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1. **Background**

1.1 As part of its wider rights and equality remit, the Office of the First and deputy First Minister (OFMDFM) has lead policy responsibility for promoting gender equality across government and addressing gender inequalities.

1.2 OFMDFM’s Gender Equality Strategy (GES) provides an overarching strategic policy framework under which departments, their agencies and other relevant statutory authorities can, through both existing and new actions, promote gender equality for the benefit of both women and men.

1.3 The Strategy sets out a series of key elements included in its framework, including a vision, principles, key action areas and strategic objectives. The document also contains guidance on how it was intended the Strategy would be implemented and the structures and responsibilities of delivery.

1.4 The GES, for the initial three years, was supported by two, cross departmental Action Plans—one for men and one for women. Each Plan detailed the actions that departments, their agencies and other statutory bodies would undertake to promote gender equality.

1.5 These plans covered the period 2008 – 2011 and were aligned with the Programme for Government 2008 – 2011. The Plans set out departmental objectives, expected outcomes and performance targets. Departments were also tasked with ensuring that appropriate mechanisms were in place to allow monitoring and evaluation against the outcomes and targets in place.

1.6 A Gender Advisory Panel (GAP), comprising stakeholder representatives, was also established in 2005 to assist in the finalisation of the GES and the development of the Action Plans. Working in partnership with OFMDFM’s Childcare, Gender Equality and Sexual Orientation (CGS) Unit (the ‘Gender Equality Unit’), the GAP assists in the delivery and monitoring of the Strategy and Action Plans.

1.7 A mid-term review of the GES was considered necessary given that the period covered by the first action plans has now elapsed. Terms of reference for the review were established and the review was to be carried out by Northern Ireland Statistics and Research Agency (NISRA) statisticians and OFMDFM’s Gender Equality Unit and be managed by a Steering Group comprising OFMDFM officials and representatives from the GAP.
1.8 Following on from initial investigations, it was clear that NISRA could not complete the evaluation within the required timescales. It was at this stage that Research Branch in OFMDFM (themselves outposted NISRA statisticians) agreed to deliver the review. However, changes to the original terms of reference were required, given the requested timescales.

1.9 Research Branch began considering the review and its necessary research elements during November 2012. However, due to resource issues in Research Branch, work was delayed and a further adjustment of the terms of reference was required.

1.10 A revised programme of research was designed and agreed with the Gender Equality Unit in OFMDFM and this programme was also agreed with the Gender Advisory Panel and Review Steering Group at a meeting at the end of February 2013. The final agreed methodology will be described in Section 3 – Methodology.

1.11 Interim findings were to be detailed in a Gender Advisory Panel steering group meeting during mid-April 2013 and it was agreed that a final report would be provided by the end of April 2013, given the research schedule agreed during February 2013. A steering group meeting was not possible until early May, at which the final report was presented. Interim findings were detailed in a meeting with Gender Equality Unit on 16 April 2013.

1.12 The review will aid the Gender Equality Unit and Gender Advisory Panel in setting the direction for the Strategy for the remainder of its term up to 2016. The review will also contribute to Northern Ireland’s input to the forthcoming (July 2013) examination of the UK’s implementation of the United Nations’ Convention for the Elimination of all forms of Discrimination against Women (CEDAW).
2. **Executive Summary**

2.1 More detailed findings can be found in Section 7 – Conclusions. However, this Executive Summary details what are considered to be the main findings coming out of the information gathered during this review.

2.2 Generally, feedback from the Gender Advisory Panel and Equality Practitioners Group indicated that stakeholders felt the Strategy was a positive step but that progress against it had been limited and implementation and monitoring could be improved.

2.3 The Strategy and its elements, such as strategic objectives, vision and key action areas, were considered still relevant in their current form. Action plans in place to address those elements were considered too broad. It is suggested that revised action plans be more focused, specific and targeted. The sizeable list of departmental actions in the 2008 – 2011 action plans should be refined. Transgender issues were considered one necessary addition by several respondents.

2.4 Action plans were difficult to assess given the existing format and wording. Rather than a clear measurement, achievement against the action plans required a judgment to be made in some instances. Given this process, explained in section 4, it was judged that 29% of outcomes had been achieved.

2.5 Action plan progress submissions for 2008 – 2011 lacked focus and consistency. An agreed monitoring framework would be advised. This would detail monitoring requirements, timeframes and a submission format to ensure all data is provided in a consistent, comparable manner for each annual return.

2.6 Outcomes and targets in the action plans were generally not SMART (Specific, Measureable, Achievable, Realistic and Timebound) and as mentioned in 2.4 this made it difficult to judge if a target or outcome had been achieved. New action plans will be designed for the remainder of the Strategy period and these should be drafted with appropriate SMART targets. OFMDFM Research Branch statisticians should be involved in any new action plan development to advise on target/outcome setting and indicator gathering.

2.7 Consideration should also be given to the current format of having two separate men’s and women’s action plans. Some actions on the 2008 – 2011 plans were gender neutral and applied to both genders but appeared on only one action plan. Plans should be gender specific as far as possible. Where gender specificity is not possible and if two separate plans exist, actions should be on both plans with an appropriate outcome for each.
2.8 Annual monitoring as stated in the Strategy has not occurred and this should be put into place as soon as possible to ensure progress can be fully reviewed in the remaining years.

2.9 The roles of the Equality Practitioners Group and Gender Advisory Panel should be more clearly defined and inputs required from both groups need to be understood by all.

2.10 The size of the Gender Advisory Panel, as well as the format, purpose and occurrence of its meetings should be considered to ensure value and focus. It may also be of value to consider an action plan for the Gender Advisory Panel to ensure its purpose is defined and specific actions or involvement is agreed.
3. **Methodology**

3.1 An initial terms of reference provided by Gender Equality Unit described a process that involved several stages of research in order to evaluate and monitor key areas of the strategy and its implementation. The processes outlined needed some refining and the timescales presented were unrealistic given the resources available to the review.

3.2 This terms of reference was re-designed by Research Branch and, while still keeping all the key elements in the original, created a process which would lead to the production of one overarching Strategy midterm review document which could be used to inform the future implementation of the Strategy over its remaining period to 2016.

3.3 The final methodology agreed involved three main elements of research. The first was to look at progress against the action plans for men and women that had been agreed at the inception of the Strategy. The action plans covered the period 2008 – 2011. Research Branch drafted correspondence requesting feedback and monitoring information against each of the actions in the plans. Gender Equality Unit sent this correspondence to the members of the Equality Practitioners Group, with an attachment outlining their respective departments actions, and requested a return be made showing the progress made against each action. Research Branch then assessed these returns and detail on this and the results from the returns can be found in section 4 and Appendix A.

3.4 The second element undertaken was an exercise aimed at gathering some qualitative and quantitative information from those closely involved with the Strategy over its lifetime to date. Research Branch designed two surveys which would gather data in both forms to allow a quantitative appraisal of the returns but would also allow those involved to provide further contextual comment to broaden Research Branch’s understanding of stakeholders experience of the Strategy.

3.5 The surveys were created online and the link to the relevant survey was issued to all members of the Equality Practitioners Group to ask for their views on the Strategy based on the experiences within their department. All 32 current members of the Gender Advisory Panel received a survey link also. One Panel member who had recently left but, due to the recentness of departure, it was felt whose input would be of value was
also issued with a link to the GAP survey. Contact details for Research Branch were also provided should anyone have any issues or questions with the survey. Detail on the survey response and returns can be found in section 5 and in Appendices B and C.

3.6 The final element of the review was to look at the Gender Statistics publication produced by OFMDFM. A baseline publication was released in 2008 and the most recent update was in June 2011. As part of this review exercise, Research Branch has been reviewing the content of the report, assessing the contents relevance to the Strategy, identifying any gaps in data and liaising with other departments to gather the most recent available data for a future update of the publication. The most recent publication is at: http://www.ofmdfmni.gov.uk/gender_equality_strategy_statistics__2011_update.pdf

and discussion and findings from Research Branch’s work to date can be found in section 6.

3.7 The review was overseen by a steering group which met once in the early stages of the process. At this meeting, Research Branch outlined and confirmed the methodology that would be employed.

3.8 However, given the difficulty in trying to arrange a further steering group meeting due to diary commitments, no further steering group meetings happened during the research period or during the drafting of this report.

3.9 Given the tight timescales for production of the report, Research Branch was not able to employ all the methods that might normally have been used in such a process. It would have been desirable to interview Gender Advisory Panel members and Equality Practitioner Group members to gain a deeper insight into their views. There were also problems in securing availability for a steering group meeting, which highlights the difficulties in completing work such as this over a short timeframe. This report suggests that consideration in the post-review period should be given to a focus group or discussion panel with GAP and EPG members, organised and chaired by Gender Equality Unit. This should occur as part of the process of taking the Strategy through its remaining period and could be used to input into revised action plans and clearly defining required roles.
4. Departmental Delivery on Action Plans

4.1 One of the key functions of the midterm review, as laid out in the terms of reference, was to evaluate the action plans that had been agreed for the 2008 – 2011 period and provide comment on both their content and on performance by departments against the outcomes and targets contained within.

4.2 This process was undertaken by Research Branch with assistance from Gender Equality Unit in contacting the relevant departments and ensuring the requests for monitoring data reached the appropriate member of staff.

4.3 Research Branch split all the action plan content, for both men and women, into departmental specific documents. An agreed email was issued to all departments, along with their associated action plan commitments.

4.4 This was the first stage undertaken as part of the midterm review, and as it was envisaged that input received from these returns may have had some bearing on the content of the Equality Practitioners Group online survey, data returns were requested within a two week deadline. The email request was issued in mid-February with a return date requested of 1 March 2013.

4.5 Departments were asked in the email to comment on the following:

- How have departmental actions contributed to achieving the planned outcomes?
- What progress has been made against the planned outcomes?
- How that progress against key outcomes and targets has been measured?
- How often are action plans monitored/reviewed?
- How is progress reported?

4.6 Departments were also asked that if annual monitoring has been completed (the Strategy requests, at 3.25, that the action plans should be monitored and assessed annually), to provide all associated data and information in relation to the above, covering each of the years of the action plans (2008 – 2011). It was also requested that at least a final year measure of progress from the 2008 baseline be provided if possible. If no information or detail of progress was available, a nil return was requested.

