



Northern Ireland
Assembly

SECTION 75 SCREENING FORM

[View the full list of the Section 75 Statutory Equality Duties for Public Authorities.](#)

The promotion of equality of opportunity entails more than the elimination of discrimination. It may also require proactive measures to be taken to maintain and secure equality of opportunity.

Section 75 (1) requires the Assembly Commission in carrying out its functions, powers and duties to have due regard to the need to promote equality of opportunity between:

- persons of different religious belief, political opinion, racial group, age, marital status, or sexual orientation
- men and women generally
- persons with a disability and persons without
- persons with dependants and persons without.

Without prejudice to the obligations set out above, the Commission is also required to:

- a) have regard to the desirability of promoting good relations between persons of different
 - religious belief
 - political opinion; or
 - racial group
- b) meet legislative obligations under the Disability Discrimination Order.

What is a policy?

The Equality Commission for Northern Ireland (ECNI) state in their guidance that the term 'policy' is used to denote any strategy, policy (proposed/amended/existing) or practice and/or decision, whether written or unwritten. The Commission's Equality Scheme reflects the ECNI's definition of a policy and this should be applied in determining what needs to be screened. The Equality Scheme states:

"In the context of Section 75, 'policy' is very broadly defined and it covers all the ways in which we carry out, or propose to carry out, our functions in relation to Northern Ireland. In respect of this equality scheme, the term policy is used for any (proposed / amended / existing) strategy, policy initiative or practice and/or decision, whether written or unwritten and irrespective of the label given to it, e.g. 'draft', 'pilot', 'high level' or 'sectoral'."

If you are in doubt, please contact the Equality and Good Relations Unit for advice. Equality screening guidance notes are also available on Assist.

Part 1 Policy scoping

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

The ECNI, in their 'model equality screening form', note that public authorities should remember that the Section 75 statutory duties apply to internal policies (relating to people who work for the authority), as well as external policies (relating to those who are, or could be, served by the authority).

Policy Details

Name of the policy to be screened/description:

Performance and Wellbeing Framework

Is this policy an existing, new or revised policy? (Please append policy to screening form)

Revised Policy

What is it trying to achieve? (brief outline of intended aims/outcomes of the policy)

The Performance and Wellbeing Framework is based on the following goals:

- Quality Dialogue – a focus on regular, high-quality conversations linked to health and wellbeing, reflection on the past 3 months, discussion of development and growth and focusing on the future.
- Manager as Coach – the promotion of a coaching style of management to help staff build their competence and confidence;
- Accountability – managers will be responsible for arranging conversations and there is visibility of performance;
- Timely Feedback – feedback should be regular, relevant, and actionable, so that staff can understand what went well or what needs improvement and make changes if necessary.

Guidance has been developed to assist staff members and managers with understanding this approach.

Are any of the Section 75 categories which might be expected to benefit from the intended policy/decision? Please explain how.

No

Who initiated or wrote the policy?

Whilst the Corporate Services Directorate is responsible for devising and implementing the policy, practical application of the policy will be by all staff and managers, with guidance from HR staff as appropriate.

Directorate responsible for devising and delivering the policy?

Corporate Services

Was consultation carried out as part of this screening exercise?

Yes

No

Background to the Policy to be screened

Include details of any pre- consultations/consultations which have been conducted and whether the policy has previously been tabled at SMT/ Assembly Commission meetings.

SMT paper 'People and Culture Strategy' on 4 July 2024, SMT paper 'People and Culture Strategy: Update on work undertaken since July 2024 and the future programme of work' on 28 March 2025, SMT paper 'Review of approach to Performance Management' on 24 October 2025. Consultation with the Performance Management Steering Group from

November 2024 to June 2025; Meeting of Assembly Leadership Team on 13 June 2025 and 17 October 2025.

Consultation with Trade Union Side

Implementation factors

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

Yes

No

If yes, are they

Financial

Legislative

Other, please specify:

Click or tap here to enter text.

Main stakeholders affected

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

Staff

Service users

Other public sector organisations

Voluntary/community/trade unions

Other, please specify

Enter information on other users of Parliament Buildings such as contractors.

Other policies with a bearing on this policy

What are these policies and who owns them? Please list: Probation Policy, Capability Policy

Please enter the details of other policies with a bearing on this policy.

Consideration of available data/research

(This means any data or information you currently hold in relation to the policy or have gathered/generated during policy development). Evidence to inform the screening process may take many forms and should help you to decide who the policy might affect the most. It will also help ensure that your screening decision is informed by relevant data.

What evidence/information (both qualitative and quantitative) have you gathered to inform this policy?

