## Screening flowchart and template (taken from Section 75 of the Northern Ireland Act 1998 - A Guide for public authorities April 2010 (Appendix 1)).

## Introduction

Part 1. Policy scoping - asks public authorities to provide details about the policy, procedure, practice and/or decision being screened and what available evidence you have gathered to help make an assessment of the likely impact on equality of opportunity and good relations.

Part 2. Screening questions - asks about the extent of the likely impact of the policy on groups of people within each of the Section 75 categories. Details of the groups consulted and the level of assessment of the likely impact. This includes consideration of multiple identity and good relations issues.

Part 3. Screening decision - guides the public authority to reach a screening decision as to whether or not there is a need to carry out an equality impact assessment (EQIA), or to introduce measures to mitigate the likely impact, or the introduction of an alternative policy to better promote equality of opportunity and/or good relations.

Part 4. Monitoring - provides guidance to public authorities on monitoring for adverse impact and broader monitoring.

Part 5. Approval and authorisation - verifies the public authority's approval of a screening decision by a senior manager responsible for the policy.

## Screening Flowchart



## Part 1. Policy scoping

## Information about the policy

```
Name of the policy
Organisation Emergency Programme (OEP)
```

Is this an existing, revised or a new policy?
New policy

What is it trying to achieve? (intended aims/outcomes)
The primary objective of the programme is to support the continuance of creative work AND assist operational costs where necessary. The programme seeks to assist small to medium scale organisations to explore ways of working that will help them to adapt and respond to the current changing circumstances. It will also aim to assist organisations most in need due to loss of income or operational capacity up to 31 March 2021, enabling them to continue to develop and/or deliver activities.

Are there any Section 75 categories which might be expected to benefit from the intended policy?
If so, explain how.
This programme has been developed in response to the current COVID 19 pandemic. This fund is to protect and support our artists at a time of great uncertainty.

Understanding that there are potential barriers for some groups within society to apply to the OEP has some specific actions that will benefit access for these groups.

Who initiated or wrote the policy?
The Arts Council co-designed this emergency support programme which reflects the Minister's priorities with financial support from the Department for Communities to support the wider cultural sector

Who owns and who implements the policy?
The programme belongs to the Arts Council. The Arts Council welcomes applications from Arts or Cultural organisations whose primary work is in the following art form or cultural areas:

- Dance
- Drama
- Literature
- Music and Opera
- Traditional Arts
- Visual Arts
- Festivals
- Participatory Arts
- Cross Art form
- Venues

Arts organisations need to have a proven track record of quality work and public engagement supported by public funding in one of the last three financial years.

## Implementation factors

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

If yes, are they
$\checkmark$ financial
legislative
other, please specify $\qquad$

## Main stakeholders affected

Who are the internal and external stakeholders (actual or potential) that the policy will impact upon?
v staff
$\checkmark$ service users
$\checkmark$ other public sector organisations
$\checkmark$ voluntary/community/trade unions
other, please specify

## Other policies with a bearing on this policy

OEP has been developed in response to the current COVID 19 situation, therefore it is reactionary response opposed to a policy response.

## Available evidence

## Data Sources:

- Annual Funding Survey (AFS)
- General Population Survey (GPS)
- Continuous household Survey (CHS)

ACNI captures religious belief of all staff, the data below represents a three year breakdown across a constant sample of Annual Funding programme organisations.

|  | 2016/17 |  | 2017/18 |  | 2018/19 |  | Total |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Religious Belief | n | \% | n | \% | n | \% | n | \% |
| Roman Catholic | 659 | 12\% | 863 | 18\% | 869 | 16\% | 2391 | 15\% |
| Protestant | 320 | 6\% | 428 | 9\% | 521 | 9\% | 1269 | 8\% |
| Other Religious Faith | 45 | 1\% | 62 | 1\% | 62 | 1\% | 169 | 1\% |
| None | 113 | 2\% | 108 | 2\% | 129 | 2\% | 350 | 2\% |
| Unspecified or not collected | 4204 | 79\% | 3351 | 70\% | 3932 | 71\% | 11487 | 73\% |
| Total | 5341 | 100\% | 4812 | 100\% | 5513 | 100\% | 15666 | 100\% |

Each annually funded body was asked to give a breakdown of their staff; it was found that $71 \%$ of respondents did not specify their religion. Of those respondents that did specify their religious belief it was found that $16 \%$ were from a Catholic background and $9 \%$ were from a protestant background. There was no significant change between 2017/18 and 2018/19.