4.7 Returns were received from all departments who had action points within the two action plans. However, there was no consistency within the reporting and no consideration of the questions asked above in the majority of the responses. Given this is a requirement that is written into the Strategy, it would appear that no consistent, agreed method of reporting has been put in place to allow departments to report progress and CGS Unit to
demonstrate successful strategic progress. Some responses were more complete than others but some action points were not reported against at all. **Consideration should be given to development of an agreed monitoring framework, in line with new, updated action plans, to ensure robust, timely monitoring against outcomes and targets and allow annual monitoring of the Strategy at a departmental and strategic level.**

4.8 There were some difficulties in obtaining responses and as above, some action points were not reported against. This suggests that reporting has not been adequately addressed across the Strategy period to date and that this data request came as a surprise, rather than expected given the annual reports mentioned in 3.25 of the Strategy. This would also suggest the need for a more formalised monitoring format and timeframe for the future of the Strategy.

4.9 The action plans themselves made reporting and measuring a difficult task in a lot of cases. In particular, as far as monitoring and evaluation is concerned the targets and outcomes in the action plans were not SMART (Specific, Measureable, Achievable, Realistic and Timebound). **Within any new action plans, it would be advised that targets and outcomes must be tightened up to ensure they are clear and tied to the Strategy period up until 2016. They should also allow measurement to ensure that future robust evaluation of the Strategy is possible.** For example, some outcomes in the 2008 – 2011 action plans state targets such as ‘to challenge stereotypes’ or ‘the opportunity to develop real world skills’, which are difficult concepts to measure. Other targets included were ‘to measure gender equality…..’ but do not have a tangible improvement or outcome associated. Therefore, for example, a reduction in female board members in an organisation still satisfies certain action points as that change has been reported on, despite the fact that the figures show less gender equality. Some actions did not have any outcome attached at all. **It would be recommended that for any future drafting of action plans, OFMDFM Research Branch statisticians are involved to ensure that targets and outcomes set will allow for robust evaluation of both the plans and the Strategy.**

4.10 Outcomes should seek a positive effect and go further than just delivering an initiative. Many of the action points and the returns provided had outputs (i.e. what will we do) but not outcomes (i.e. what is the impact of doing). In order to evaluate the success of a Strategy, monitoring needs to look beyond rolling out initiatives and must try to seek information on what changes and benefits occur as a consequence of initiatives. Outcomes should be written with this in mind in future action plans.

4.11 The delay in advancing a midterm evaluation has meant that departments have delivered additional and alternative measures that have not been reflected in the action
plans, which only cover the period 2008 - 2011. In some instances, departments are
now reporting on useful delivery that is in addition and beyond the time period covered
by the action plans. **New action plans should consider some retrospective
outcomes to ensure that potential valuable delivery and progress in respect of the
Strategy is not lost in limbo between 2011 and any subsequent revised action
plans.**

4.12 While the action plans were two separate entities, one specifically for women and one
for men, action points have been included in the plans that actually have no gender
specific actions but are more general population-based targets and outcomes. **If action
plans are to continue to be drafted separately for men and women, actions and
outcomes should be tailored and written to reflect the differences between the
genders as appropriate.**

4.13 There were action plan points relating to all departments but these were generally vague
and lacking any actual output or outcomes. **All actions points should be clearly
attributable to a department and responsibility towards the commitments should
be obvious.** It would be desirable to remove “departments will collect data” type actions
as these actions should be assumed as a matter of course in any monitoring framework.

4.14 Despite the original email request asking five quite distinct questions (see 4.5), very few
returns addressed these directly. While most reported directly (at least in part) against
the action plans, no returns provided any detail on how progress is measured (for
instance what methodology or data sources are used), how often action plans have
been assessed or reviewed (it appears that the original action plans have only existed in
one form and no reviewing has occurred) and how progress is reported (no evidence of
annual reporting, as per the Strategy, has been provided). **This also points to the need
for a formalised, agreed monitoring framework to be put in place to allow data
collection to be a consideration for the remainder of the Strategy to ensure full
evaluation is possible in 2016.**

4.15 Following on from the broad issues identified above, a full assessment of the returns as
provided to OFMDFM Research Branch is included in Appendix C. The action points
and their returns are considered by department across both the action plans.

4.16 Some of the outcomes and targets had issues regarding measurement of what they
were asked to achieve and a judgement had to be made to allow an estimate of success
rate against the action points. Taking the information from the returns, as an indicative
measure it could be stated that 37 out of 126 action points attributed across all
departments had been achieved. This equates to 29%. However, this is not to say that
the remainder had definitely not been achieved as, given the wording in the action plans,
not all outcomes and targets were measureable or possible to report against.
5. **Online Survey Returns – Primary Research**

*Research Branch considered online surveys to be the most efficient way to obtain required quantitative information, alongside some qualitative detail, in order to satisfy and address issues that were included in the review terms of reference such as progress and relevancy of the vision, role of government, principles, key action areas and strategic objectives. Response to both surveys was not as high as it should have been, considering that the sample was a full sample of the stakeholder groups. The detail below sets out the action related to surveys issued to the Equality Practitioners Group and the Gender Advisory Panel as well as an overview of responses. Full responses are provided in the Appendices.*

5.1 **Equality Practitioners Group survey**

5.1.1 All members of the Equality Practitioners Group (EPG) were first contacted by Gender Equality Unit on 12 February 2013. This initial contact was to initiate the process of providing a response to the outcomes detailed on the action plans for men and women, as detailed in Section 4.

5.1.2 This initial contact also advised that EPG members would also be asked to complete a short online survey to provide their own experience and thoughts on the Strategy. This ensured when the survey did arrive in their inbox, it would not come as a surprise and would hopefully prompt a more successful response.

5.1.3 The email, including a link to the online survey, was issued to EPG members on 5 March 2013 and a reminder email was issued on 14 March 2013.

5.1.4 The survey received a total of 9 responses. Two responses were received from DRD and no responses were received from DCAL, DEL, DoJ and DSD. Few of the respondents provided any further detail when given the opportunity. Therefore, in terms of qualitative analysis, it was difficult to identify any trends or common ground when only a small number of comments were provided. However, where of interest, further commentary has been noted.

5.1.5 This represents a return from 66.7% of the departments (8 out of the total of 12 departments).

**Role of the EPG**

5.1.6 The first section asked questions on what the respondents considered to be their responsibilities through the EPG. The response was as below (see table 1). Raising awareness of the Strategy and working with Gender Equality Unit were the two most common responses. Next most common was ensuring action plans are relevant but given findings in other elements of this review, action plan development has not been
undertaken regularly. No-one felt they had a role in ensuring the Strategy is monitored adequately or that they should be providing feedback to colleagues on progress, only one felt they should be providing feedback to EPG. This suggests EPG members do not see themselves as important in the monitoring of the Strategy but as more of a co-ordinator between departments and Gender Equality Unit. Given the requirement in the Strategy for annual monitoring, the EPG members have a role to play in gathering and reporting against action plans and the importance of this role needs to be emphasised and clearly defined, through a terms of reference, if necessary. Comments did not provide any other responsibilities. One comment provided suggested that the statements presented were about the Strategy and not the specific action plans, so it may be that there is a need to ensure that the members of the group are aware of how the action plans are linked to the Strategy and how the actions they monitor relate to achieving the objectives within the Strategy.

Table 1: EPG Response to Responsibilities of the Equality Practitioners Group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Since you have been involved, through the Equality Practitioners Group, in the Gender Equality Strategy and its delivery, what responsibilities do you consider your role to have included?</th>
<th>Response Percent</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Finalising the content of the Strategy</td>
<td>22.2%</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raising awareness of the Strategy in my department</td>
<td>77.8%</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working with the Gender Equality Unit in OFMDFM</td>
<td>77.8%</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delivery of the Strategy within my department</td>
<td>22.2%</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measuring progress in my department against aims and objectives in the Strategy</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reporting against agreed outcomes and targets in action plans</td>
<td>55.6%</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ensuring the Strategy is monitored adequately</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ensuring action plans are relevant to my department</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sharing best practice in gender issues across departments</td>
<td>55.6%</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing feedback on progress against the Strategy to departmental colleagues</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing feedback on progress against the Strategy to the EPG</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The majority felt their role had not changed and that it did not need to change. One suggestion was that a more joined up approach linking with other equality frameworks would be beneficial and that any future changes should minimise the burden on policy leads when it comes to reporting progress. Given this comment and the monitoring returns provided for this review, the format and process for providing progress reports requires refining and should be considered alongside the content of revised action plans. This should ensure that monitoring returns are provided annually, as laid out in the Strategy but which has not occurred to date.
5.1.8 The majority agreed that their role added value to achieving the aims and objectives of the Strategy. Also, most did not see the responsibilities as a burden but as part of their day-to-day role.

**Elements of the Strategy**

5.1.9 The survey next asked for views on particular content within the Strategy. Two-thirds of respondents thought that the Vision was adequate and seven of the nine respondents felt that the Strategy had made progress in achieving this vision. Several individual comments were received and these and other additional comments can be viewed in Appendix A.

5.1.10 The Strategy, on page 15, sets out four actions around the role of Government. Respondents felt unable to say whether any progress had been made in delivering two of the actions. One action, achieving a balance between men and women in representation and participation, was considered not delivered. There was split opinion over delivery reported against active use of gender measures to tackle gender inequalities and disadvantages with three reporting partial delivery, two reporting no delivery and three who could not say. All felt that the actions in their current form were still relevant.

