

PBNI Equality Impact Screening

Part 1 Policy Scoping

Information about the policy

This form should be read in conjunction with the Equality Commission's revised Section 75, "A Guide for Public Authorities" April 2010 and available via the following link <u>S75 Guide for Public Authorities April 2010</u>. Staff should complete a form for each new or revised policy for which they are responsible (see page 6 for a definition of policy in respect of section 75).

The purpose of screening is to identify those policies that are likely to have an impact on equality of opportunity and/or good relations and so determine whether an Equality Impact Assessment (EQIA) is necessary. Screening should be introduced at an <u>early stage</u> when developing or reviewing a policy.

1.1 Name of the policy

Women's Service User Strategy

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

New Policy

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

Enhance gender-responsive, trauma informed outcomes for women service user's in addition to supporting and developing staff involved in delivery.

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

Staff: No section 75 categories identified

Service Users: Yes, this strategy will benefit women service users however not to the detriment of males

1.5 Who initiated or wrote the policy?

Assistant Director Prisons

1.6 Which Dept. owns and who implements the policy?

Operations

Implementation factors

| 1.7 | Are there any factors which could contribute to/detract from the intended aim/outcome of the policy/decision? |
|----------|---|
| Yes – | potential budgetary impact on ability to deliver action plan |
| If yes, | are they |
| X | financial |
| | legislative |
| | other, please specify |
| Main s | stakeholders affected |
| 1.8 | Who are the internal and external stakeholders (actual or potential) that the policy will impact upon? |
| X | staff |
| X | service users |
| X | other public sector organisations |
| X | voluntary/community/trade unions |
| specify | other, please |
| 1.9 | Other policies with a bearing on this policy |
| | what are they? |
| Service | User Strategy |
| | who owns them? |
| Assistar | nt Director Urban – Operations |
| | |

Available evidence

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

| Section 75 category | Details of ev | idence/int | formation | | | | |
|----------------------|--|-------------|-----------|-------------------------|----------|------------------|-------|
| Religious belief | Service User Monitoring (May 2025) | | | | | | |
| | Community B | ackground | | | | % | |
| | Buddhist | | | | 8 | | 0.4% |
| | Declined to Ar | nswer | | | 196 | | 9.1% |
| | Hindu | | | | | | 0.0% |
| | Jewish | | | | 2 | | 0.1% |
| | Muslim | | | | 12 | | 0.6% |
| | None | | | | 224 | | 10.4% |
| | Other | | | | 33 | | 1.5% |
| | Other Christia | n | | | 84 | 3.9% | |
| | Protestant | | | | 679 | 31.4% | 31.4% |
| | Roman Catho | lic | | | 905 | | 41.8% |
| | Sikh | | | | | | 0.0% |
| Unable to Complete | | | | 20 | | 0.9% | |
| | | | | | 2163 | | 100% |
| | Staff Monitorion Protestant 43% | ng (April 2 | , | n Catholic | No 6% | n-determined | |
| Political opinion | N/A- PBNI does not gather service user information on political opinion Staff Monitoring (Dec 2022) | | | | | | |
| | | | <u> </u> | | | | |
| | Nationalist | None | Other | Prefer not to say | Unionist | Not disclosed | |
| | 11% | 30% | 7% | 5% | 7% | 40% | |
| Racial group | Service Users (as of May 2025) | | | | | | |

| Ethnicity | | % |
|--------------------|------|-------|
| Bangladeshi | 0 | 0.0% |
| Black African | 14 | 0.6% |
| Black Caribbean | 2 | 0.1% |
| Black Other | 2 | 0.1% |
| Chinese | 9 | 0.4% |
| Declined to Answer | 138 | 6.4% |
| Indian | 2 | 0.1% |
| Irish Traveller | 43 | 2.0% |
| Mixed Ethnic Group | 10 | 0.5% |
| Other | 15 | 0.7% |
| Other Asian | 4 | 0.2% |
| Pakistani | 2 | 0.1% |
| Unable to Complete | 21 | 1.0% |
| White | 1905 | 87.9% |
| Grand Total | 2167 | 100% |

Staff (Dec 22)

| White | Black African / \other | Not disclosed / Blank | Mixed race |
|-------|------------------------|-----------------------|------------|
| 98% | 0.5% | 1% | 0.5% |

Age

Service Users (as of May 2025)

| Age | | % |
|-------------|------|-------|
| Under 20 | 47 | 1.3% |
| 20 to 29 | 901 | 25.4% |
| 30 to 39 | 1215 | 34.2% |
| 40 to 49 | 798 | 22.5% |
| 50 to 59 | 396 | 11.1% |
| 60 and over | 195 | 5.5% |
| | 3552 | 100% |

