

Overview of Equality Screening Process

Section 1: Policy Scoping: This notes the background & context of the policy/proposal/decision being screened.

Section 2: Screening Classification: The purpose of this section is to consider the policy/proposal/decision in terms of its relevance and likely impact (actual/potential) on equality of opportunity, disability/good relations duties and human rights. Policies may be screened out at this stage provided they are clinical and/or technical and have no relevance whatsoever to equality, disability/good relations and human rights and 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.

Section 3: Evidence Used to Assess Impact: This section records the quantitative and qualitative data gathered and considered across the 9 protected groups (plus multiple identities) to assess the impact of the policy/proposal/decision on staff and service users.

Section 4: Consideration of Impact & Identification of Mitigation and/or Alternative Policies given the evidence.

Section 5: Good Relations Duties: Based on the evidence gathered the Good Relations duties are considered.

Section 6: Disability Duties: Based on the evidence gathered the Disability Duties are considered.

Section 7: Human Rights: Based on the evidence gathered Human Rights obligations are considered.

Section 8: Screening Decision: In this section, a decision is taken as to whether or not there is a need to carry out an equality impact assessment (EQIA), or to introduce (a) measures to mitigate the likely impact (b) an alternative policy to better promote the duties.

Section 9: Monitoring: identify the steps that will be taken to monitor the policy

Section 10: Approval and Authorisation: The screening decision is verified and approved by a senior manager responsible for the policy. Equality screenings are completed by a senior manager subject to advice/assistance from Trust Equality Managers.

Section 11: Statutory Rural Impact Assessments: Signposting

****Completed Screening Templates are public documents posted on the [Trust Website](#)****

Section 1: Policy Scoping: Information about the Policy / Proposal / Decision					
(1.1) Name of the policy/proposal/decision	Guidelines For Empirical Antibiotic Prescribing In Hospitalised Adults over 16 years of age Addition of “Appendix 13: Necrotizing Fasciitis”				
(1.2) Status of policy/proposal/decision <i>(please underline)</i>	New		Existing		<u>Revised</u>
(1.3) Trust Directorate / Division <i>(please underline)</i>	Corporate Services Group <i>(Please specify)</i>	Nursing and User Experience	Unscheduled Care and Older People's Acute Services	ACCTSS and Surgery Anaesthetics, Critical Care, Theatres and Sterile Services (ACCTSS)	Trauma, Orthopaedics, Rehab Services, Maternity, ENT, Dental and Sexual Health
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Performance, Planning & Informatics Finance, Estates & Capital Development HR & Org Development Corporate Comms 	Medical Directorate			
	Mental Health and Intellectual Disability	<u>Cancer and Specialist Services</u>	Children's Community Services and Social Work	Child Health & NISTAR, Imaging, Medical Physics and Outpatients and Medical Illustration	Adult Community, Older Peoples' Services and Allied Health Professionals
(1.4) Description of the policy/proposal/decision?	<p>Addition of “Appendix 13: Necrotizing fasciitis” to the Belfast Health and Social Care Trust (BHSCT) guidelines for empirical antibiotic prescribing in hospitalised adults over the age of 16 years. This includes a preferred antimicrobial regimen as well as an alternative antimicrobial regimen which can be used in patients with serious penicillin allergy. The appendix includes initial management and investigations as well as infection prevention and control (IPC) precautions.</p> <p>The intended outcome is to provide an initial empirical antimicrobial regimen for the management of necrotizing fasciitis in order to maintain appropriate prescribing decisions, taking into consideration antimicrobial stewardship as well as clinical efficacy.</p>				

<p>(1.5) Who owns the policy/proposal?</p>	<p>Authors of “Appendix 13: Necrotising Fasciitis”:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Dr Dean Carolan, ST4, Combined Infection Training (Medical Microbiology), BHSCT - Dr Grace Ong, Consultant, Microbiology Department, BHSCT - Dr Aaron Brady, Lead Antimicrobial Pharmacist, BHSCT <p>Overall policy authors for “Guidelines For Empirical Antibiotic Prescribing In Hospitalised Adults over 16 years of age”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Dr Grace Ong, Consultant, Microbiology Department, BHSCT - Dr Ronan McMullan, Consultant, Microbiology Department, BHSCT - Dr Aaron Brady, Lead Antimicrobial Pharmacist, BHSCT - Antimicrobial Stewardship Committee members, BHSCT
<p>(1.6) Who are the main stakeholders affected?</p>	<p>Patients and members of staff in the BHSCT.</p>
<p>(1.7) Provide details of how you involved stakeholders, views of colleagues, service users, staff side or other stakeholders when screening this policy/proposal.</p>	<p>The empirical antimicrobial prescribing regimens for the management of necrotizing fasciitis were circulated amongst consultant medical microbiologists in BHSCT for comment.</p> <p>The opinion of infection prevention and control (IPC) colleagues was obtained prior to inclusion of IPC precautions within “Appendix 13: Necrotizing Fasciitis”.</p>
<p>(1.8) Other policies/strategies with a bearing on this policy/proposal</p>	<p>The guideline will be accessible on the MicroGuide app in addition to the BHSCT intranet.</p>
<p>(1.9) Are there any factors that could contribute to/detract from the intended aim/outcome of the policy/proposal/decision?</p>	<p>N/A</p>