5.1.11 The survey then moved on to the principles and key action areas laid out on page 16 and 17 of the Strategy. Respondents felt that none of the principles had been fully implemented across all relevant bodies. However, two of the principles were considered implemented by some relevant bodies. Respondents in the main felt that they could not say whether two principles had been implemented. The principles and key action areas, as with the actions in the role of government section, were all considered relevant in their current form. No comment was put forward to suggest modifications or additions were required to the principles. One comment was provided in relation to the key action areas, which argued that there were too many competing priorities. Another comment on key action areas was the lack of any trans-gender specific action.
5.1.12 When asked to comment on the nine strategic objectives that are laid out on pages 18 and 19 of the Strategy (also see table 3), all respondents felt that the objectives were still relevant but when asked if progress had been made, the most common response to all nine objectives was ‘neither agree or disagree’. One further comment that was provided was that objectives should have associated actions, milestones and measures in place. **Consideration to the strategic objectives should be at the fore in developing revised action plans.**

Table 3: EPG Response to Progress Against Strategic Objectives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer Options</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neither Agree / Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To achieve better gender disaggregated data collection, analysis and dissemination to enhance gender-based analysis.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To ensure the economic security of both men and women.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To achieve equal value for paid work done by women and men and promote their equitable participation in the paid and unpaid labour force.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To improve the health of women and men, including their reproductive health.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To achieve gender balance on all government-appointed committees boards and other relevant official bodies.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To ensure the active and equal participation of women and men at all levels of society.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To promote and protect the rights of girls and boys.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To eliminate gender based violence in society.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To ensure women and men, including girls and boys, shall have equal access to education and lifelong learning.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Action Plans**

5.1.13 Seven respondents were familiar with the action plans. One respondent stated they were not familiar, which is a concern given the EPGs role in providing monitoring information against the action plans.

5.1.14 Opinion was split on whether the current model of a mens and womens action plan was the best way to deliver actions against the Strategy. Five respondents thought it was and three did not. There was some concern regarding duplication both across departments and across the genders. Some actions were considered applicable to both genders and had to appear on both action plans. One departmental response stated that all its actions were aimed at all genders and two action plans were unnecessary. These issues should be factored into any re-design of the action plans for the remainder of the Strategy.

5.1.15 It was felt that the action plans were reflective of the Strategy and its content but five of the eight respondents did feel that the future action plans needed to change from the previous plans in some way. Respondents suggested that the 2008 – 2011 plans were too long and complicated and a single plan would be useful. It was also stated that there should be a rethink as to what key inequalities are, commitments should be robust and the process of monitoring should be reconsidered.

5.1.16 When asked if, given departmental responsibility to monitor against the action plan commitments, they considered the Strategy to have been adequately monitored to date, 37.5% felt that it had. The same percentage stated they did not know, which is of some concern given the EPG members role in their department in gathering monitoring data in relation to the action plans. The same percentage (37.5%) also stated no involvement in collecting, collating or requesting monitoring data. Comments suggested that EPG members saw their role as co-ordinating input from their departmental policy areas but it came across that there was no appreciation of how this input had value in terms of the greater Strategy context. The value of this input should be made clear to encourage a sense of value to action plan returns.

5.1.17 While contact between the EPG and the Gender Advisory Panel may have been limited, it was thought it may be of some value to ask for opinion on the Panel. Respondents were provided with several statements around monitoring and action plans in general and also asked if they agreed or disagreed that the Panel had engaged with departments, advised and assisted in action plan monitoring and engaged with public bodies effectively. The general response was neutral, with the most common response to the provided statements being ‘neither agree / disagree’ (see table 4).
Table 4: EPG Response to Monitoring, Action Plans and the Gender Advisory Panel

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer Options</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neither Agree / Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Strategy and its progress have been monitored and reported on annually by the GAP (as stated in the Strategy document).</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Action plans are fit for purpose in their current format.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The GAP has engaged with departments to assist and advise on their commitments within the action plans.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involvement in the GAP is a good use of my time.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The GAP has advised and assisted in monitoring against the action plans.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The current monitoring process allows me to form judgement on the outcomes under the Strategy and its action plans.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The GAP has engaged positively with public bodies regarding gender issues, engagement that would not have happened without the GAP.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Given progress to date, I would say that the outcomes in the action plans for 2008 - 2011 were achieved.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**EPG views on Gender Equality Unit**

5.1.18 The trend for responses to questions on the EPGs interaction with GEU was neutral to positive. The majority felt that GEU has helped raise understanding and awareness. It was also felt that monitoring against action plans has been undertaken as required. Strictly speaking, given the detail set out in the Strategy, this has not been undertaken and this is a further sign that perhaps the monitoring roles of the EPGs as envisaged in the Strategy are not fully understood.

5.1.19 Overall, it was also felt that the GEU had provided a platform for identifying and sharing best practice. There were slightly positive responses to GEU assisting in gender mainstreaming, encouraging data analysis to inform and implementing and developing action plans.

5.1.20 While no response came through as negative, the least positive response was to the statement ‘the GEU have provided support as required to assist in my role within the delivery of the Strategy’. While the overall view of GEU and its work with the EPG was generally positive, there may be a requirement for a closer working relationship or increased communication between GEU and EPG in future, to ensure roles are understood and adequate support is given to induce best value from EPG members during their input to this Strategy and its monitoring.
Overall Strategy Progress

5.1.21 For the final section of the survey respondents were presented with a number of broader questions relating to what progress has been made through delivery of the Strategy, what has worked and what could be changed.

5.1.22 There was limited response to the qualitative questions so it is difficult to identify any common thoughts or trends. When asked what would be considered the main successes or positive changes to date, greater awareness of men's issues and the complexities of gender equality in general were mentioned. Greater recognition of transgender issues was also mentioned despite this not being an element of the Strategy in its current form. It was also noted by one respondent that while opinions on this can be asked for, it should be possible to detail evidence of successes (i.e. through monitoring data and evaluation).

5.1.23 When asked what could be improved or had not worked, one respondent’s opinion was that female representation and equal pay had not improved (however, the departmental returns generally suggest otherwise, at least in the public sector). It was suggested that wholesale changes at this stage would be of no benefit and that any revisions should look at focussed, targeted impact.

5.1.24 Respondents were asked to give the Strategy a score out of ten, given to work undertaken and progress made to date. Marks given ranged from four to six but the average score was 4.9. It will be interesting to ask this question again in 2016 to see if that response has improved at all. When asked if the changes that they consider to have occurred in gender equality since 2006 would have happened anyway, 37.5% of respondents disagreed and felt that those changes would not have happened without the Strategy. Similarly, 37.5% did feel changes they saw would have occurred anyway and 25% felt that no success or positive changes have occurred in that time period. This shows a fairly wide range of views in the perceived effectiveness of the Strategy to date.

5.1.25 Given the opportunity to explain what they felt were the key areas of importance between now and 2016, two responses were received. Reiterating an earlier point in 5.2.23, representation of women was highlighted alongside childcare, violence and the identification of what are the key inequalities and obtaining high level support to drive forward to deliver progress in these areas.

5.1.26 The survey ended with an opportunity for any further comment. Comments were more in keeping with the development of the next Strategy rather than the remaining years of the current edition. Comments included the next Strategy needs to cover shorter timescales and be more focussed and the need for more stakeholder consultation.
5.2 Gender Advisory Panel survey

5.2.1 Having provided a brief on the midterm review evaluation methodology to the Gender Advisory Panel and review steering group at a Panel meeting on 21 February 2013, an online survey was then designed by OFMDFM Research Branch. The Panel was advised of the survey to raise awareness of its arrival in order to aid response rate, rather than issue without advance notice. The Panel were also advised of the purpose of the survey and the importance of their contribution given their experience in gender issues and role in the panel.

5.2.2 The role of the Panel was written in to the Strategy and included the Panel providing continued advice and assistance in the monitoring of action plans and assistance and advice in completion of the review.

5.2.3 The link to the survey was first sent out to the all members of the Panel on 5 March 2013 with a request that submissions were made by 14 March 2013 (see 3.5 for sample size). This was to ensure events at the time did not prevent some panel members completing the survey, as per advice from steering group members. A reminder was issued on 14 March 2013 with an extended submission date of 19 March 2013. Unfortunately at close of business on this date only five responses had been received. A decision was made to issue a further reminder and extend the date for submission of responses to 27 March 2013. The survey received eleven responses by this date. Given the timescales of the review, it was decided that no further reminders would be issued.

5.2.4 Given the role of the Gender Advisory Panel in the delivery of the Strategy, this return of 11 responses from the 33 who were issued with the link to the survey represents a return of just 33% (three male responses and eight female responses). While there may be reasons for non-response, no contact was received from any of those who did not complete the survey. It is vital, given the role of the Panel to assist the department in delivering the Strategy, that those sitting on the Panel are prepared to engage with the department in monitoring, evaluating and developing the Strategy over its lifetime. Consideration should be given to reviewing the size and membership of the Panel to ensure stakeholder engagement and Strategy development is taken forward as envisaged in the terms of reference of the Panel set out in the Strategy (see Appendix E).

5.2.5 The response received cannot be said to be representative of the views of the Panel as a whole, given the 33% response rate. Therefore the following results should be treated with caution. It should be borne in mind throughout however, that the views expressed and statistics presented represent the views of only the eleven GAP members who responded. Given the low response rate, no wider inference can be made from these
results and, as such, it would not be advisable to present too many recommendations from the return. A full presentation of the response obtained can be found in Appendix B.

**Role on the Panel**

5.2.6 The survey broadly mirrored the EPG survey, in order to compare thoughts across the two groups. The GAP survey first asked how Panel members felt about what their role involves, if they felt it had changed since they first became involved with the Panel, does the role need to change, does it add value and is it seen as a burden given normal day-to-day responsibilities.

5.2.7 All panel members saw their role as involving working with Gender Equality Unit in OFMDFM. The other most common responses were providing feedback on progress against this Strategy, interesting given the low response from the full Panel to the midterm evaluation, and raising awareness of the Strategy. Less than half of responses felt that their role involved adequate monitoring, sharing best practice and ensuring action plans are relevant. **It may be worth revisiting the role of the Panel and the terms of reference detailed in the Strategy and consider how this may apply for the remainder of the Strategy period.** Of the further comments received, there was a view that the Panel is more of an advisory body than a monitoring or decision-making tool and that its effectiveness has not been fully realised.

**Table 5: GAP Response to Responsibilities of the Gender Advisory Panel**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Since you have been involved, through the Gender Advisory Panel, in the Gender Equality Strategy and its delivery, what responsibilities do you consider your role to have included?</th>
<th>Response Percent</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Finalising the content of the Strategy</td>
<td>27.3%</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raising awareness of the Strategy</td>
<td>72.7%</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working with the Gender Equality Unit in OFMDFM</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delivery of the Strategy</td>
<td>18.2%</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measuring progress against aims and objectives in the Strategy</td>
<td>54.5%</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reporting against agreed outcomes and targets in action plans</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ensuring the Strategy is monitored adequately</td>
<td>36.4%</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ensuring action plans are relevant</td>
<td>45.5%</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sharing best practice across gender issues</td>
<td>36.4%</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing feedback on progress against the Strategy</td>
<td>72.7%</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.2.8 When asked if they felt their role had changed 55% felt that it had and 45% felt that it had not. The most common view was that the Panel had become more ad hoc and less well defined as time has passed. Following on from this, 73% of those who responded
felt that the responsibilities and duties of the Panel needed to change. It was felt that the Panel was not currently influencing decisions and aiding action plan development.