To date, there has been no suggestion that any political grouping suffers any adverse impact in accessing and participating in the arts in Northern Ireland. There is no evidence from any monitoring returns of a discernible impact with regards to political opinion.

There has been an historical tendency for voting preferences in Northern Ireland to closely reflect the religious affiliations of the population. This implies that those issues and differentials identified in relation to persons of different religion may also impact on persons of different political opinion. ACNI captures data on age of employees working within Annual Funding Programme organisations, this table shows three years with a constant sample of organisations.

## Details of evidence/information

| Ethnicity - All groups* | $2016 / 17$ |  | $2017 / 18$ |  | $2018 / 19$ |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| White | 1,344 | $99 \%$ | 1,455 | $98 \%$ | 1,286 | $99 \%$ |
| Irish Traveller | 0 | $0 \%$ | 1 | $0 \%$ | 0 | $0 \%$ |
| Chinese | 9 | $1 \%$ | 19 | $1 \%$ | 7 | $1 \%$ |
| Indian | 2 | $0 \%$ | 2 | $0 \%$ | 2 | $0 \%$ |
| Pakistani | 0 | $0 \%$ | 0 | $0 \%$ | 0 | $0 \%$ |
| Bangladeshi | 0 | $0 \%$ | 0 | $0 \%$ | 0 | $0 \%$ |
| Other Asian | 0 | $0 \%$ | 0 | $0 \%$ | 0 | $0 \%$ |
| Black Caribbean | 0 | $0 \%$ | 0 | $0 \%$ | 0 | $0 \%$ |
| Black African | 0 | $0 \%$ | 1 | $0 \%$ | 1 | $0 \%$ |
| Black Other | 0 | $0 \%$ | 0 | $0 \%$ | 0 | $0 \%$ |
| Mixed ethnic group | 1 | $0 \%$ | 0 | $0 \%$ | 0 | $0 \%$ |
| Other ethnic group | 0 | $0 \%$ | 1 | $0 \%$ | 2 | $0 \%$ |
| Unspecified or not collected | 4 | $0 \%$ | 13 | $1 \%$ | 4 | $0 \%$ |
| Total | 1,360 |  | 1,492 |  | 1,302 |  |

In relation to employment it was found that in 2018/19 there were 12 staff members from an ethnic minority out of 1,302 employed by ACNI's annually funded organisations. This represented $1 \%$ of their total staffing complement. This has fallen on the previous year which accounted for $1.6 \%$ confirming that that there is an increasing underrepresentation.

ACNI captures data on age of employees working within Annual Funding Programme organisations. This table represents 3 years of data across a constant sample of organisations.

| Age - All groups* | $2016 / 17$ |  | $2017 / 18$ |  | $2018 / 19$ |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 16 to 24 years | 266 | $11 \%$ | 170 | $9 \%$ | 196 | $12 \%$ |
| 25 to 34 years | 713 | $29 \%$ | 429 | $24 \%$ | 435 | $27 \%$ |
| 35 to 44 years | 729 | $30 \%$ | 579 | $32 \%$ | 459 | $28 \%$ |
| 45 to 54 years | 455 | $19 \%$ | 441 | $25 \%$ | 331 | $20 \%$ |
| 55 to 64 years | 209 | $9 \%$ | 143 | $8 \%$ | 142 | $9 \%$ |
| $65+$ years | 71 | $3 \%$ | 35 | $2 \%$ | 76 | $5 \%$ |
| Total | 2,443 |  | 1,797 |  | 1,639 |  |

The AFS shows that there is an increase in percentage staff members of arts organisations within the 16-24 category from $9 \%$ to $12 \%$; an increase of 3 percentage points and an increase in the number of $16 / 24$ year old employees, by 26.

In 2018/19 37.5\% of programme activity by annually funded organisations was targeted at young people. There is also collaboration between organisations in 'playgroup / after school' and 'youth work / development' sectors of $43 \%$ and $15 \%$ respectively. Additional collaboration are likely to be made to direct the focus of the youth outreach activities.

ACNI and NISRA's General Population Survey 2016 shows that although the engagement, attendance and participation of older people in the arts is much lower than any other age category there has been an upwards trend over the last 12 years. There has been a $15 \%$ rise in engagement, over $10 \%$ increase in attendance, and a $5 \%$ rise in participation. There was a drop in all engagement during 2014 to $54.7 \%$ however 2016 data shows that the engagement of this age group is recovering, rising to $59.3 \%$.