Section 2: Screening Classification of the Policy / Proposal /Decision

- The purpose of this Section is to consider the policy/proposal in terms of its **relevance** and likely **impact (actual/potential)** on **equality of opportunity, disability duties, good relations and human rights**.
- To **determine the impact (actual and potential)** of a policy/proposal on **equality of opportunity, disability duties, good relations duties and human rights** please **complete the screening questions at 2.1 – 2.6**.

Screening Questions	Yes	No
(2.1) Is there an impact on Equality of Opportunity for those affected by this policy, for each of the S75* equality categories? I.e. is there a differential impact for one S75 group rather than the others?		X
(2.2) Are there better opportunities to promote equality of opportunity for people within the S75* categories?		X
(2.3) Does the policy impact upon Good Relations between people of a different religious belief, political opinion or racial group? (Good Relations Duties)		X
(2.4) Are there opportunities to better promote good relations between people of a different religious belief, political opinion or racial group? (Good Relations Duties)		X
(2.5) Are there opportunities to encourage disabled people to participate in public life and promote positive attitudes toward disabled people? (Disability Duties)		X
(2.6) Does the policy/proposal impact on human rights ?		X

*S75 protected equality categories include: Age, Dependent Status, Disability, Men and Women generally, Marital Status Ethnicity, Religion, Political Opinion and Sexual Orientation.

Screening Statement

- If you have answered **Yes** to **any** of the above questions (2.1 – 2.6) please **complete Sections 3 – 10**
- If you have answered **No** to **all** of the above questions (2.1 – 2.6) please **complete only 2.7, 2.8 and 2.9**

(2.7) Screening Statement:	
This policy is ' screened out ' on the basis that - please tick all statements that are appropriate to the policy:	
1. It is purely clinical policy and/or is technical in nature and has <u>no relevance</u> or <u>bearing in terms of its likely impact</u> (actual / potential) on equality of opportunity, good relations and for people within these categories and in relation to disability duties, good relations and human rights.	X
2. It is a purely clinical policy and/or is technical in nature and aims to standardise practice to achieve best practice based on current evidence.	X
3. Other reason: Please provide details.	
(2.8): Statutory Duties – Making Reasonable Adjustments and Accessible Information	
To complete the equality screening please tick this box to indicate that you have considered <u>and</u> have made explicit reference in the policy to the need to make reasonable adjustments and information accessible.	
1. The Trust has a statutory duty to make reasonable adjustments in respect of disabled patients/service users/carers/visitors. This includes making all communication (in person, by phone, via email) <i>and</i> any information provided (in writing, verbally) accessible using alternative formats as required. Accessible/ Alternative formats can include, for example, information translated into Easy Read format or into Audio format - when a patient/service user/carer/visitor has a learning disability or is visually impaired. For advice on making information accessible for a person with a disability please refer to the staff guidance Making-Communication-Accessible-for-All-A-guide-for-HSC-Staff	X
2. In addition, if a patient/service user/carer/visitor does not speak English as their first language or has poor English, the Trust has a statutory duty to provide an interpreter and to translate written information . This facilitates informed consent, better understanding and greater independence.	

(2.9) Approval

Please sign / date and forward to the Equality and Planning Team for consideration equalitiescreenings@belfasttrust.hscni.net

Lead Responsible Manager:

Name: Dr. Grace Ong
 Position: Consultant Microbiologist
 Date: 24.11.23

Countersigned by Equality Manager:

Name: Peter Kane
 Equality & Planning Manager
 Date: 19/12/2023

Section 3: Evidence used to Assess Impact on Service Users and Staff

This section records the quantitative and qualitative data you have used to consider equality and good relations issues to assess the impact on staff and service users across the 9 protected categories plus multiple identities.

