Heterosexual'; 3.6% were 'LGBT+' and 24.2% were 'Not Known'.

Although we collect student data on sexual orientation, this is not considered to be reliable.

---

## Men and Women generally

The University's EO data were reviewed. In 2023, 57.9% of staff were 'Female'. This indicates a 2.6% increase in female staff compared with 2018.

In AY2022/23, 57.2% of students were 'Female', a 1% increase compared with AY2017/18.

---

## Disability

The University's EO data were reviewed. In 2023, 5.6% of staff declared a disability, an increase of 0.5% compared with 2018.

In AY2022/23, 15.5% of students declared a disability, an increase of 5.1% compared with AY2017/18.

Our disability declaration rate is lower than expected, compared with the local population. The NI 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 2023, 44.1% of staff had dependants. This indicates a decrease of 4.3% compared with 2017.

In AY2022/23, 13.3% of students declared they had dependants, a decrease of 4.4% compared to AY2017/18.

---

## Needs, experience 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 or decision? (Please specify for each of the Section 75 categories below the needs, experiences and priorities)

### Religious Belief

Ulster University prides itself on its strong sense of civic responsibility as articulated within its 'People, Place and Partnership: Delivering Sustainable Futures for all' Strategic Plan.

The naming / renaming of facilities (or any location) is complex and potentially emotionally evocative because assigning a name, and in particular the name of an individual, can be a powerful and permanent identity for a public space and facility.

The University recognises that in all 'naming' decisions it should seek to provide or maintain fair participation on all its campuses, ensuring that its services and facilities are widely utilised by all sections of the community. The Equality Commission's 'Promoting a Good and Harmonious Working Environment: A Guide for Employers and Employees, 2009' provides further guidance in this regard.

---

### Political Opinion

Ulster University prides itself on its strong sense of civic responsibility as articulated within its 'People, Place and Partnership: Delivering Sustainable Futures for all' Strategic Plan.

The naming / renaming of facilities (or any location) is complex and potentially emotionally evocative because assigning a name, and in particular the name of an individual, can be a powerful and permanent identity for a public space and facility.

The University recognises that in all 'naming' decisions it should seek to provide or maintain fair participation on all its campuses, ensuring that its services and facilities are widely utilised by all sections of the community. The Equality Commission's 'Promoting a Good and Harmonious Working Environment: A Guide for Employers and Employees, 2009' provides further guidance in this regard.

This proposal for the naming in honour of Kathleen "Kay" McNulty Mauchly Antonelli, primarily recognises the ground breaking work of an Irish computer programmer and one of the six original programmers of the ENIAC (Electronic Numerical Integrator And Computer) , one of the first general-purpose electronic digital computers. In her native Donegal, the Letterkenny Institute of Technology established the annual Kay McNulty medal and prize for the best computer science student in her memory and in 2016 Dublin City University re-named their computer



science building in her honour. Today, Kay is rightly recognised as one of the mothers of modern-day computer programming.

---

### **Racial Group**

The University recognises that in all 'naming' decisions it should seek to provide or maintain fair participation on all its campuses, ensuring that its services and facilities are widely utilised by all sections of the community. The Equality Commission's 'Promoting a Good and Harmonious Working Environment: A Guide for Employers and Employees, 2009' provides further guidance in this regard.

This proposal for the naming in honour of Kathleen "Kay" McNulty Mauchly Antonelli, primarily recognises the ground breaking work of an Irish computer programmer and one of the six original programmers of the ENIAC (Electronic Numerical Integrator And Computer) , one of the first general-purpose electronic digital computers. In her native Donegal, the Letterkenny Institute of Technology established the annual Kay McNulty medal and prize for the best computer science student in her memory and in 2016 Dublin City University re-named their computer science building in her honour. Today, Kay is rightly recognised as one of the mothers of modern-day computer programming.