5.2.9 When asked if they felt their role on the Panel added value in achieving the aims of the Strategy, 55% disagreed (see figure 1). Of those who agreed, 9% strongly agreed and 36% agreed. Comments were mostly from those who disagreed and demonstrated a feeling of wasted potential, acting in an advisory capacity but not helping to achieve progress and a removal from the actual decision making on Strategy matters. One response did state that there was a value in the fact that a Panel had been established and had involvement in some capacity.

Figure 1: GAP Views on Value of Role

5.2.10 Sixty-four percent felt that Panel membership was a burden on their usual day-to-day responsibilities. Time was the main issue, especially for those who live and work further from Belfast with regards to travel and attendance.

Elements of the Strategy

5.2.11 The survey then moved into asking respondents how they felt about the various elements contained within the Strategy. The first set of questions related to the Vision of the Strategy and 73% felt that the current vision was adequate. The main criticism was that the Vision made no specific reference to the particular issues that affect mainly women and that there may be cause for including particular language emphasising the distinct genders and their concerns. Only 55% of respondents felt that the Strategy had helped make progress in achieving the Vision. Given further detail provided, the view across respondents was that the Strategy was commendable and a positive step but implementation has not been as positive.
5.2.12 The next questions related to the role of Government in delivering the Strategy. The Strategy set out a series of actions and the survey asked whether respondents felt that these had been delivered on to date. All four actions were still considered relevant and no respondents felt that any actions had been fully delivered. Only one, improving protection against discrimination by improving legislative measures and keeping their effectiveness under review, was considered partially delivered by the majority of respondents. The other three actions: achieving a balance between men and women in representation and participation, the active use of gender mainstreaming across all policy areas to identify structural inequalities which create gender inequality and taking mitigating action where appropriate, and the active use of ‘gender action measures’ including positive action as provided for within the Sex Discrimination Order 1976 to tackle gender inequalities and disadvantages were all considered as ‘not delivered’ by the majority of respondents. Comments provided related to a lack of focus in government action and the need for gender specific focus and ensuring gender neutral actions are avoided, as per 2.5 in the Strategy.

Table 6: GAP response to the Role of Government

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer Options</th>
<th>Delivered</th>
<th>Partially delivered</th>
<th>Not delivered</th>
<th>Can’t say</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Improving protection against discrimination by improving legislative measures and keeping their effectiveness under review</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achieving a balance between men and women in representation and participation</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The active use of gender mainstreaming across all policy areas to identify structural inequalities which create gender inequality and taking mitigating action where appropriate</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The active use of ‘gender action measures’ including positive action as provided for within the Sex Discrimination Order 1976 to tackle gender inequalities and disadvantages</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.2.13 The survey then moved on to the principles and key action areas laid out on page 16 and 17 of the Strategy. Respondents felt that none of the principles had been fully implemented across all relevant bodies. However, the consensus was that there had been implementation to some extent. The principles and key action areas, as with the actions in the role of government section, were all considered relevant in their current form. No comment was put forward to suggest modifications or additions were required to the principles. Some comments were provided in relation to necessary additions to the key action areas, the most common suggestion being a requirement to consider how welfare reform will have an impact across the genders.
5.2.14 The final questions related specifically to the content of the Strategy dealt with the **Strategic Objectives** detailed on pages 18-19. As with the other content, all respondents felt that all the objectives were still relevant. Opinion varied on whether progress had been made against the objectives. Figure 2 below details the response and the picture is a negative one. All nine objectives had more respondents disagreeing that progress had been made against the objectives. The objective which had the most positive response was related to the elimination of gender based violence. Participation in society, equal pay and economic security were the objectives that received the most negative responses. **However, overall, it can be stated that respondents felt that progress had not been made against the objectives.**

**Figure 2: GAP Response to Progress Against Strategic Objectives**

1. To achieve better gender disaggregated data collection, analysis and dissemination to enhance gender-based analysis.
2. To ensure the economic security of both men and women.
3. To achieve equal value for paid work done by women and men and promote their equitable participation in the paid and unpaid labour force.
4. To improve the health of women and men, including their reproductive health.
5. To achieve gender balance on all government-appointed committees boards and other relevant official bodies.
6. To ensure the active and equal participation of women and men at all levels of society.
7. To promote and protect the rights of girls and boys
8. To eliminate gender based violence in society.
9. To ensure women and men, including girls and boys, shall have equal access to education and lifelong learning.
Action Plans

5.2.15 The survey then moved on to the action plans for men and women. All respondents stated they were aware of the action plans and the associated content and 73% of respondents felt that the current model of delivery (departmental commitments through discrete plans for women and men) was the best way to deliver the Strategy. Common comment was the need for support or drive in proactively delivering the action plans, with one suggestion being the creation of a gender champion in each department. This is along the lines of the role of departmental staff on the Equality Practitioners Group and it may be of value to have EPG members attend Panel meetings or organise a short event where both groups can discuss implementation going forward and develop the revised action plans for the remainder of the Strategy.

5.2.16 Thirty six percent of respondents agreed that the action plans reflected the elements of the Strategy. However, overall 64% disagreed (27.3% strongly disagreed and 36.4% disagreed) that the action plans reflected the Strategy. Further to this, 91% or respondents (10 of the 11) felt that future action plans needed to change in some way. Comments suggest that the annual monitoring required by the Strategy has not occurred and an increase in monitoring and reporting would provide more focussed, specific plans that can move with change. The mens action plan was considered an after-thought and requires a wider scope.

5.2.17 Following on from the points raised in 5.2.16, 91% of respondents felt that action plans had not been adequately monitored. No-one considered the Strategy, through the action plans, to have been adequately monitored. This corroborates with the findings from the departmental returns, presented in section 4 and Appendix C, which provided modest evidence and detail on monitoring and progress against the action plans. As recommended in 5.2.15, further comments suggested the Panel meeting with departments, as well as a more joined-up departmental approach, annual monitoring including responding to findings and the need to increase awareness across relevant departmental staff beyond equality.

5.2.18 Respondents were then presented with a series of statements asking for their opinion on delivery to date, their involvement with the Panel and monitoring of the Strategy. Response again was generally negative. The majority of the Panel felt that action plans were not fit for purpose in their current form (this response relates to the content, as the majority felt that the current model of delivery was appropriate, see 5.2.15). Two statements in relation to monitoring and reporting processes also received a highly negative response. There were some positive responses in relation to engagement with departments and the Panel being a good use of time. Overall 90% of respondents
disagreed / strongly disagreed that outcomes in the 2008 – 2011 action plans had been achieved.

**Figure 3: GAP Response to Monitoring, Action Plans and Gender Advisory Panel Involvement**

1. The Strategy and its progress have been monitored and reported on annually by the GAP (as stated in the Strategy document).
2. Action plans are fit for purpose in their current format.
3. The GAP has engaged with departments to assist and advise on their commitments within the action plans.
4. Involvement in the GAP is a good use of my time.
5. The GAP has advised and assisted in monitoring against the action plans.
6. The current monitoring process allows me to form judgement on the outcomes under the Strategy and its action plans.
7. The GAP has engaged positively with public bodies regarding gender issues, engagement that would not have happened without the GAP.
8. Given progress to date, I would say that the outcomes in the action plans for 2008 - 2011 were achieved.

**GAP views on Gender Equality Unit**

5.2.19 The next section of the survey presented a series of statements around the Gender Equality Unit in OFMDFM and asked for comment in relation to Panel members interactions with the Unit. Overall response was neutral although some statements did receive slightly positive or negative views. It was felt that the GEU has encouraged gender issue data analysis to inform Strategy delivery. However, given the returns received in this review it appears not all stakeholders have fully bought into the existing monitoring framework. The positive response to ‘the GEU has been proactive in the implementation and development of the gender action plans’ could be challenged by the fact that the action plans covered the period to 2011 and have not been updated. Respondents agreed that the GEU has helped to raise awareness and understanding on gender issues. Responses on other areas including gender mainstreaming, monitoring
requirements and providing a platform for sharing best practice were mixed. The most negative response was disagreement to the statement that the GEU have provided support as required to assist in my role within the delivery of the Strategy.

5.2.20 Suggestions for improvements in the working practices between the Panel and GEU included input from the Panel on creating the agenda for Panel meetings to ensure relevancy and more joined up, constructive working between the Panel, GEU and departments. A tighter focus on the role of the Panel was mentioned and there seems to be some uncertainty over what the specific role of the Panel entails. There was also, as mentioned previously, a suggestion for departmental champions, more information on monitoring and an annual review process on both progress and roles. The lack of annual reporting and monitoring appears to have created a perception that the Panel has no input or involvement in assisting actual delivery of the Strategy as progress or action taken is rarely presented.

5.2.21 Further to how the Panel and GEU link, positives were expressed in terms of current staff strongly engaging and a hope that the future will provide for good partnership working between the GAP and GEU. Other broad comments in relation to the GEU that were of relevance included missed potential to date, a lack of ability to force compliance from other departments and continuity issues from GEU staff turnover.

Overall Strategy Progress

5.2.22 The survey closed with a number of broader questions relating to the Strategy including what progress has been made through delivery of the Strategy, what has worked and what could be changed.

5.2.23 When asked about the main successes or positives that have come about in gender equality over the Strategy period to date, there were several comments provided. Progress in relation to domestic violence and sexual assault was noted, including the forthcoming opening of the Sexual Assault Referral Centre. The inclusion of men’s equality issues was seen as a success against early resistance in the development phase of the Strategy. However, the success was detailed as including men’s issues, not that any progress had been made in addressing them. The fact that there was some networking promoted through the existence of a strategy was also seen as a success. One respondent felt that the main successes have come from those departments which gained understanding of the Strategy and committed to delivery of its objectives. While some successes were mentioned by the Panel, there was an absence of tangible outcomes borne through the Strategy over the action plan period of 2008 – 2011.