For example, is there any evidence of higher or lower participation or uptake by different groups? Specify details for each of the Section 75 categories.

Section 75 category and details of evidence/information

Religious belief

HR data as at 1 May 2025.

Community background profile of Assembly Commission employees

Community Background	Number of staff	Percentage of staff
Protestant	197	55%
Roman Catholic	146	41%
Non-determined	13	4%

Community background profile by grade

Grade	Protestant	Roman Catholic	Non-determined	Total
1-3	7	8	0	15
4	18	25	4	47

Grade	Protestant	Roman Catholic	Non-determined	Total
5	26	25	1	52
6	31	29	1	61
7	56	31	2	89
8	59	28	5	92
Total	197	146	13	356

Political opinion

Currently we do not have any data on the political opinion of our staff. The ECNI has advised that data on Religious Belief can be used as a proxy for political opinion.

Racial group

Assembly Commission Section 75 Staff Survey results as at 26 March 2024.

It should be noted that a total of 195 responses were received to the survey representing 61 per cent of all permanent Assembly Commission staff.

Category	Per cent (%) Survey
White	98.5
Chinese	0.0
Irish Traveller	0.0
Roma	0.0
Filipino	0.0
Indian	0.0

Category	Per cent (%) Survey
Asian	0.0
Arab	0.0
Black African	0.0
Black Other	0.0
Mixed Ethnic Group	0.0
Other Ethnic Group	0.0
Prefer not to say	1.5
Total	100

Age

HR data as at 1 May 2025.

Age profile of Assembly Commission employees

AGE	NUMBER
20 – 24	1
25 - 29	9
30 - 34	18
35 - 39	32
40 - 44	62
45 - 49	68
50 - 54	61
55 - 59	57
60 - 64	28

AGE	NUMBER
65+	20
TOTAL	356

Age profile by grade

GRADE	20-24	25-29	30-34	35-39	40-44	45-49	50-54	55-59	60-64	65+	TOTAL
1-3	0	0	0	1	1	4	3	5	1	0	15
4	0	0	3	2	4	15	7	8	7	1	47
5	0	1	2	8	9	12	13	4	2	1	52
6	0	0	3	4	13	10	14	16	0	1	61
7	0	5	6	4	22	18	11	9	8	6	89
8	1	3	4	13	13	9	13	15	10	11	92
TOTAL	1	9	18	32	62	68	61	57	28	20	356

Marital status**Assembly Commission Section 75 Staff Survey results as at 24 March 2024.**

It should be noted that a total of 195 responses were received to the survey representing 61 per cent of all permanent Assembly Commission staff.

Category	Percentage (%)
Single	20.7
Married	65.8
Separated	2.6
Divorced	3.1
Civil partnership	1.6

Category	Percentage (%)
Widow / widower	1.0
Other (please specify)	2.6
Prefer not to say	2.6
Total	100.0

Sexual orientation

Assembly Commission Section 75 Staff Survey results as at 24 March 2024.

It should be noted that a total of 195 responses were received to the survey representing 61 per cent of all permanent Assembly Commission staff.

Category	Percentage (%)
Heterosexual	92.6
Other (Gay, Lesbian, Bisexual)	2.7
Prefer not to say	4.7
Total	100.0

Men and women generally

HR data as at 1 May 2025.

Gender profile of Assembly Commission employees

Gender	Number of staff	Percentage of staff (%)
Male	182	51
Female	174	49

Gender profile by grade

GRADE	MALE	FEMALE	TOTAL
1-3	8	7	15
4	17	30	47
5	19	33	52
6	31	30	61
7	47	42	89
8	60	32	92
TOTAL	182	174	356

Disability**Assembly Commission Section 75 Staff Survey results as at 24 March 2024.**

It should be noted that a total of 195 responses were received to the survey representing 61 per cent of all permanent Assembly Commission staff.

Category	Per cent (%)
Yes	21.6
No	73.2
Don't know	2.6
Prefer not to say	2.6
Total	100.0

Type of Disability.

Category	Per cent (%)
Mental health condition	40.0%
Long term pain or discomfort	34.0%
Mobility impairment	20.0%
Hearing impairment	14.0%
Other	54.0%

N.B. Percentages do not add up to 100, as some respondents have more than one disability.

Dependants

Assembly Commission Section 75 Staff Survey results as at 24 March 2024.

It should be noted that a total of 195 responses were received to the survey representing 61 per cent of all permanent Assembly Commission staff.

Category	Per cent (%)
No	36.5
Yes, for a child/children	49.2
Yes, for 1 or more adult dependents	24.9
Other	3.7
Prefer not to say	2.1

N.B. Percentages do not add up to 100, as some respondents have more than one caring responsibility.