---

### **Age**

The University recognises that in all 'naming' decisions it should seek to provide or maintain fair participation on all its campuses, ensuring that its services and facilities are widely utilised by all sections of the community. The Equality Commission's 'Promoting a Good and Harmonious Working Environment: A Guide for Employers and Employees, 2009' provides further guidance in this regard.

---

### **Marital Status**

The University recognises that in all 'naming' decisions it should seek to provide or maintain fair participation on all its campuses, ensuring that its services and facilities are widely utilised by all sections of the community. The Equality Commission's 'Promoting a Good and Harmonious Working Environment: A Guide for Employers and Employees, 2009' provides further guidance in this regard.

---

### **Sexual Orientation**

The University recognises that in all 'naming' decisions it should seek to provide or maintain fair participation on all its campuses, ensuring that its services and facilities are widely utilised by all sections of the community. The Equality Commission's 'Promoting a Good and Harmonious Working Environment: A Guide for Employers and Employees, 2009' provides further guidance in this regard.

---

## **Men and Women generally**

The University recognises that in all 'naming' decisions it should seek to provide or maintain fair participation on all its campuses, ensuring that its services and facilities are widely utilised by all sections of the community. The Equality Commission's 'Promoting a Good and Harmonious Working Environment: A Guide for Employers and Employees, 2009' provides further guidance in this regard.

This proposal for the naming in honour of Kathleen "Kay" McNulty Mauchly Antonelli, primarily recognises the ground breaking work of an Irish computer programmer and one of the six original programmers of the ENIAC (Electronic Numerical Integrator And Computer) , one of the first general-purpose electronic digital computers. In her native Donegal, the Letterkenny Institute of Technology established the annual Kay McNulty medal and prize for the best computer science student in her memory and in 2016 Dublin City University re-named their computer science building in her honour. Today, Kay is rightly recognised as one of the mothers of modern-day computer programming.

---

## **Disability**

The University recognises that in all 'naming' decisions it should seek to provide or maintain fair participation on all its campuses, ensuring that its services and facilities are widely utilised by all sections of the community. The Equality Commission's 'Promoting a Good and Harmonious Working Environment: A Guide for Employers and Employees, 2009' provides further guidance in this regard.

---

## **Dependants**

The University recognises that in all 'naming' decisions it should seek to provide or maintain fair participation on all its campuses, ensuring that its services and facilities are widely utilised by all sections of the community. The Equality Commission's 'Promoting a Good and Harmonious Working Environment: A Guide for Employers and Employees, 2009' provides further guidance in this regard.

---

## Consultation

Consultation with relevant groups, organisations or individuals about the policy can provide useful information about issues or opportunities which are specifically related to them (that is evidence to inform the policy).

Please indicate whether you carried out or intend to carry out any consultation exercises prior to equality screening?

Yes

Consultations have taken place with the Vice-Chancellor, Deputy Vice Chancellor, Development and Alumni Relations Office, Regional Engagement and Estates Services. Additionally a staff/stakeholder consultation was undertaken on 11 January 2018 which included participation by 30 members of staff in a consultation roundtable.

## Part 2: Screening questions

### 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 question 1 to 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 opportunities 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.

**Taking into account the evidence presented in Part 1, please complete the screening questions (Question 1 to 4).**

## Screening questions

1. What is the likely impact on equality of opportunity for those affected by this policy, for each of the Section 75 categories? Please provide details of the likely policy impacts and determine the level of impact for each Section 75 category below.

### Details of the likely policy impacts on **Religious Belief**

This proposal is unlikely to impact on equality of opportunity for this category. This renamed building will continue to be available to all stakeholders, regardless of religious belief.

What is the level of impact?

None

---

### Details of the likely policy impacts on **Political Opinion**

This proposal is unlikely to impact on equality of opportunity for this category. This renamed building will continue to be available to all stakeholders regardless of their political opinion.