5.2.24 On the other hand, there were also some areas which were considered not to have worked or which had room for improvement. It was felt that women’s representation on
public bodies had not improved and that there was not a full commitment across all
departments. Action plans were also considered as not being effective. These issues
could all be resolved with a greater attention to annual reviews and monitoring.
Putting in place such a process would allow identification of representation to be
measured, ensure commitment from departments by requesting and actively
pursuing annual returns, and allowing shaping of effective action plans through
evidenced-based policy decisions. One respondent also suggested a specific
action plan for the Panel, which may develop a greater sense of purpose, focus
and direction to allow the Panel to have more of an influence and stake in the
Strategy development.

5.2.25 Given the opportunity to address what they might consider to be issues with the
Strategy, respondents were asked what elements of the Strategy they would change at
this stage. Specificity and awareness were the two main themes of comments.
There was an expressed need for focus on details such as the roles of GAP (a review of
the terms of reference) and a need for specific commitments within realistic, effective
action plans. This again highlights the need for any revised action plan development to
involve Research Branch to advise on the monitoring and evaluation requirements.
Several respondents saw a need to raise awareness of the Strategy through greater
dissemination and multi-ownership of commitments.

5.2.26 Respondents were asked to give the Strategy a mark out of ten, given to work
undertaken and progress made to date. Marks given ranged from a three to an
eight but the average score was 5.1. It will be interesting to ask this question
again in 2016 to see if that response has improved at all. When asked if the changes
that they consider to have occurred in gender equality since 2006 would have happened
anyway, 50% of respondents disagreed and felt that those changes would not have
happened without the Strategy. Contrary to that, 40% felt changes they saw would have
occurred anyway and 10% felt that no success or positive changes have occurred in that
time period. This shows a clear split in the perceived effectiveness of the Strategy
to date and as in 5.2.24, this is an issue that could be addressed with better
monitoring which would help provide the evidence of change and the contributing
factors behind any change.

5.2.27 Respondents were finally invited to describe what they saw were the key areas in the
remaining years of the current Strategy and provide any other comments they thought
would be of value to the midterm review. Economic issues were put forward as key,
including welfare reform and childcare. Women’s participation in public roles was again
highlighted. Men’s issues were prevalent in issues presented, given the number of male
respondents. One respondent felt that if no progress has been made, it would be of
more use to acknowledge this fact and use it to create a collective way forward for the
remainder of the Strategy period. A recommendation made in a previous section of this review that noted the potential need for an event to discuss and build on the review findings, was also suggested by a respondent.

5.3 Comparison across EPG and GAP responses

5.3.1 The EPG respondents were more positive when asked if the Strategy had made progress towards achieving its stated Vision. However, when it came to the detail of the role of Government, principles and strategic objectives, the GAP did tend to consider more progress had been made.

5.3.2 Opinion on the current model of delivery, through two action plans was fairly similar. Around two-thirds of both sets of respondents thought that the current model was the best delivery method. However, the GAP felt more strongly that the content of the action plans did not reflect the Strategy and that future action plans needed change.

5.3.3 There was also a divergence in opinions when it came to monitoring. No-one in the GAP felt that the Strategy had been adequately monitored, compared to 37.5% of the EPG. While some departments feel they are doing as asked in terms of monitoring, it is clear that the GAP are not seeing what they feel is required to allow their role in the monitoring of the Strategy to occur.

5.3.4 There was a stronger feeling within the GAP that the outcomes in the 2008 – 2011 action plans had not been achieved. The EPG were much more neutral in their view when asked the same question.

5.3.5 Both groups were broadly positive when it came to the role of the Gender Equality Unit. There was less positive response to the area of support from GEU and there may be a need for more engagement and assistance and this is an area GEU should engage with the groups to identify issues and address any needs.

5.3.6 The GAP did appear to be more positive when it came to progress made but lack of monitoring was an issue. Therefore it is unclear what underpins that view of progress. The EPG response was more neutral overall. Although it is only an indicative measure, it is of interest that when asked to broadly score the Strategy to date, both returned similar averages (GAP – 5.1, EPG – 4.9) and both groups responded similarly when asked if any successes would have happened anyway, without a Strategy.
6. **Gender Equality Strategy Statistics Publication**

6.1 Accompanying the Gender Equality Strategy and its action plans are a range of gender equality indicators, agreed through formal consultation and published by Research Branch. The indicators were chosen to measure changes over time in gender equality, providing an evidence base to evaluate the progress and the overall effectiveness of actions in tackling gender inequalities and promoting gender equality.

6.2 The baseline data for 2006 for these indicators was published by OFMDFM in 2008. The publication was updated in June 2011, entitled Gender Equality Strategy Statistics: 2011 Update.

6.3 The 2011 publication contained themed indicators, collated under ten themes considered relevant to the gender equality strategy. A list of the indicators can be found in Appendix D. Some data used in the 2011 publication is no longer available and these indicators will potentially be dropped from future publications.

6.4 As part of the Gender Equality Strategy review, one element agreed in the terms of reference was to review the key indicators that have been presented in the previous gender publications. Research Branch will produce a revised indicator set with fully updated data following this review. An updated publication will form an important part of the strategic-level monitoring of the Gender Equality Strategy.

6.5 The statistical publication provides supporting information to assist implementation and monitoring of the Strategy. Given the time constraints of this review, it was not possible to produce an updated publication alongside this report. However, as part of this review, the most recent publication from 2011 was examined alongside the Gender Equality Strategy document in order to determine the relevance of the current indicators, to ensure that all current inclusions were of value, and to identify any gaps in data to improve the statistical publication and its relevance to the Strategy.

6.6 Research Branch identified links between the content of the strategy and the relevant indicators and, in turn any gaps where Strategy content that required monitoring was not covered by an indicator. Whilst many of the points made within the strategy document related directly to one of the ten indicator themes or headings, a number of them expressed cross-cutting themes. There were also a number of points which did not fall obviously within any of the ten headings.

6.7 A brief of key areas of indicator coverage, and gaps that were identified in relation to the strategy can be found under their relevant theme headings below. Themes are presented in the order they appear in the 2011 publication. Research Branch has
produced a more detailed spreadsheet identifying gaps and this will be used to inform future redounds of the publication. This information can be made available if requested.

6.8 Within the Gender Equality Strategic Framework, one of the strategic objectives is to ensure **equal access to education and lifelong learning and opportunities to develop personal ambitions, interests and talents**. The statistical publication includes indicators for qualifications obtained, proportion of school leavers progressing to higher education, enrolment by subject in further and higher education, amongst other indicators. The publication does not include indicators relating to equal access to education and lifelong learning, including opportunities to develop personal ambitions, interests and talents. There is a need for indicators which show applications and enrolments for secondary and grammar schools, and to further and higher education. In relation to the needs of the pupil, the number of applications compared with number of places available would give an indication of training need within educational establishments. The training needs of teachers would also be relevant, in provision of a high standard of education to pupils.

6.9 The next theme relates to the strategic objective which aims to **promote equitable participation in the paid and unpaid labour force, thus achieving equal value for paid work and equitable participation in unpaid work**. Indicators under this theme include the composition of employees by occupation and by industry sector. It also includes indicators relating to economic inactivity, and hours worked. Potential gaps identified include indicators relating to entrepreneurship, access to employment, promotion, and recruitment. An example of a possible indicator for the latter would be the number of applications received compared to the number recruited for particular jobs. Whilst the statistical publication does report on informal caring and the number of women who are economically inactive due to looking after children/family, it does not include indicators relating to unpaid or voluntary work.

6.10 The next theme of pay and earning also relates to the strategic objective **to achieve equal value for paid work done by women and men**. One of its action measures is to implement actions based on the recommendations of the Women and Work Commission with regard to equal pay. The statistical report contains a number of relevant indicators for pay and earnings, including weekly and hourly earnings. Earnings indicator tables compare wages as a whole, but are not broken down by occupation or grade, therefore we cannot compare the wages, or salaries, for men and women in jobs that are like for like, at the same levels. This information would be useful for both within and outside the NICS.

6.11 Under income and poverty, indicators address the strategic objective **to ensure the economic security of both men and women, particularly acknowledging women’s**
vulnerability to poverty, e.g. lone parents. The statistical publication includes tables that provide the percentage of the population in receipt of non-state pensions and benefit income. Potential areas of interest include access to benefits and pensions and benefit take-up. There are no indicators which relate specifically to the economic position of lone parents, either male or female. It may be helpful to have the income or earnings indicator tables broken down into three subsets if possible: two parent families, male single parent families, and female single parent families.

6.12 One of the gender action measures within the strategy is the provision of childcare which is reliable, affordable and accessible which is noted as a measure which particularly benefits women, but is also of benefit to men. Indicator table coverage in relation to childcare is extremely limited, relating solely to childcare and pre-school places. There may be a need to investigate additional indicators. Issues such as affordability and accessibility of childcare may be of interest and would also link to issues in earnings and personal development opportunities.

6.13 In the Introduction of the strategy it is stated that ‘There are gender differences in ... family and caring responsibilities’ and that ‘women carry the major responsibility of caring, including childcare’. Coverage for caring in the 2011 publication is two tables: one reporting on informal caring (providing a male and female breakdown by number of hours worked by informal carers), whilst the other provides a breakdown of the employment status of these informal carers. A useful indicator might be the number of male and female carers, or the ratio of male to female carers. It would also be useful to report on the actual number of male and female carers as a percentage of the male and female population of Northern Ireland.

6.14 One of the key action areas is health and well-being, with the related strategic objectives being to increase the health of women and men and to improve access to services and delivery of health and social care services. The indicator tables within the statistical publication include birth and death rates, self-reported health, activity levels, long-standing illness, incidence of cancers and lung cancer, smoking, alcohol, suicide rates, mortality rates and activity levels. These indicators are a fairly robust set to evidence improvements in health across the gender split. The indicators do focus on physical health and some consideration should be given to including some data on mental health issues.