Although there has been an overall increase in the number of older people working in the arts sector, it is most likely that it is the voluntary staff that have experienced the greatest increase,

Annually funded organisations tailor a portion of their programme towards reaching an older audience. In 2018/19, approximately 13\% of the annually funded organisations' programmes were aimed at older people, in addition $12.5 \%$ were aimed at people with a physical or mental

|  | impairment; which could also include older people. There was also the provision of Hearing <br> Support Loops, Large Print, and wheel chair access in many of the events which could improve <br> access to older people with any physical impairment. |
| :--- | :--- |
| Marital |  |
| status | We can observe the trends in marital status engagement, attendance, and participation in the arts <br> from ACNI and NISRA's General population Survey. Both separated and divorced respondents <br> show a higher variation in results and this can be explained as the number of respondents in <br> these categories is very low; much less than 100. As such analysis cannot be carried out with any <br> confidence and these trends should not be considered representative of these marital categories. <br> Single and married respondents observed an increase in engagement up until 2014, and married <br> engagement has continued to grow. There does not seem to be any bias towards engagement in <br> the arts for single or married respondents and in 2016 married engagement surpassed single <br> engagement (80.8\% vs 78.6\%). However GPS showed that 20\% of people reported that 'family <br> commitments / childcare' was a barrier to their engagement in the arts. |
| It is of course interesting to note that those who are married do cite 'family commitments and <br> childcare' as a barrier considerably more often than single respondents; 23\% vs 9\% in 2016. <br> Despite this, there is not a significantly, or reproducibly, higher proportion of single people <br> reporting that they do not have any barriers to the arts than married people; suggesting that there <br> is not any difference in perceived access to the arts (In 2016 14\% of single respondents reported <br> none of the these barriers applied and 10\% of married respondents however there was much <br> variation through the last 12 years). <br> Widowed respondents were few in number, generally with just less than 100 respondents, |  |
| however in general had engagement, and corresponding attendance and participation, that was |  |
| much lower than the rest of the categories; however this can be explained as 80\% of all those in |  |
| the widowed category (421 of 528 respondents across the 12 year period) are in the 65+ age |  |
| category. |  |


|  | Male (n) |  |  |  | Female (n) |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Year | Permanent | Contract | Volunteers | Total | Permanent | Contract | Volunteers | Total |
| 20162017 | 389 | 2543 | 1892 | 4824 | 528 | 2401 | 2807 | 5736 |
| 20172018 | 350 | 3154 | 1670 | 5174 | 557 | 3473 | 2453 | 6483 |
| 20182019 | 412 | 2947 | 1568 | 4927 | 639 | 3388 | 2543 | 6570 |
| Grand Total | 1151 | 8644 | 5130 | 14925 | 1724 | 9262 | 7803 | 18789 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Male (\%) |  |  |  | Female (\%) |  |  |  |
| Year | Permanent | Contract | Volunteers | Total | Permanent | Contract | Volunteers | Total |
| 20162017 | $42 \%$ | $51 \%$ | $40 \%$ | $46 \%$ | $58 \%$ | $49 \%$ | $60 \%$ | $54 \%$ |
| 20172018 | $39 \%$ | $48 \%$ | $41 \%$ | $44 \%$ | $61 \%$ | $52 \%$ | $59 \%$ | $56 \%$ |
| 2018 2019 | $39 \%$ | $47 \%$ | $38 \%$ | $43 \%$ | $61 \%$ | $53 \%$ | $62 \%$ | $57 \%$ |
| Grand Total | $40 \%$ | $48 \%$ | $40 \%$ | $44 \%$ | $60 \%$ | $52 \%$ | $60 \%$ | $56 \%$ |

Within the last year there has been little change in the split between males and females in the workforce, representing $43 \%$ and $57 \%$ respectively. There has always been a $40: 60$ male/female employment trend within the arts sector.

ACNI and NISRA's Continuous Household Survey 2015/16 find that in general men are less likely to engage in the arts than women, $78 \%$ of men versus $84 \%$ of women. Women are more likely to participate in an arts activity (35\%) and to attend an arts event (80\%) than men (28\% and 75\% respectively). This is a consistent trend that can be observed in previous surveys.

The General Population Survey 2016 shows that females' engagement in the arts is higher than males' across attendance, participation, and overall engagement. Over the last 12 years there has been an increase in overall engagement of the sexes; male engagement rising form $71.9 \%$ to $75 \%$ and female engagement rising from $76.9 \%$ to $79.4 \%$, however engagement peaked in 2011 and has fallen slightly since then. Similar trends can be observed in both attendance and participation between genders.