Evidence to help inform the screening process may be quantitative and qualitative. Consideration needs to be given to the different needs, experiences and priorities of each of the categories in relation to the policy / proposal. For example: previous consultations and equality impact assessments (EQIAs), statistics, research, complaints, feedback, referrals, grievances, inspection reports, focus groups, user groups etc. Please also refer to the Equality Commissions' publication: [Section 75 - Using Evidence in Policy Making \(A Signposting Guide\)](https://equalityni.org) (equalityni.org)

(3.1)	Quantitative and Qualitative Data: Service Users			
Equality Category	Service Users	Quantitative Data (Using 2022 census data unless otherwise stated)		Qualitative Data (Needs, Experiences, Priorities)
		Belfast Population only	NI Population	Service Users affected %

1. Age	0-14 15-24 25-34 35-44 45-54 55-64 65-74 75+	18.04% 14.57% 15.47% 13.35% 11.85% 12% 7.8% 6.92%	19.19% 11.8% 12.74 13.11% 13.27 12.73 9.3% 7.86%		
2. Dependent Status	Caring for a child dependant, older person or a person with a disability		12.42 % are carers		
3. Disability	Yes* No *Type of disability: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Deafness or partial hearing loss • Blindness or partial sight loss • Mobility or dexterity difficulty that requires the use of a wheelchair • Intellectual or learning disability • Learning difficulty • Autism or Asperger Syndrome • Emotional, psychological or mental health condition • Frequent periods of confusion or memory loss 		24.33%* 75.67% 5.75% 1.78% 1.48% 0.89% 3.15% 1.86% 8.68% 1.99%		*

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Long term pain or discomfort • Shortness of breath or difficulty breathing • Other condition 		11.58%		
			10.29%		
			8.81%		
4. Men and Women generally	Female		50.81%		
	Male		49.19%		
5. Marital Status	Single	49.82%	38.07%		
	Married	32.94%	45.59%		
	Civil P'ship	0.26%	0.18%		
	Separated	4.73%	3.78%		
	Divorced	6.15%	6.02%		
	Widowed	6.1%	6.36%		
6. Race Ethnicity	White	92.95%	96.55%		
	BME	7.05%	3.45%		
7. Religion	Roman Catholic	43.46%	42.31%		
	Presbyterian	12.44%	16.61%		
	C.of Ireland	8.49%	11.55%		
	Methodist	2.86%	2.35%		
	Other Christian	5.95%	6.85%		
	Other Religions	2.96%	1.34%		
	No Religion	21.67%	17.39%		
	Religion not stated	2.17%	1.6%		

<p>8. Political Opinion Based on total elected candidates in the local government elections 2023</p> <p><i>*Figures extracted from Lisburn and Castlereagh Council 2023.</i></p>	<p>DUP SF SDLP UUP APNI Green PBP IND Trad UP</p>	<p>Belfast Council</p> <p>14 22 5 2 11 3 1 1 2</p>	<p>C'reagh*</p> <p>3 2 1 1 5 0 0 0 0</p>		
<p>9. Sexual Orientation</p>	<p>Straight or heterosexual Gay or lesbian Bisexual Other Prefer not to say Not stated</p>	<p>87.1% 2.27% 1.48% 0.32% 5.2% 3.64%</p>	<p>90.04% 1.17% 0.75% 0.17% 4.58% 3.30%</p>		
<p>Multiple Identities</p>					<p>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?</p> <p><i>(For example; disabled minority ethnic people; disabled women; young Protestant men; and young lesbians, gay and bisexual people).</i></p>

(3.2) Quantitative and Qualitative Data: Staff

When organisational / policy change is necessary, regardless of whether it is a permanent or temporary change, the Trust is committed to treating staff fairly and equitably. Staff can be assured that the change process will be managed. This includes consultation with staff and the opportunity for staff to discuss in one to one meetings, any adverse equality impacts resulting in changes to their employment.

Information will be provided together with analysis and advice by the Employment Equality Team in the Human Resources department.

Quantitative Data: Please contact: **Samantha Whann / Tel: 028 96159615 Email : samantha.whann@belfasttrust.hscni.net**

Qualitative Data: Consider the different needs, experiences and priorities of each of the categories in relation to the policy / proposal / decision. Should any equality / modernisation related issues arise they will be managed through the Organisational Change Framework.

[Click here for Framework](#)

This framework also works alongside other Human Resources policies including for example the Disability and Reasonable Adjustment Framework, the Work Life Balance Policy and Procedure, the Recruitment and Selection Policy and Procedure and Agenda for Change Terms and Conditions Handbook.