6.15 The next theme in the publication is transport. Inaccessible transport can be considered as a potential barrier to addressing issues of poverty, and education and training. The indicators cover modes of transport, purpose of travel, and a limited number driving related variables such as driving license, seatbelt wearing and speeding. These indicators are not all relevant to the strategic objective and may not be necessary. An
6.16 Within the strategic objectives is the need to address and eliminate gender related violence. The statistical publication reports on three areas: domestic violence, fear of violence, and victimisation rates by crime type (for common assault, mugging and wounding, plus all violence). There are no indicators to evidence gender issues relating to sexual abuse, and survivors, nor specifically addressing gender related hate crimes. It would be beneficial to report further on violence against the person, sexual offences and robbery. Tying directly across to the rights of girls and boys, one area of concern that has been reported is violence and abuse. Whilst we use PSNI figures to report on the number of child victims of domestic abuse (as a group aged under 18), it would be useful to select out these child figures and split them down further, into specific age ranges. Another potential indicator could also be to produce a table similar to the adult victimisation by crime, to profile the types of child victimisation (e.g. physical abuse, sexual abuse and so on).

6.17 One of the strategic objectives outlined in the strategy is to achieve a gender balance on all government-appointed committees, boards and other relevant official bodies. This is covered in the decision making roles section of the publication. There are only two indicators that fall under this theme, one provides the proportion of males to females across AA/AO, EOII/EOI, SO/DP, G7/G6 and G5 and above grades in the NICS, and one reports across occupation type for NI health personnel. In addition, the statistical publication provides a number of bullet points detailing the proportion of women in politics, public appointments, the judiciary, lay magistrates and Justices of The Peace. An obvious gap in our statistical coverage of this area would be in relation to private sector decision-making grades, or for other vocations.

6.18 Identifying gaps for the Indicator Tables is only a first step in taking forward any future statistical publication. It will be necessary to ascertain exactly what relevant data would be required to address identified gaps and whether that data is available. Research Branch will liaise with statistical colleagues in relevant departments to identify and gather indicator data as required and where available. This process will be undertaken with the view to producing a revised, updated indicator publication.

6.19 In addition to reviewing the content of the publication, Research Branch are also reviewing the current format and how to best to present the data. This may also lead to a change in the presentation of data but any changes will be with the intention of improving understanding and increasing engagement with the publication and making it a key element within the wider gender equality field.
6.20 Research Branch will continue to develop the publication both in terms of updating the publication with most recent data, keeping it relevant to the Strategy and creating a visually enhanced document. Research Branch will liaise with Gender Equality Unit in the coming months during this next phase. Any subsequent publications will be notified to relevant stakeholders, including the Gender Advisory Panel and the Equality Practitioners Group, and will be published on the OFMDFM website.

7. Conclusions

7.1 Findings relating to Departmental Returns against Action Plans

i. Returns from departments varied in consistency and quality. Consideration should be given to the development of an agreed monitoring framework in line with new and updated action plans, to ensure robust and timely monitoring against outcomes and targets. This will allow improved monitoring of the Strategy at a departmental and strategic level.

ii. There was some difficulty in getting responses against all action points in the plans. This would also suggest, moving forwards, the need for a more formalised monitoring format and timeframe for the future of the Strategy to ensure departments are aware of their reporting requirements and the timeframes for when such reporting is required.

iii. Within any new action plans, it would be suggested that targets and outcomes must be tightened up to ensure they are clear and tied to the objectives of the Strategy up until and including 2016. They should also be drafted to allow measurement, ensuring robust evaluation of the Strategy is possible.

iv. It would be recommended that for any future drafting of action plans, OFMDFM Research Branch statisticians are involved to ensure that targets and outcomes drafted are SMART and will allow for robust future evaluation of both the plans and the Strategy.

v. New action plans should consider some retrospective outcomes to ensure that potential valuable delivery and progress in respect of the Strategy is not lost in the interim period between 2011 and any subsequent revised action plans that come out of the midterm review.

vi. If action plans are to continue to be drafted separately for men and women, actions and outcomes should be tailored and written to reflect the particular needs and differences
within each gender and not be written as broad outcomes with no specific focus to equality issues.

vii. All actions points should be clearly attributable to a department and responsibility towards the commitments should be obvious. No action points should slip through unaddressed due to lack of ownership.

viii. This issue in relation to ownership also points to the need for a formalised, agreed monitoring framework to be put in place, as mentioned in (i). This will allow departments to plan data collection and required monitoring activity and ensure this is a consideration for the remainder of the Strategy. This in turn will help to ensure full evaluation is possible in 2016.

7.2 Findings relating to the Equality Practitioners Group Online Survey
i. Returns from the EPG suggested a reluctance or inability to make a judgement or provide an opinion based on the experiences gained in their role. Most common responses were mainly neutral ‘can’t say’ or ‘neither agree or disagree’. While this is a legitimate response, it was hoped there would be an understanding of equality issues in departments and that would provide an basis to comment on the Strategy based on that departmental experience.

ii. There would be some value in revisiting the terms of reference and the intended EPG involvement in the Strategy with members of the group. Gender Equality Unit should look to clearly describe the role they need EPG to play and the value of that role when it comes to monitoring action plans and how that input can help in steering the Strategy.

iii. The general theme of response in relation to the Strategy to date was of some movement in gender equality but few successes or progress being reported.

iv. The comments received suggested that the need was to create a more focussed, targeted set of actions. The current approach was considered too broad. Too many targets and action areas meant progress was spread too thin. Leaner, specifically targeted action plans with a focus on key advancements in equality should be considered.

v. Several comments also put forward the need for appropriate, specific measures and indicators with clear milestones and targets. The development of revised action plans should compliment strategic objectives and other elements of the Strategy in mind and be relevant to those elements.
vi. Comments also referenced that actions also need not be attributed solely on a
departmental basis but that cross-departmental work can create advances and progress.
This would likely require more hands-on management of action plan implementation and
monitoring by the Gender Equality Unit.

vii. Departmental specific action plans, specific for men and women, was not always
considered the best model of delivery due to some actions applying across both
genders.

7.3 Findings relating to the Gender Advisory Panel Online Survey

i. Consideration should be given to a review of the size and membership of the Panel to
ensure stakeholder engagement and Strategy development is taken forward as
envisaged in the terms of reference of the Panel set out in the Strategy.

ii. It may also be necessary to redefine the role of the Panel also depending on how the
Gender Equality Unit envisage taking the Strategy forward following this review.

iii. The over-arching view across the responses received from the Panel was that the
Strategy was commendable and a positive step but it has not been adequately
supported and implementation has not been as positive as hoped. Overall 90% of
respondents disagreed or strongly disagreed that outcomes in the 2008 – 2011 action
plans had been achieved.

iv. The role of government, principles and key action areas were all considered relevant in
their current form. Some comments were provided in relation to necessary additions to
the key action areas, the most common suggestion being a requirement to consider how
welfare reform will have an impact across the genders.

v. Comments provided suggest that the annual monitoring required by the Strategy has not
occurred and a process of monitoring and reporting would provide more focussed,
specific plans. Consideration should be given to organising a specific event where the
Panel and the Equality Practitioners Group can discuss implementation going forward
and develop the revised action plans for the remainder of the Strategy. There may be
value also in having EPG members attend Panel meetings to update on progress or
notable events or actions.

vi. Consideration should be given to a specific action plan for the Panel, which may help
define its role and develop a greater sense of purpose, focus and direction to allow the
Panel to have more of an influence and stake in the Strategy development.

vii. Respondents were asked to give the Strategy a mark out of ten, regarding the work
undertaken and progress made to date. Marks given ranged from three to eight but the
average score was 5.1. The perceived effectiveness of the Strategy could be addressed
with better monitoring which would help provide the evidence of change and the contributing factors behind any change.

7.4 Other Issues Arising from the Strategy Review

i. One of the main difficulties that Research Branch encountered was obtaining engagement in the review process. Several reminders had to be issued in relation to all data gathering requests connected to the midterm evaluation. Responses to some elements were particularly disappointing in terms of allowing researchers to form a meaningful evaluation.

ii. Consideration was given to using further research methods to further contextualise findings obtained elsewhere and allow for a different platform for feedback. However, given the timescales that the review was working to, the time taken to obtain the responses that were received through the methods detailed in this report and difficulties in arranging evaluation steering group meetings due to diary conflicts, it was decided that it would not be possible to organise potential focus groups in the timescales.

iii. It should be considered, following this review, that Gender Equality Unit organise meetings with relevant parties to discuss findings and encourage debate on the future direction the Strategy might take, particularly in relation to the development and design of future departmental action plans. Given the relative apathy to the review through the online surveys, this format may assist in gathering further useful feedback. Several respondents to the online surveys suggested that they had more to say and would be receptive to further discussion and this is an opportunity to involve stakeholders in action plan and strategy development.

iv. This should be the first step in Gender Equality Unit taking an active lead in driving the Strategy through to 2016. Closer work with equality representatives in departments will also be required to ensure action plans are developed and agreed in a timely manner. There will also be a requirement to work with departments to ensure that appropriate monitoring and reporting occurs. The role of the GAP should be confirmed and the potential of the Panel to advise, develop and promote the Strategy should be exploited in full, with a proactive lead taken by the Gender Equality Unit.
Appendix A – Full Departmental Action Plan Returns Commentary

(Some particular notable successes described in the returns have been italicised)

DARD – Women

This department had a large amount of actions for women, twenty in total. However there was some repetition in the action points and future drafts should ensure that plans are tighter and reduce this repetition. Of the twenty action points, it could be said that nine were achieved, seven were not, two were for all departments and had nothing to report against and were more advisory in nature and two had no outcome associated that could be monitored to state either success or failure to achieve.

1.2 – farm development plans do not hold information in relation to the gender of participants. This is acknowledged as an issue and that a need for stronger monitoring exists for future action plans.

1.3 – A higher rate of women in farm diversification programmes over the period has been achieved, from 34% to 45%.

1.4 – This outcome only stated ‘better equality outcomes in respect of gender’ but had no specifics. In relation to the Rural Development Programme, 10% of the beneficiaries are female compared to 5% of the farming population. Therefore it can be said that better equality outcomes in respect of the RDP have been achieved.

1.5 – This relates to all departments monitoring and collecting data to underpin and review policy. While it is general, there is a case that, given these returns, data collection and monitoring could be improved, as acknowledged in 1.2.

1.6 – As part of RDP, applications were to be examined and adjustments made for womens groups. No information or evidence on this has been provided and, of certain commissioned research mentioned, no one has a gender focus.