Current Assessment of Impact

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? and what is the actual or likely impact on equality of opportunity for those affected by the policy. **(See appendix 1 for information on levels of impact).**

Specify details of the needs, experiences and priorities for each of the Section 75 categories below:

Section 75 category

Religious belief

Needs/experiences/priorities/impacts: Click or tap here to enter text.

Impact Level: None

Political opinion

Needs/experiences/priorities/impacts: Click or tap here to enter text.

Impact Level: None

Racial group

Needs/experiences/priorities/impacts: Click or tap here to enter text.

Impact Level: None

Age

Needs/experiences/priorities/impacts: Click or tap here to enter text.

Impact Level: None

Marital status

Needs/experiences/priorities/impacts: Click or tap here to enter text.

Impact Level: None

Sexual orientation

Needs/experiences/priorities/impacts: Click or tap here to enter text.

Impact Level: None

Men and women

Needs/experiences/priorities/impacts: Click or tap here to enter text.

Impact Level: None

Disability

Needs/experiences/priorities/impacts: We are aware from the data of staff with disabilities and are content that the policy and system can facilitate those people. In future, any adjustments can be made to support staff with disabilities as required.

Impact Level: None

Dependants

Needs/experiences/priorities/impacts: Click or tap here to enter text.

Impact Level: None

If you do not have enough data to tell you about potential or actual impacts, you may need to generate more data to distinguish what groups are potentially affected by your policy.

Part 2 Screening Questions

What is the likely impact on equality of opportunity for those affected by this policy, for each of the Section 75 equality categories?

Section 75 category

Religious belief

Issues: None

Impact Level: None

Political opinion

Issues: None

Impact Level: None

Racial group

Issues: None

Impact Level: None

Age

Issues: None

Impact Level: None

Marital status

Issues: None

Impact Level: None

Sexual orientation

Issues: None

Impact Level: None

Men and women generally

Issues: None

Impact Level: None

Disability

Issues:None

Impact Level: None

Dependants

Issues: None

Impact Level: None

Are there any actions which could be taken to reduce or mitigate any adverse impact which has been identified, or opportunities to better promote equality of opportunity for people within the section 75 categories?

Section 75 category

Religious belief

Issue: Click or tap here to enter text.

Impact Level: None

Political opinion

Issue: Click or tap here to enter text.

Impact Level: None

Racial group

Issue: Click or tap here to enter text.

Impact Level: None

Age

Issue: Click or tap here to enter text.

Impact Level: None

Marital status

Issue: Click or tap here to enter text.

Impact Level: None

Sexual orientation

Issue: Click or tap here to enter text.

Impact Level: None

Men and women generally

Issue: Click or tap here to enter text.

Impact Level: None

Disability

Issue: Click or tap here to enter text.

Impact Level: None

Dependants

Issue: Click or tap here to enter text.

Impact Level: None

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

Good relations category

Religious belief

Details of policy Impact: This policy is not likely to have any impacts on good relations between people of different religious belief, political opinion or racial group.

Impact Level: None

Political opinion

Details of policy Impact: This policy is not likely to have any impacts on good relations between people of different religious belief, political opinion or racial group.

Impact Level: None

Racial group

Details of policy Impact: This policy is not likely to have any impacts on good relations between people of different religious belief, political opinion or racial group.

Impact Level: None

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

Section 75 category

Religious belief

If Yes, provide details: Click or tap here to enter text.

If No, provide reasons: The policy applies to all staff.

Political opinion

If Yes, provide details: Click or tap here to enter text.

If No, provide reasons: The policy applies to all staff.

Racial group

If Yes, provide details: Click or tap here to enter text.

If No, provide reasons: The policy applies to all staff.

Consultation

Tell us about who you have talked to about your proposals, either internally or externally and who you have formally or informally consulted, to help you decide if the policy needs further equality investigation?

Consultation has taken place with SMT, TUS and staff through the Performance Management Steering Group, which was made up of staff from different Business Areas and different grades.

Disability Duties

Consider whether the policy:

- a) Discourages disabled people from participating in public life and fails to promote positive attitudes towards disabled people.

No

- b) Provides an opportunity to better positive attitudes towards disabled people or encourages their participation in public life.

N/a

Additional considerations

Multiple identities

Generally speaking, people can fall into more than one Section 75 category. Taking this into consideration, are there any potential impacts of the policy/decision on people with multiple identities?

(For example; disabled minority ethnic people; disabled women; young Protestant men).