Level of impact

None

---

### Details of the likely policy impacts on **Racial Group**

This proposal is unlikely to impact on equality of opportunity for this category. This renamed building will continue to be available to all stakeholders, regardless of racial group.

Level of impact

None

---

### Details of the likely policy impacts on **Age**

This proposal is unlikely to impact on equality of opportunity for this category.

This renamed building will continue to be available to all stakeholders, regardless of age.

Level of impact

None

---

Details of the likely policy impacts on **Marital Status**

This proposal is unlikely to impact on equality of opportunity for this category. This renamed building will continue to be available to all stakeholders, regardless of marital status.

Level of impact

None

---

Details of the likely policy impacts on **Sexual Orientation**

This proposal is unlikely to impact on equality of opportunity for this category. This renamed building will continue to be available to all stakeholders, regardless of sexual orientation.

Level of impact

None

---

Details of the likely policy impacts on **Men and Women generally**

This proposal is unlikely to impact on equality of opportunity for this category. This renamed building will continue to be available to all stakeholders, regardless of sex.

Level of impact

None

---

Details of the likely policy impacts on **Disability**

This proposal is unlikely to impact on equality of opportunity for this category.  
This renamed building will continue to be available to all stakeholders, regardless of disability.

Level of impact

None

---

#### Details of the likely policy impacts on **Dependants**

This proposal is unlikely to impact on equality of opportunity for this category.  
This renamed building will continue to be available to all stakeholders, regardless of dependants.

Level of impact

None

---

2. Are there opportunities to better promote equality of opportunity for people within the Section 75 categories?

#### **Religious Belief**

No. This proposal is unlikely to impact on equality of opportunity for this category.  
It is envisaged that the new name of the MS Building will have no impact on the experience of stakeholders. This is regardless of religious belief.

---

#### **Political Opinion**

No. This proposal is unlikely to impact on equality of opportunity for this category.  
It is envisaged that the new name of the MS Building will have no impact on the experience of stakeholders. This is regardless of political opinion.

---

#### **Racial Group**

No. This proposal is unlikely to impact on equality of opportunity for this category.  
It is envisaged that the new name of the MS Building will have no impact on the experience of stakeholders. This is regardless of racial group.



---

**Age**

No. This proposal is unlikely to impact on equality of opportunity for this category. It is envisaged that the new name of the MS Building will have no impact on the experience of stakeholders. This is regardless of age.

---

**Marital Status**

No. This proposal is unlikely to impact on equality of opportunity for this category. It is envisaged that the new name of the MS Building will have no impact on the experience of stakeholders. This is regardless of marital status.

---

**Sexual Orientation**

No. This proposal is unlikely to impact on equality of opportunity for this category. It is envisaged that the new name of the MS Building will have no impact on the experience of stakeholders. This is regardless of sexual orientation.

---

**Men and Women generally**

No. This proposal is unlikely to impact on equality of opportunity for this category. It is envisaged that the new name of the MS Building will have no impact on the experience of stakeholders. This is regardless of sex.

---

**Disability**

No. This proposal is unlikely to impact on equality of opportunity for this category. It is envisaged that the new name of the MS Building will have no impact on the experience of stakeholders. This is regardless of disability.

---

**Dependants**

No. This proposal is unlikely to impact on equality of opportunity for this category. It is envisaged that the new name of the MS Building will have no impact on the experience of stakeholders. This is regardless of dependants.

---

3. To what extent is the policy likely to impact on good relations between people of different religious belief, political opinion or racial group?

### **Religious Belief**

Details of the likely policy impacts on **Religious Belief**

This proposal is unlikely to impact on good relations between people of different religious belief. The building will continue to provide access for all stakeholders regardless of religious belief.

Level of impact

None

---

### **Political Opinion**

Details of the likely policy impacts on **Political Opinion**

This proposal is unlikely to have an adverse impact on good relations between people of different political opinion. The building will continue to provide access for all stakeholders regardless of political opinion.