2.1 – Planned outcomes in the point were not gender related. No specific targets were set and from the information provided as an update, nothing relates directly to the action point. It does mentioned that action plans for the Rural Womens Network were monitored on a six monthly basis but no further information on that was provided so it must be stated that the action point was not addressed.

3.2 – As per 1.2, farm development plans do not hold information in relation to the gender of participants. This is acknowledged as an issue and that a need for stronger monitoring exists for future action plans.

3.3 – As per 1.3, a higher rate of women in farm diversification programmes over the period has been achieved, from 34% to 45%.
3.4 – The outcome/target associated with this action point was to continue to monitor student enrolment for People Development Programmes on a gender basis. This has been achieved. However, the monitoring has shown a decrease in female enrolment %. So while the action point technically has been achieved, gender equality has decreased in this area.

3.5 – Gender applications and RDP beneficiaries are monitored, the gender split has increased in terms of females.

5.1 – as per 3.5. Also, research developed and commissioned through the Evidence and Innovation Strategy has been detailed. However, none of it is specifically gender based.

5.2 – Numbers of women on the board of the Livestock and Meat Commission were to be increased by one. No information was provided against this outcome so it is assumed it was not achieved.

5.3 – At least 2 females were to be recruited to the AFBI board at the next recruitment exercise. 10% of applications were from females and 2 out of 17 interviews were with females. Only one female applicant was recruited so the outcome was not achieved.

5.4 – Applications from women for the management of fishery harbours were to be increased by 30% by the end of March 2011. The returns stated that applications from women have not increased. One female board member was recruited but in 2012, outside the action plan period. Therefore this action point is considered as not achieved.

5.5 – A better balance was to be achieved on the Agricultural Wages Board, which is currently filled by one male and two females. Outcome achieved.

5.6 – Representation on the Drainage Council was to be increased by 2. This has increased from one member to six so this outcome has been achieved.

5.9 – This point relates to all departments and gender balance in EU funded projects. No outcome was associated.

6.1 – This action point had no measureable outcome attached and instead had quoted participation rates up to 2008. The text update provided did explain how participation rates have since fallen but as no outcome was within the action plan, it cannot be said that an outcome was not delivered against.

7.2 – This action planned to increase the number of female applicants to the Financial Assistance to Young Farmers programme to mirror the farming population (stated at 8%). Feedback details that a 12% rate of applications was achieved and that the scheme has now closed. This outcome can be considered achieved.

9.1 – No outcomes were attached to this action point and no data or feedback was provided by the department. The action point relates to admissions to CAFRE, so rates could probably have been
supplied. However, the issue lies in the draft of the outcome, which sets out no measurable element.

**DARD - Men**

There were no action plan points for DARD in relation to men.

**DCAL – Women**

This department had five actions to report against in the action plan for women. The response received was detailed and examined each of the points requested in the initial email request. Given the response, a judgement that three (1.5, 9.8 and 9.10) have been met.

1.5 – An assurance that gender information is regularly collected and a monitoring group reviews data collection. All outputs are published annually, although none were provided. Gap analysis and an audit of inequalities are conducted and progress is reported annually. Action can be considered complete and addressed.

5.9 – No specific outcomes but also no information on public appointment gender splits provided. If this action is to be carried over, it must be improved. Information provided mentions consultation with women’s groups, job advertisements welcoming female applicants and appropriately split interview panels.

9.7 – No progress or updates on numbers of angling permit sales to women or promotion of angling for women. Action point not addressed.

9.8 – Five governing bodies of sport with dedicated posts aiming to increase female participation. Has found success in netball, football, GAA and rugby. However much of the progress is recent and outside this specific action plan period. There has also been good female uptake in Active Communities but this is also partially outside the action plan period. These successes should be retrospectively considered in any new action plans and in the Strategy final review in 2016.

9.10 – The write on the edge programme drew 117 participants and as such has addressed the outcome of increasing women participating in programmes. The outcome was not SMART and similar actions should be tightened up for the remainder of the Strategy period. However, as is, this can be considered successfully met.

**DCAL – Men**

There were no action plan points for DCAL in relation to men.
The return from DE was provided in a format different to those from the other departments. No specific mention was made of the action plan, despite a copy being sent with the update request. A generic document was provided, which given the appearance of the word annex at the top of the first page appeared to be cut out from another document. The document included information that, with no gender related information, was totally irrelevant to the request that was made. No obvious effort was made to tie any of the information provided directly to the action plans and the information that was provided detailed the type of delivery but did not provide any indicators or measurements of progress over the action plan period.

Action plan points also related to groups such as travellers and newcomers but had no gender specificity, which is a concern given these are gender strategy action plans.

**DE - Women**

Areas where no information was provided that could be used to comment on success against the action plan were:

- Collection of data for monitoring
- Provision of essential life and work skills for girls and boys
- Increased female uptake in STEM subjects
- Sexual education development
- Proportionate representation on the ESA board
- Equal participation between men and women in teaching
- Greater awareness through schools of LGBT issues
- Young women to broaden their expectations
- Teaching and assessment styles to suit girls and boys specific needs

Action point 7.1 related to gender stereotypes and preconceptions. Some detail was provided advising of the DE/DEL strategy “Preparing for Success” which in part aimed to challenge stereotypes. However, no indicators or quantifiers were provided to evidence progress or success through this strategy.

Action point 8.4 related to violence against women and aims to empower future generations to have healthy relationships. Some detail was provided in relation to funding, strategies and a revised curriculum in issues relevant to this area. However, the majority were outside the action plan period up to 2011 and again, little quantitative information was provided.
Action points 8.5 and 9.2 related to support of school age mothers. However the targets in these points (to achieve 30% reduction in rate of birth to mothers under 17) are more appropriate to DHSSPS and more education specific SMART targets should be considered for future plans. The return provided did state that a regional programme funds school age mothers to allow them to complete their education. In the school year 09/10, 286 women received support, with 191 being new referrals. A judgement as to whether this is a success or not cannot be made without other contextual figures - previous years uptake, number of teenage mothers for example.

DE – Men

Areas where no information was provided that could be used to comment on success against the action plan were:

- Provision of essential life and work skills for girls and boys
- Sexual education development
- Equal participation between men and women in teaching
- Bullying
- Greater awareness through schools of LGBT issues
- Male underachievement in literacy and numeracy
- Gender balance in the revised curriculum
- Mental, emotional and physical well-being and underachievement (with direct reference to a 5 year longitudinal study in UU funder by DE which was, at the time, in year 3)
- SEN and inclusion

Action point 8.3 related to domestic violence and aims to empower future generations to have healthy relationships. Some detail was provided in relation to funding, strategies and a revised curriculum in issues relevant to this area. However, the majority were outside the action plan period up to 2011 and again, little quantitative information was provided.

Other references in the action plan were made to changing the curriculum and life long learning but the return provided does not allow for any comment or measure in those areas.

DEL – Women

The action plan for women had eleven action points on it but only six could be considered as achieved. However, some points were not SMART and due to this, could not be measured. Also, given the response provided some action points appear to not be relevant or no longer applicable and as such should be considered for removal in any revised action plans.

1.5 – all departments action related to the collection of monitoring data, no comment was provided.
2.8 – There was a reported increase in employment outcomes through pathways to work, an evaluation report of 2009 was cited but not provided. Given the detail provided however, the action point can considered achieved.

3.7 - New parental leave regulations have been adopted and this action can be considered complete.

3.13 – This action involved increasing womens entrepreneurship particularly in STEM subjects. No figures for the action plan period were provided but some text for potential future action plans was provided.

5.9 – response suggested that as DEL has no remit for appointments to boards, this action is not applicable. However the action point did not relate solely to boards and related to any wider project management involvement. Therefore the action point has not been addressed.

5.10 – Representation in the bodies of colleges has increased from 27% to 29.1%. However, the action plan set an outcome of 32%, so while positive progress has been made, the target set out in the action plan has not been achieved. Comment suggested that the 32% target was for 2016 but the target was contained within the action plans for 2008 – 2011. Clarification with the departments on the timeframes for action plans may be required.

6.5 – Workable NI, a disablement Advisory Service employment programme has seen a slight increase in female uptake of the service and regular monitoring is described as being ongoing. The planned outcome required “a small increase” so this outcome can be considered completed.

7.3 – The careers information service continues to provide advice as required and this satisfies the outcome which was written in the action plan. However, if any future outcome is included regarding the careers information service, numbers or % engagement over a specific period should be included to ensure robust monitoring of SMART targets.

9.6 – Training for Success female participants have risen from 24% in 2008 to 41% in 2011. Therefore the action point to increase female uptake has been addressed.

9.9 – No reporting against outcomes regarding increased STEM subject uptake in girls was provided. Therefore the action point, which was to see increased female uptake in STEM subjects cannot be said to have been addressed without appropriate evidence.

9.11 – The outcomes set were not SMART but the response puts forward that recent work has highlighted that there is no apparent evidence to suggest that there is underrepresentation of females in HE. This action may no longer be relevant to any future action plan and should be discussed with DEL as required.
DELT – Men

The action plan for men had four actions, two of which were not reported on at all in the returns. Of the remaining two action points, only one had associated evidence provided to show how it had been addressed in the period to 2011.

3.2 – This related to paternity leave, similar to the issue in 3.7 above, and through new legislation can be considered addressed.

4.4 – Data provided was outside of the time period of the action plans. Progress to work programme has been subsumed by Local Employment Intermediary Service (LEMIS) and this has been delivering gender balanced services. New action plans will need to reflect change in programmes. However, in respect of this action plan, as no relevant timebound data has been provided, the action point cannot be said to have been addressed.

7.1 and 7.4 were not reported on. These action points were related to careers guidance for men and under-representation for men in administrative and junior management in the NICS.

DETI – Women

This action plan had four points for monitoring. Only one of the four could be considered as being partially addressed by the submission provided. However within that one outcome there are difficulties with the wording and SMARTness of the outcome. Again, a tighter monitoring framework is required for any new action plans for DETI to ensure measurement and relevance is in place.

1.5 – all departments action related to the collection of monitoring data, no comment was provided.

2.3 – the outcome, as basic as increasing the number of women setting up businesses, has not been reported against. Despite the issues with the outcome not being SMART, no information on business start-ups was provided and the submission detailed action that has been occurring outside the action plan period and has not detailed outputs from those actions. Therefore the action cannot be considered as having been addressed.