Equality Category	Groups	Quantitative Data		Qualitative Data
		Belfast Trust workforce (@January 2023)	Staff affected by the Policy/Proposal /Decision %	
1. Age	16-24 25-34 35-44 45-54 55-64 65+	6% 23% 25% 23% 19% 3%		

2. Dependant Status	Dependants No Dependants Not known	18% 24% 58%		
3. Disability	Yes No Not known	2% 65% 33%		
4. Men and Women generally	Female Male	76% 24%		
5. Marital Status	Married/ Civil P'ship Single Other/ Not known	45% 28% 27%		
6. Race a) Ethnicity	BME White Not Known	4% 68% 29%		

b) Nationality	GB Irish Northern Irish Other Not known	20% 15% 2% 1% 62%		
7. Religion				
a) Community Background	Protestant Roman Catholic Neither	35% 45% 20%		
b) Religious Belief	Christian Other No religious belief Not known	30% 1% 10% 59%		
8. Political Opinion <i>* 2011 Assembly election</i>	Broadly Nationalist Broadly Unionist Other Do not wish to answer/ Unknown Not known	7% 6% 8% 78%		

9. Sexual Orientation	Opposite sex Same sex or both sexes Do not wish to answer	43% 1% 56%		
Multiple Identities				<p>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?</p> <p><i>(For example; disabled minority ethnic people; disabled women; young Protestant men; and young lesbians, gay and bisexual people).</i></p>

Section 4: Consideration of Impacts and Identification of Mitigations and/or Alternative Policies

Given the **evidence** gathered in Section 3, please identify for each of the **nine equality categories** the level of **impact**, **mitigation measures** and **alternative policies** / proposals that better **promote equality of opportunity**.

(4.1) SERVICE USERS

Equality Category	Level of Impact			Mitigation Measures and Alternative Policies or Actions that might lessen the severity of the equality impact (where Major or Minor Impact identified)
	Major	Minor	None	
Age				
Dependant Status				
Disability				

Men and Women generally				
Marital Status				
Race (Ethnicity)				
Religion				
Political Opinion				
Sexual Orientation				
Multiple Identities <i>e.g. disabled ethnic minorities or young Protestant men.</i>				

(4.2) STAFF				
Equality Category	Level of Impact			Mitigation Measures and consideration of alternative policies or actions that might lessen the severity of the equality impact (where Major or Minor Impact identified)
	Major	Minor	None	
Age				
Dependant Status				
Disability				
Men and Women generally				
Marital Status				

Race	Ethnicity				
	Nationality				
Religion	Community Background				
	Religious Belief				
Political Opinion					
Sexual Orientation					
Multiple Identity e.g. female staff with caring responsibilities					

Section 5: Good Relations

Based on the **evidence** collected in Sections 3 & 4:

- To what extent is the policy/proposal likely to **impact Good Relations** i.e. between people of different religious belief, political opinion or racial group?
- Are there any **additional measures** that could be suggested to ensure the policy or proposal **promotes Good Relations**?

Good Relations category	Level of impact			Mitigation Measures and Alternative Policies or Actions that might lessen the severity of the equality impact (where Major or Minor Impact identified)
	Major	Minor	None	

Religious belief				
Political opinion				
Racial group				

Section 6: Disability Duties	
<p>How does the policy / proposal:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • encourage disabled people to participate in public life <i>and</i> • promote positive attitudes towards disabled people? <p>Consider what other measures you could take to meet these duties.</p> <p><i>For example, have staff received disability equality training.</i></p>	

Section 7: Human Rights

Belfast Health and Social Care Trust is committed to providing the **highest attainable standard of physical and mental health** within our resources.

(7.1)

Does the policy/proposal/decision negatively impact on any of the following human rights?

The rights particularly relevant in the delivery of health and social care are emboldened below. Examples for these rights and further information can be found in the [Equality Screening Toolkit](#).

Human Rights Articles	Yes	No
A2: Right to life		
A3: Right to freedom from torture, inhuman or degrading treatment or punishment		
A4: Right to freedom from slavery, servitude & forced or compulsory labour		
A5: Right to liberty & security of person		
A6: Right to a fair & public trial within a reasonable time		
A7: Right to freedom from retrospective criminal law & no punishment without law		
A8: Right to respect for private & family life, home and correspondence.		
A9: Right to freedom of thought, conscience & religion		
A10: Right to freedom of expression		
A11: Right to freedom of assembly & association		
A12: Right to marry & found a family		
A14: Prohibition of discrimination in the enjoyment of the convention rights		
1st protocol Article 1 – Right to a peaceful enjoyment of possessions & protection of property		
1 st protocol Article 2 – Right of access to education		

If you answered **YES** to any of the above, please refer to the Human Rights Screening Tool below to check if the policy is likely to be human rights compliant.