Staff (Dec 2022)

| 18-25 | 26-35 | 36-45 | 46-55 | 56+ |
|-------|-------|-------|-------|-----|
| 3%; | 24%; | 25%; | 30%; | 18% |
| | | | | |

Marital status

Service Users (May 2025)

| Marital Status | | % |
|--------------------|-----|------|
| Declined to Answer | 180 | 8.3% |

| Divorced - or dissolved civil partnership | 145 | 6.7% |
|---|--|--|
| Married - or in a civil partnership | 230 | 10.6% |
| Separated - (but still legally married or in a civil partnership) | 130 | 6.0% |
| Single - Never married and never formed a civil partnership | 1444 | 66.6% |
| Unable to Complete | 23 | 1.1% |
| Widowed - or the surviving partner from a civil partnership | 16 | 0.7% |
| | 2168 | 100% |
| | Married - or in a civil partnership Separated - (but still legally married or in a civil partnership) Single - Never married and never formed a civil partnership Unable to Complete Widowed - or the surviving partner from a | Married - or in a civil partnership Separated - (but still legally married or in a civil partnership) Single - Never married and never formed a civil partnership 1444 Unable to Complete 23 Widowed - or the surviving partner from a civil partnership 16 |

Sexual orientation

Service Users (May 2025)

| LGBT | | % |
|--------------------|------|-------|
| Bisexual | 29 | 1.3% |
| Declined to Answer | 241 | 11.1% |
| Gay | 33 | 1.5% |
| Heterosexual | 1827 | 84.3% |
| Lesbian | 8 | 0.4% |
| Transgender | 1 | 0.0% |
| Unable to Complete | 29 | 1.3% |
| | 2168 | 100% |

Staff

| Bisexual | Heterosexual | Gay/Lesbian | Not |
|----------|--------------|-------------|-----------------|
| | | | Disclosed/Blank |
| 2% | 91% | 2% | 5% |

Men and women generally

Service users (May 2025)

Trends across gender have remained consistent for the past 5 years.

| Gender | | % |
|---------|------|-------|
| Female | 417 | 11.7% |
| Male | 3134 | 88.2% |
| Other | 1 | 0.0% |
| Unknown | | 0.0% |
| | 3552 | 100% |

Registered victims evidence high proportions of female service users.

| Total Current Males Registered | % Male | Total Current Females Registered | % Female |
|--------------------------------------|--------|--|----------|
| 165 | 30% | 391 | 70% |

Latest Section 75 data for staff suggests

| Male | Female |
|------|--------|
| 23% | 77% |

Disability

Service Users (May 2025)

Highest proportion of disability across service users is mental health conditions at 35.8% followed by 9.4% learning disability. 34.5% also identify as having no form of disability.

| Disability | | % |
|-------------------------|------|-------|
| Declined to Answer | 161 | 7.4% |
| Learning Disability or | | |
| Difficulty | 203 | 9.4% |
| Long Term Illness | 101 | 4.7% |
| Mental Health Condition | 776 | 35.8% |
| None | 748 | 34.5% |
| Physical Disability | 143 | 6.6% |
| Sensory Impairment | 17 | 0.8% |
| Unable to Complete | 20 | 0.9% |
| | 2169 | 100% |

Staff:

| Not Disabled | Disabled |
|--------------|----------|
| 89% | 11% |

Dependants

Service Users (May 2025)

18.5% of service users have care of a child

| Dependants | | % |
|--------------------------|-----|------|
| Care for a Person with a | | |
| disability | 114 | 5.3% |

| Care for Elderly Person | 55 | 2.5% |
|--------------------------|------|-------|
| Care of Child / Children | 400 | 18.5% |
| Declined to Answer | 165 | 7.6% |
| None | 1409 | 65.1% |
| Unable to Complete | 23 | 1.1% |
| | 2166 | 100% |

Staff

Latest Section 75 data suggests:

| Care of a | Care of an | Care | Not |
|-----------|------------|--------------|-----------------|
| child | adult | (disability) | Disclosed/Blank |
| 39% | 9% | 3% | 49% |