Of all subsections of gender the hardest to reach was older men of $65+$; however looking at the 12 year trends engagement in the arts from over 65 males has increased by nearly $20 \%$ from $37 \%$ to $55 \%$, peaking at $60 \%$ in 2011 . This represents the fastest growing subsection of gender and has shown that programmes put in place have addressed some of the inequality in access to the arts.

Male Engagement in the Arts


ACNI captures data on the number of employees within Annual Funding Programme organisations who self-declare as disabled. This table represents three years of a constant sample.

| Disability | $2016 / 17$ |  | $2017 / 18$ |  | $2018 / 19$ |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Total Disclosed Disability | 99 | $5 \%$ | 133 | $7 \%$ | 184 | $9 \%$ |
| Total Unspecified | 1780 | $95 \%$ | 1645 | $93 \%$ | 1823 | $91 \%$ |
| Total | 1879 |  | 1778 |  | 2007 |  |

The proportion of people employed in the sector with a disability has risen overall. The total number specifying their disability has fallen from $93 \%$ to $91 \%$ ) whereas those disclosing their disability has risen slightly from $7 \%$ in 2017/18 to $9 \%$ in 2018/19.

| Disability | $2016 / 17$ |  | $2017 / 18$ |  | $2018 / 19$ |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Disclosed Job Role | 99 | $2 \%$ | 133 | $2 \%$ | 184 | $2 \%$ |
| Undisclosed Job Role | 1780 | $30 \%$ | 1645 | $22 \%$ | 1823 | $25 \%$ |
| Total Disability | 1879 | $32 \%$ | 1778 | $24 \%$ | 2007 | $27 \%$ |
| Without Disability | 3982 | $68 \%$ | 5756 | $76 \%$ | 5379 | $73 \%$ |
| Total Workforce | 5861 |  | 7534 |  | 7386 |  |

Just slightly over a quarter ( $27 \%$ ) of those working in the arts are disabled. This is an increase of $3 \%$ on last year.

ACNI Captures data on disability access within annually funded organisations under the following headings:

- Captioning
- British Sign Language
- Irish Sign Language
- Audio described
- Hearing support loop
- Large print / braille for programmes
- Wheelchair access
- Relaxed performances

This data refers to the total number of performances available with each of the accessibility types.

|  | $2016 / 17$ |  | 2017/18 |  |  | 2018/19 |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | ---: | :--- | ---: | :--- | ---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | n | $\%$ | n | $\%$ | n | $\%$ |  |  |
| Captioning | 2,477 | $15 \%$ | 2,239 | $22 \%$ | 7,838 | $28 \%$ |  |  |
| British Sign Language | 222 | $1 \%$ | 55 | $1 \%$ | 387 | $1 \%$ |  |  |
| Irish Sign Language | 182 | $1 \%$ | 24 | $0 \%$ | 7 | $0 \%$ |  |  |
| Audio described | 457 | $3 \%$ | 316 | $3 \%$ | 422 | $2 \%$ |  |  |
| Hearing support loop | 3,204 | $19 \%$ | 1,734 | $17 \%$ | 2,976 | $11 \%$ |  |  |
| Large print / braille for <br> programmes | 697 | $4 \%$ | 821 | $8 \%$ | 585 | $2 \%$ |  |  |
| Wheelchair access | 8,186 | $49 \%$ | 4,544 | $44 \%$ | 14,179 | $51 \%$ |  |  |
| Relaxed performances | 1,290 | $8 \%$ | 548 | $5 \%$ | 1,381 | $5 \%$ |  |  |
| Total | 16,715 |  | 10,281 |  | 27,775 |  |  |  |


|  | There has been an increase in almost all forms of disability access in 2018/19 with app 3 times the number of performances offering captioning and wheelchair access for dis audiences between 2017/18 and 2018/19. Almost 4 times the amount of performances BSL and more than doubling the number of relaxed performances. This suggests that taking into consideration the needs of disabled audiences and making not only their faciriter accessible but also attendance and participatory elements as well. |
| :---: | :---: |
| Dependa nts | There is less information to inform the impact of dependents on engagement in the art and NISRA's General Population Survey showed that $20 \%$ of people reported that 'fam commitments / childcare' was a barrier to their engagement in the arts. <br> The general population survey shows that over the last 13 years there has been more engagement with those with dependents than those without. There is not a large differ however the trend, particularly in attendance of $1+$ event per year, is regularly observed. 2011 and 2016 participation has fallen with respondent with dependents and participa without dependent has continued to rise. The trends are shown on the following line $g$ However this difference in engagement is not large, and does not imply there is any in provision relating to those respondents with and without dependents. It may be possib activities of children encourage adults to attend events they otherwise would not. |
|  |  |