If the flowchart indicates that the policy is **unlikely** to be human rights compliant, please contact the Planning and Equality team equalitiescreenings@belfasttrust.hscni.net

If the flowchart indicates that the policy is **likely** to be human rights compliant, please **continue to section 7.2**.

Human Rights Screening Tool

To be used by staff who have received human rights training or in conjunction with the Planning and Equality Team

(Kindly reproduced with permission from the Northern Ireland Human Rights Commission)

Is there the potential for a negative impact on:

- the human right not to be subjected to torture, inhuman or degrading treatment?
- the human right not to be subjected to slavery or forced labour?

(These are absolute rights and therefore cannot be interfered with)

- Be aware of any possibility that the proposal may **discriminate** against someone in terms of their human rights.
- Legal advice may still be necessary.
- Things may change and you may need to reassess the situation.

YES

Is the interference with the right **legal**?

Is the interference only to the **extent set out** in the relevant Article?

Is it **necessary, justifiable, proportionate** to the legitimate aim?

(**Please note** - A public authority must make sure that it tries to **interfere with the right as little as possible**.)

Any interference must be **no more than necessary** to achieve the intended objective).

NO

NO

Will there be a potential negative impact on / interference with any other human rights?

YES

NO

YES

The proposed action is likely to be human rights compliant

The proposed action is not likely to be human rights compliant

(7.2)

Outline any actions you will take to promote awareness of human rights and evidence that human rights have been taken into consideration in decision making processes:

Section 8: Screening Decision	Major		Minor	None
(8.1) How would you categorise the impacts of this policy / proposal? (Please underline one category)	(Screened In for an Equality Impact Assessment)		(Screened Out with mitigation)	(Screened Out)
(8.2) If you have identified any impact, what mitigation has been considered to address this?				
(8.3) Do you think the policy/proposal/decision should be subject to an Equality Impact Assessment (EQIA)? NB: A full Equality Impact Assessment (EQIA) is usually confined to those policies or proposals considered to have <u>major</u> implications for equality of opportunity/good relations/human rights.	Yes	No	Reasons A policy/proposal/decision is subject to an EQIA if one or more of the following criteria is met: 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.	

			<p>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.</p> <p>e) The policy is likely to be challenged by way of judicial review.</p> <p>f) The policy is significant in terms of expenditure.</p>
<p>Section 9: Monitoring</p> <p>(9.1)</p> <p><i>Please detail the steps you will take to monitor the effect of the policy/proposal/decision for impact in terms of equality of opportunity, good relations, disability duties and human rights?</i></p>	<p><i>Belfast Trust is committed to the effective monitoring of this policy so that we can identify any future adverse impact arising from the policy which may lead to conducting an equality impact assessment and with helping with future planning and policy development.</i></p> <p><i>Monitoring will take place by undertaking the following steps:</i></p> <p><i>Please list actions to be taken.</i></p>		
<p>Section 10: Approval and Authorisation</p> <p>Please sign /date and forward to the Planning and Equality team equalitiescreenings@belfasttrust.hscni.net</p> <p>Equality screenings are completed with information provided by the senior responsible manager subject to advice and assistance from Belfast Trust Equality & Planning Managers.</p> <p>**Completed Screening Templates are public documents posted on the Trust Website**</p>			
<p>Lead Responsible Manager</p> <p>Name:</p> <p>Position:</p>	<p>Countersigned by: Equality Manager/Employment Equality Manager</p> <p>Name:</p> <p>Position:</p>		

Date:

Date :

Section 11: Statutory Rural Impact Assessment Duties

The Trust is legally obliged to take **due regard of the impact** of any policy, proposal or decision on the social and economic needs of people who live in a rural community. This is particularly so when the policy/proposal/decision impacts service users/carers/patients across NI (eg regional service/policy).

Please **tick the box** to indicate that you have paid '**due regard**' to the social and economic needs of the rural community when developing, adopting, implementing or revising policies, strategies and plans *and* when designing and delivering public services and that **a rural impact assessment is not required**.

OR

Please complete a [Rural Needs Impact Assessment Template](#) rural impact assessment if there is impact on the social and economic needs of people who live in a rural community.

Please go to the: [Rural Impact Assessments Toolkit for HSC NI](#) to find out how to undertake a rural impact assessment.

Contact Estella.Dorrian@belfasttrust.hscni.net for further advice.