Level of impact

None

---

### **Racial Group**

Details of the likely policy impacts on **Racial Group**

This proposal is unlikely to impact on good relations between people of different racial group. The building will continue to provide access for all stakeholders regardless of racial group.

Level of impact

None

---

4. Are there opportunities to better promote good relations between people of different religious belief, political opinion or racial group?

#### **Religious Belief**

No. This proposal is unlikely to impact on good relations between people of different religious belief.

---

#### **Political Opinion**

No. The proposed name is not considered to unlawfully discriminate or be party-political in intention or use. It is unlikely to have an adverse impact on good relations between people of different political opinion.

---

#### **Racial Group**

No. This proposal is unlikely to have an adverse impact on good relations between people of different racial group.

---

### **Additional considerations**

#### **Multiple identity**

5. Generally speaking, people can fall into more than one Section 75 category. Taking this into consideration, are there any potential impacts of the policy or 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 specify the relevant Section 75 categories concerned below.  
Provide details of the policy impact and data which describes the policy impact.

None

---

## Disability Duties

6. Does the policy provide an opportunity to encourage disabled people to participate in University life?

Yes. The University recognises that in all 'naming' decisions it should seek to provide or maintain fair participation on all its campuses, ensuring that its services and facilities are widely utilised by all sections of the Community.

---

7. Does the policy provide an opportunity to promote positive attitudes towards disabled people?

Yes. The University recognises that in all 'naming' decisions it should seek to provide or maintain fair participation on all its campuses, ensuring that its services and facilities are widely utilised by all sections of the Community.

---

## Part 3: 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 (that is, subject to an Equality Impact Assessment). The likely impact is **major** in respect of one, or more of the equality of opportunity or good relations categories.
- ☒ **Screen out** the policy without mitigation or an alternative policy proposed to be adopted (that is, **no** Equality Impact Assessment). The likely impact is **none** in respect of all of equality of opportunity or good relations categories.
- ☐ **Screen out** the policy and **mitigate the impacts on equality by amending or changing the policy**, or by **developing an alternative policy or action** (that is, **no** Equality Impact Assessment). The likely impact is **minor** in respect of one or more of the equality of opportunity or good relations categories.

---

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

Not applicable

---

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

The likely impact is none in respect of all of equality of opportunity or good relations categories. This is a proposal to rename Building MS Teaching Block on the Derry~Londonderry campus to the "McNulty Building", in line with the Policy on the Naming of Ulster University Buildings and Spaces.

Kathleen "Kay" McNulty Mauchly Antonelli was an Irish computer programmer and one of the six original programmers of the ENIAC (Electronic Numerical Integrator

And Computer), one of the first general-purpose electronic digital computers. Today, she is recognised as one of the mothers of modern-day computer programming.

In line with University Policy, this proposal will be reviewed one year after implementation.

---

If the decision is not to conduct an equality impact assessment (that is, 'screen out' the policy), and mitigate the impacts on equality of opportunity 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.

Not applicable

---

## Timetabling and prioritising

If the policy had been '**screened in**' for an equality impact assessment, then please answer the following questions to determine its priority for timetabling the equality impact assessment.

On a scale of 1 to 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 rating for timetabling the equality impact assessment in terms of effect on equality of opportunity and good relations:**

Not Applicable

### **Priority rating for timetabling the equality impact assessment in terms of social need**

Not Applicable

### **Priority rating for timetabling the equality impact assessment in terms of effect on people's daily lives**

Not Applicable

### **Priority rating for timetabling the equality impact assessment in terms of relevance to the University's functions**

Not Applicable

**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?


Not Applicable

## Approval and authorisation

Screened by: 

Position or Job Title: The University Provost

Date screened: 10.09.2023



Approved by:

Position or Job Title: Chief People Officer

Date approved: 12.09.23

## Review

This policy is due for review (in terms of its impact on equality of opportunity and good relations) by the policy owner on: 12 September 2024