| Section 75 <br> category | Details of needs/experiences/priorities |
| :--- | :--- |
| Religious <br> belief | No indication of any inequality in access to the arts. Speculatively, <br> due to the contentious nature of the subject there is a high <br> proportion of respondents to any survey that do not specify this <br> information; meaning it is impossible to determine the actual <br> breakdown by religious belief. However, in terms of access to the <br> arts, a significant proportion of activities by funded organisations <br> are in collaboration with community development (61\%) and cross <br> border activity (11\%) in 2018/19. |
| Political <br> opinion | As with religious belief this is a contentious topic and would <br> explain why any arts specific source has a high proportion of <br> 'other' responses. However due to historic circumstances we can <br> correlate religious belief with political opinion and determine that <br> there is no evidence for any inequality in arts provision by political <br> opinion. |
| Racial group | Northern Ireland has a much smaller ethnic minority community <br> when compared to the rest of the UK and this is reflected in the <br> proportion of respondents working in thd art sector. The size of <br> the sample makes it hard to determine trends, but there is no <br> evidence of any inequality in the access to the arts, or selection <br> for independent artist grants. In addition, the significant work <br> carried out on the Intercultural Arts programme has made efforts <br> to ensure artists from ethnic minority backgrounds are able to <br> participate fully within the arts sector, with 7\% of all programme <br> activity targeted to ethnic minorities in 2018/19. |
| Age | Young people have considerably higher attendance and <br> participation in the arts than any other age group, and older <br> people have lower attendance and participation. The Arts Council <br> recognise both these age groups in their targeted programmes, <br> recognising the formative influence of the arts on young people <br> and the wellbeing benefits observed with older people. |
| AcNi has a dedicated youth programme called Articulate. In <br> addition to this programme, there are arts funded to target 37\% of <br> their programme towards children and young people (0-24 years). <br> Moreover, there are a proportion of activities by funded <br> organisations working in collaboration youth work and <br> development (15\%) and playgroup/after schools (43\%). |  |


|  | However despite provision of targeted arts for the youth <br> attendance and participation has fallen by 3\% recorded by the <br> General Population Survey. |
| :--- | :--- |
| According to the General Population Survey, 12\% of 2015/16 <br> activities were targeted towards older people, a similar level to <br> that of ACN''s annually funded arts organisations where 13\% of <br> programmes were targeted at older people aged 65 and over. The <br> GPS also reported an increase in the employment of older people <br> by 1.65\% percentage points and an increase in engagement of <br> older people by 10\% over a 10 year period (2006-16). |  |
| Overall, every effort is made to be inclusive to the youth and the <br> older generations but it may be necessary to preserve the high <br> attendance of the youth and to increase attendance in the older <br> generations to combat loneliness, increase self-confidence and <br> ensure it contributes towards their wellbeing. |  |
| Marital status | There does not seem to be any impediment to working in the art <br> sector for any marital status, although family <br> commitments/childcare was a barrier for 17\% of those surveyed in <br> the 2016 Northern Ireland Omnibus survey; this could include <br> married respondents. |
| Sexual <br> orientation | There is no evidence that there is any inequality in access to the <br> arts depending on sexual preference however annually funded <br> organisations target 3\% of arts activitios towards the LGBT <br> community and collaborate with LGBT organisations on 34\% of |
| activities. This shows that the sector strives to include this |  |
| proportion of the population. |  |

The General Population Survey has shown that $20 \%$ of respondents claim family commitments / childcare as a barrier to the arts proving that dependents do have an impact on the consumption of the arts.

## Group Targeting of AFS Organisations' Programmes

AFS organisations target a proportion of their programmes towards certain Section 75 groups. The table below shows the average percentage of organisations" programmes targeted at these groups:

| Group Targeting | $2016 / 17 \%$ | $2017 / 18 \%$ | $2018 / 19 \%$ |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| People with a physical or mental impairment | 11.34 | 14.01 | 12.53 |
| Ethnic minorities | 6.67 | 8.35 | 6.94 |
| Deprived neighbourhoods | 28.10 | 26.55 | 29.61 |
| LGBT community | 4.19 | 4.82 | 5.10 |
| Older people (aged 65+) | 13.61 | 13.98 | 12.92 |
| Children and young people (aged 0-24) | 36.68 | 36.13 | 37.45 |