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

No level of impact on multiple Section 75 categories has been identified during screening

Part 3 Screening decision

Through screening, an assessment is made of the likely impacts; either major, minor or none, of the policy on equality of opportunity and/or good relations for the relevant categories. Completion of screening should lead to one of the following three outcomes:

check the appropriate box:

- Screened out' i.e. the likely impact is none and no further action is required.
- 'Screened out' with mitigation i.e. the likely impact is minor and measures will be taken to mitigate the impact or an alternative policy will be proposed.
- 'Screened in' for an equality impact assessment (EQIA) i.e. the likely impact is major and the policy will now be subject to an EQIA.

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

Click or tap here to enter text.

If the decision is not to conduct an equality impact assessment, but the policy has minor equality impacts, please provide details of the reasons for this decision and of any proposed mitigating measures or proposed alternative policy.

n/a

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

n/a

Timetabling and prioritising for EQIA

Complete this section only if your business area/directorate plans to conduct two or more EQIAs.

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

Click or tap here to enter text.

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	Choose an item.
Social need	Choose an item.
Effect on people's daily lives	Choose an item.
Relevance to a public authority's functions	Choose an item.

Note: The Total Rating Score should be used to prioritise the policy in rank order with other policies screened in for equality impact assessment.

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

Yes

No

If yes, please provide details

Click or tap here to enter text.

Part 4 Monitoring

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

The ECNI recommends that where a policy has been amended or an alternative policy introduced, the public authority should monitor more broadly for adverse impact. See *ECNI Monitoring Guidance for use by Public Authorities (July 2007) pages 9-10, paragraphs 2.13 – 2.20*

Please detail how you will monitor the effect of the policy?

The HR Office will monitor the implementation of the new approach to performance management at the end of its first year of being implemented to ensure that there is no adverse impact arising from the policy. Monitoring will be through feedback from staff in the operation of the policy within the first year and whether the Goals are achieved.

What data is required in the future to ensure effective monitoring of the policy?

Click or tap here to enter text.

Part 5 Data Protection

If applicable, has legal advice been given due consideration?

Yes

No

N/A

Has due consideration been given to information security in relation to this policy?

Yes

No

Part 6 Approval and authorisation

Screened by: Diane Lamont

Position/Job Title: Senior HR Manager

Date: Thursday, 15 January 2026

Approved by: Karen Martin, Deputy Head of HR

The policy lead should sign and date the policy under the 'screened by' heading. It should then be countersigned by an approver. The Approver should be the senior manager responsible for the policy which would normally be a Head of Business. In instances where a screening decision concludes that an EQIA is required then the screening form should be countersigned by the Director instead of the Head of Business.

There are of course a range of issues which may fall within the scope of being novel, contentious or politically sensitive and could only be taken forward following consultation with the Northern Ireland Assembly Commission (Assembly Commission). Where policy screening highlights novel, contentious or politically sensitive issues, once approved by the Director, the screening form should be forwarded to the Clerk/Chief Executive for review, prior to proceeding to SMT and the Assembly Commission.

A copy of the completed screening form, related policy and any other relevant associated documentation should be forwarded to the Equality Manager.

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION TO INFORM THE ANNUAL PROGRESS REPORT TO THE EQUALITY COMMISSION

1. Please provide details of any measures taken to enhance the level of engagement with individuals and representative groups.

Click or tap here to enter text.

2. In developing this policy/decision were any changes made as a result of equality issues raised during:
 - a) pre-consultation/engagement;
 - b) formal consultation;
 - c) the screening process; and/or
 - d) monitoring/research findings.

If so, please provide a brief summary including how the issue was identified, what changes were made, and what will be the expected outcomes/impacts for those affected.

Click or tap here to enter text.

3. Does this policy/decision include any measure(s) to improve access to services including the provision of information in accessible formats? If so, please provide a short summary.

Click or tap here to enter text.

Appendix 1 Screening Questions

Introduction

In making a decision as to whether or not there is a need to carry out an equality impact assessment, you should consider your answers to the questions above.

In addition, the screening questions above further assist you in assessing your policy and must be completed. Some of these questions require you to assess the level of impact of the proposed policy on “equality of opportunity” and “good relations”. The scale used when assessing this impact is either “None”, “Minor” or “Major”. The following paragraphs set out what each of these terms mean.

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

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

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

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

In favour of a ‘major’ impact

- a) The policy is significant in terms of its strategic importance;
- b) Potential equality impacts are unknown, because, for example, there is insufficient data upon which to make an assessment or because they are complex, and it would be appropriate to conduct an equality impact assessment in order to better assess them;
- c) Potential equality 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.

In favour of ‘minor’ impact

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

In favour of none

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