Needs, experiences and priorities

1.11 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? Specify details for each of the Section 75 categories

| Section 75 category | Details of needs/experiences/priorities |
|---------------------|---|
| Religious belief | None in relation to this strategy |
| Political opinion | None in relation to this strategy |
| Racial group | None in relation to this strategy |
| Age | None in relation to this strategy |
| Marital status | None in relation to this strategy |

| Sexual orientation | While there are no specific needs related to sexual orientation, this strategy seeks to ensure equality for women service users inclusive of their sexual orientation. |
|-------------------------------|--|
| Men and women generally | This strategy is specific to women service users and therefore will ensure equality for this group of PBNI service users. |
| Disability | None in relation to this strategy |
| Dependants | While data relating to independents is not separated by gender, it is highly likely that women service user's will have caring responsibilities and this will be considered within the relevant action plan. |

Part 2 Equality Screening Questions

SCREENING QUESTIONS

- 2.1 In making a decision as to whether or not there is a need to carry out an equality impact assessment, consider questions 2.5 -2.8 listed below.
- 2.2 If the conclusion is <u>none</u> in respect of all of the Section 75 equality of opportunity and/or good relations categories, then the decision may to screen the policy out. If a policy is 'screened out' as having no relevance to equality of opportunity or good relations, give details of the reasons for the decision taken.
- 2.3 If the conclusion is <u>minor</u> 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:
 - i.measures to mitigate the adverse impact; or
 - ii.the introduction of an alternative policy to better promote equality of opportunity and/or good relations.
- 2.4 If the conclusion is <u>major</u> 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.

2.5 Equality Impact

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 Level of impact? Details of policy impact Minor | Major | None category Religious belief None Political None opinion Racial group None None Age Marital status None This strategy seeks to improve outcomes for None Sexual orientation women irrespective of sexual orientation Men and women This strategy will focus on improving quality Major generally outcomes for women which are gender responsive, and trauma informed. This will have no adverse impact for males. Disability None Dependants This strategy should promote outcomes for women Minor who are more likely to have caring responsibilities

2.6 Promotion of Equality

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

| Section 7 | '5 equalities categories? | |
|-------------------------------|---|-----------------------------------|
| Section 75 category | If Yes , provide details | If No , provide reasons |
| Religious belief | | No. Not relevant applied equally. |
| Political opinion | | No. Not relevant applied equally |
| Racial group | | No. Not relevant applied equally |
| Age | | No. Not relevant applied equally |
| Marital status | | No. Not relevant applied equally |
| Sexual orientation | | No. Not relevant applied equally |
| Men and women generally | Yes, the strategy will promote best outcomes for women service users. | |
| Disability | | No. Not relevant applied equally |
| Dependants | Yes. The strategy will promote good outcomes for women taking account of caring responsibilities. | |

2.7 Good Relation Impact

| 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 relations category | Details of policy impact | Level of impact Minor Major None |
| Religious belief | | None |
| Political opinion | | None |
| Racial group | | None |

2.8 Promotion of Good Relations

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

Religious belief

No- applied equally

Political opinion

Racial group

No-applied equally

No-applied equally

Additional considerations

Multiple identities

2.9 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 women; young Protestant men; and young lesbians, gay and bisexual people).

Women may fall into more than one Section 75 category however this strategy seeks to improve overall best outcomes for women

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

As above – the strategy action plan will improve outcomes for women across multiple categories

2.11 Is there an opportunity thorough this policy for PBNI to promote positive attitudes towards disabled people or encourage the participation of disabled people in public life?

Yes X

No

If answered yes detail how this will be achieved: -

Best practice guidance for women, as part of the strategy action plan may assist in this regard for example when considering environment location for office appointments

Part 3 Screening decision

| 3.1 If the decision is not to conduct an equality impact assessment, pleadetails of the reasons. | ase provide |
|---|---------------------------------------|
| Not required- while the strategy will have a significant impact for wome users, there will be no negative impact in terms of gender for males. | en service |
| 3.2 If the decision is not to conduct an equality impact assessment conspolicy should be mitigated or an alternative policy be introduced. | sider if the |
| Not required- the strategy will improve equality outcomes for women | |
| 3.3 If the decision is to subject the policy to an equality impact assessm provide details of the reasons. | nent, please |
| N/A | |
| Mitigation | |
| 3.4 When the likely impact is 'minor' an equality impact assessment is r conducted, mitigation may lessen the severity of any equality impact, or introduction of an alternative policy to better promote equality of opporturelations. Can the policy/decision be amended or changed or an alternative introduced to better promote equality of opportunity and/or good relation give the reasons to support your decision, together with the proposed changes/amendments or alternative policy. | rthe unity or good ative policy |
| | |
| Date Screening Completed: 02/05/2025 Department Completing this Screening: Operations | |