## Cross Sector Collaboration by AFS organisations

N represents how many of the sample ( 98 organisations) collaborated with each sector. The collaborations that do not specifically relate to section 75 groups have been excluded.

|  | 2016/17 |  | 2017/18 |  | 2018/19 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | n | \% | n | \% | n | \% |
| Community development | 51 | 52\% | 56 | 57\% | 60 | 61\% |
| Youth work / development | 37 | 38\% | 45 | 46\% | 15 | 15\% |
| LGBT | 13 | 13\% | 20 | 20\% | 33 | 34\% |
| Disability | 31 | 32\% | 36 | 37\% | 56 | 57\% |
| Gender | 6 | 6\% | 12 | 12\% | 16 | 16\% |
| Playgroup / after schools | 10 | 10\% | 17 | 17\% | 42 | 43\% |
| Human rights / equality | 4 | 4\% | 14 | 14\% | 25 | 26\% |
| Cross-border/cross-community | 34 | 35\% | 37 | 38\% | 11 | 11\% |

## Part 2. Screening questions

## 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? minor/major/none

| Section 75 <br> category | Details of policy impact | Level of impact? <br> minor/major/none |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Religious <br> belief |  | None foreseen |
| Political <br> opinion |  | None foreseen |
| Racial group |  | None foreseen |
| Age |  | None foreseen |
| Marital status |  | None foreseen |
| Sexual <br> orientation |  | None foreseen |
| Men and <br> women <br> generally |  | None foreseen |
| Disability |  | None foreseen |
| Dependants |  |  |


| Are there opportunities to better promote equality of opportunity for <br> people within the Section 75 equalities categories? |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Section 75 <br> category | Details of policy impact | Level of impact? <br> minor/major/none |
| Religious <br> belief |  | None foreseen |
| Political <br> opinion |  | None foreseen |
| Racial <br> group |  | None foreseen |
| Age |  | None foreseen |
| Marital <br> status |  | None foreseen |
| Sexual <br> orientation |  | None foreseen |
| Men and |  |  |
| women |  |  |
| generally |  |  |$\quad$| Disability |  |
| :--- | :--- |

3 To what extent is the policy likely to impact on good relations between people of different religious belief, political opinion or racial group? minor/major/none

| Good <br> relations <br> category | Details of policy impact | Level of impact <br> minor/major/none |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Religious <br> belief | No Change. Continue to welcome applications <br> from all backgrounds and socio-economic <br> status. | Minor |
| Political <br> opinion | No Change. Continue to welcome applications <br> from all backgrounds and socio-economic <br> status. | Minor |
| Racial <br> group | No Change. Continue to welcome applications <br> from all backgrounds and socio-economic <br> status. | Minor |

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

| Good <br> relations <br> category | If Yes, provide details | If No, provide reasons |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Religious <br> belief | Cross community arts. |  |
| Political <br> opinion | Cross community arts. |  |
| Racial <br> group | Intercultural arts events. |  |

## Additional considerations

## Multiple identities

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

This emergency programme will support organisations who work across all Section 75 categories; including those with multiple identities.

## Part 3. Screening decision

If the decision is not to conduct an equality impact assessment, please provide details of the reasons.
Based on the available data presented and taking into consideration that the OEP is an emergency programme responding to the current COVID 19 pandemic, it is felt that this policy presents no foreseen inequalities of opportunity.

If the decision is not to conduct an equality impact assessment the public authority should consider if the policy should be mitigated or an alternative policy be introduced.
The OEP can be supported by the resource organisations funded by ACNI i.e. audience development services and advice as well as governance and resilience training.

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

N/A

## Mitigation

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

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

If so, give the reasons to support your decision, together with the proposed changes/amendments or alternative policy.
The OEP is an emergency response to the COVID 19 pandemic. ACNI's long running Annual Funding Programme (AFP) promotes equality of opportunity and good relations.

## Timetabling and prioritising

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

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

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

| Priority criterion | Rating <br> $(1-3)$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| Effect on equality of opportunity and good relations |  |
| Social need |  |
| Effect on people's daily lives |  |
| Relevance to a public authority's functions |  |

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

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

If yes, please provide details

## Part 4. Monitoring

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

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

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

## Part 5. Approval and authorisation

| Screened by: | Position/Job Title | Date |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Ashleigh Lilley | Policy and Research <br> Officer | $4 / 06 / 2020$ |
| Approved by: |  |  |
| Paul Harron | Director of <br> Operations | $4 / 06 / 2020$ |

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