5.7 - Representation on the DETI board has increased from 20% to 23%. The planned outcome was poorly worded – as widely representative a pool of applicants as possible – which was not defined or timebound and as such is not possible to measure.

5.9 – related to all departments data collection on EU projects and no comment regarding data collection or such protocols was provided regarding EU DSD projects.

DETI – Men

There were no action plan points for DETI in relation to men.
**DoE – Women**

Five actions were included in the action plan and a good narrative response was provided against all. Again, some outcomes were not outcomes and were difficult to measure or monitor (eg. New developments should seek to provide a feeling of security and a sense of vitality). Given these design issues with the actions, it could be said that four of the five were at least being addressed through the workings of DoE and one was not reported on as a response was not forthcoming from the responsible area.

1.5 – A proactive identification of data gaps and methods for addressing them were detailed in the response. This was undertaken in conjunction with DoE statisticians.

5.9 – no update was provided on management structures of EU funded projects.

5.12 – A good return detailing progress of increasing % of women applying for DoE public appointments (22.8% to 39.2%) and % on DoE board (20.5% to 24.6%).

6.2 – Womens Development Steering group has been wound down but new equality group taking on similar function. Consideration should be given in any updated action plan what this role should be. As the outcome was to increase awareness of gender issues, the existence of the steering group over the action plan period satisfies the outcome.

8.6 – All planning delivered through implementation of PPS7 so this action point can consider to be delivered but future action plan should seek to establish a more tangible outcome as the current wording adds little value and is difficult to quantify.

**DoE – Men**

Two action points were included for men, on relating to road death awareness and one on security from crime. Given the returns it can be said that the road death awareness outcome has been achieved as it is stated that a reduction in fatalities in the target age group have been achieved (no figures were provided). The crime action point was extremely vague and lacked any measureable outcome to relate any progress against what was intended as success. Given the vagueness, it cannot be stated whether this has been successfully achieved or not and is another example of action plans being drafted without due thought to SMART.

**DFP - Women**

10 action points were on the plan. Responses were provided to seven of the actions and from the information provided a judgement could be made that three could be considered achieved (2.10, 3.11, 5.9).
Given the outcomes and targets, the returns showed that while some actions were being addressed, the returns were not being provided in a manner that suggested proactive monitoring against the action plans was in place. For example action point 1.1 aimed to ensure equitable participation of men and women in the NICS workforce. The return, stating a statistical profile is published by NISRA but not quoting or providing any specific evidence, does not show that the action point has been adequately considered. More care and attention is required in writing the action plans to ensure outcomes are SMART and appropriate to the owner department.

1.1 – As above, in relation to the NICS workforce, it was advised that NISRA produce a gender report including workforce composition. However, this does not detail any work undertaken by DFP to address gender issues in this area and whether a more equitable workforce has been achieved.

1.5 – No information on data collection or monitoring protocols against the action plans was provided.

2.10 – With respect to the review of the domestic rating system, a deferment scheme was introduced but has since been closed due to poor take-up. However, as the action written was the introduction of the scheme, it can be considered complete, despite the fact that take-up was poor and it was described as not effective. Outcomes should be written to aim for positive change and not just completing actions with no regards to their achievements. The lone pensioner allowance continues to operate but uptake and result relating to gender impact of rates not evidenced.

3.1 – No information was provided against this action point, which aimed to improve work-life balance and create equitable sharing of family and caring responsibilities.

3.8 – In relation to equitable pay, some information was given on ongoing action taking through NICS pay review. However, this action point related to the wider employment environment and the response detailed only ongoing action within the NICS, so the action point has not been fully considered and no evidence has been provided of what change ongoing action has produced in terms of pay equality in the NICS.

3.10 – No information provided against an action point which related to underemployment of females in top level positions.

3.11 – A review of funding and detail provided on PEACE III funding to womens projects was submitted and while it was detailed as being difficult to quantify, it was stated as likely that these projects would include training and employment based activity. This point can be considered as addressed.

3.12 – Relating to composition of PEACE III monitoring commission, information was supplied but no time series to judge if improvement in balance is being achieved. Current splits are still below the desired level of 40% set by the PEACE III operational programme. Currently the female members make up 29% of full members and 33% of deputy members.
5.9 – Gender balance in EU funded management structure is detailed as 63% female, including beneficiaries, staff, committees etc. This point can be considered as addressed.

6.7 – no further update on composition of the NICS workforce, a review that was due in 2009 has not been referenced or results provided. A further gender review is now planned in 2013 and this should be written into any future action plan in the appropriate area (men are cited as under-represented in AA – EOI). There was no measureable outcome or target attached to this point but no information regarding composition has been provided so the point has not been addressed.

DFP – Men

1 action – no information provided on any actions to encourage work-life balance in men was provided.

DHSSPS – Women

There were ten action points for women in the DHSSPS action plan. Two were the all department guideline points. Of the remaining eight, one was addressed partially (although it had no gender specific element, see 4.3), six were not addressed and one had no real measureable targets or outcomes.

1.5 - This relates to all departments monitoring and collecting data to underpin and review policy. Information has been provided which the details of current monitoring.

4.1 – This action point related to reproductive rights and had no associated SMART targets. As such it is not considered addressed or not addressed. An update on the current position was provided.

4.2 – In relation to a 5-year tobacco plan, no data has been provided regarding a reduction in female smokers. An update provides a brief bit of detail on a new strategic group established but this targets has not been detailed as addressed given the return.

4.3 - This action point had a target to reduce the level of alcohol and drug related harm. However, the outcome had no gender element and the reported progress is not gender related either. The response details a fall in those who binge drink and a fall in young people who report getting drunk across the action plan period. However, no information was provided by male/female or regarding drug use or misuse. Under phase 2 of the new strategic direction, annual updates are published and this should be of use in monitoring any new action plans.

4.4 – Child obesity has actually risen so this action point has not been successfully met. The planned outcome was also not gender specific and this should be looked at in any new plan.

4.5 – In relation to mental health issues, it is stated that the Bamford action plan is measured and reported on regularly. However, no information to show progress against the outcomes on this plan
has been provided. However, there is also a problem with the quality of the proposed outcomes and
the lack of gender specificity within the outcomes. However, from the return, the outcome as it was
written has not been addressed.

4.6 – Related to maternity services. A number of indicators have been listed but none are provided.
These could inform any future action points in this area and should be discussed with DHSSPS in
any update. As no data was submitted, this action point cannot be said to have been addressed.

5.9 - This point relates to all departments and gender balance in EU funded projects. No outcome
was associated.

8.1 – This point had several outcomes planned. They were not SMART in nature but no relevant
data was provided in the response to go towards addressing them in any case. Some information
was provided on initiatives taken recently but these included initiatives that are due in place for
September 2013. One initiative, Multi Agency Risk Assessment Conferencing was introduced in
January 2010 but no detail on its progress was provided. Action point not met.

8.2 – No detail on this action point was provided beyond the detail of the SARC centre opening in
May 2013 and an independent sexual adviser service in place from December 2013. While both
welcome they are not within the period that the actions plans are looking to monitor and the action
point went wider than these two issues also. Action point not met.

**DHSSPS – Men**

There were five action points for men in the DHSSPS action plan. Two could be considered
addressed fully (although 4.3 had no gender specific element), one partially and three, given the
information provided, could not be said to have been addressed or completed.

4.2 – No information was provided regarding suicide rates over the action plan period.

4.3 – This action point had a target to reduce the level of alcohol and drug related harm. However,
the outcome had no gender element and the reported progress is not gender related either. The
response details a fall in those who binge drink and a fall in young people who report getting drunk
across the action plan period. However, no information was provided by male/female or regarding
drug use or misuse. Under phase 2 of the new strategic direction, annual updates are published
and this should be of use in monitoring any new action plans.

4.5 – This action point was to achieve an increase in life expectancy in males and females (3 and 2
years respectively). The data referenced suggests that this was broadly achieved.

4.6 – In order to address sexual violence and abuse, this action point related to the development of
a Sexual Assault Referral Centre (SARC) by April 2011. While this target was not achieved it should
be noted that SARC is to open in May 2013.
8.2 – Mens Advisory Project were to complete research into domestic violence against men and examine the services available. The research findings were to be considered and a response made to the recommendations. The feedback provided mention increased access to a domestic violence helpline, a booklet published and a directory of services for victims. As no specific targets were set in this action point, it can only be said that DHSSPS has responded through the actions above and the action point is addressed.

DoJ

Nil return due to DoJ not being in place at the time of the development of the action plans. Consideration should now be given to the development of action plans, given DoJs remit, for the remainder of the Strategy period to ensure awareness and implementation of the Strategy in issues around crime and justice.

DRD – Women

Only two actions, data collection and analysis and gender balance in EU funding and neither had any specific, measureable outcomes attached. A data collection gap analysis was provided and DRD are confident that there are no gaps in their data collection. However, the action plan did not request any data and therefore it cannot be said whether data collection is adequate or not. Given the gaps analysis provided, gender is collected for all detailed DRD initiatives. Gender balance in project management structures is informed by relevant HR policies. No further information for the 2008 – 2011 period was provided.

It could be said that DRD has addressed all actions required. However, the outcomes stated were slight and no outcomes were in place to report against. Consideration should be given to more detailed examination of DRD responsibilities, current gender issues in that portfolio and the production of a new action plan to include relevant outcomes against those areas.

DRD – Men

No actions

DSD – Women

DSD had seven action points in the action plan for women and given the returns only two could be considered achieved. However, there were also issues with the drafting of the outcomes and actions which made measurement and achievement difficult. Again, any future action plan should more carefully consider the needs of the plan content and ensure outcomes are SMART.

1.5 – related to all departments data collection and no comment regarding data collection or such protocols was provided.

2.2 – No response provided in relation to pensions legislation.
2.4 – Child maintenance initiatives and services in place were detailed but these were lacking any specific gender detail. However, the outcomes in the action plan were also vague and lacking a gender focus and as such, the return goes some way to addressing the outcome. However, it would have been interesting to have been provided with uptake of these services. Again however, the drafting of the action did not encourage such monitoring or reporting.

2.6 – No return provided. A brief statement references work ongoing in the 2012/13 programme, outside the period of these action plans. It is disappointing that the returns do not include benefit uptake numbers as these are available. Given the report provided, it cannot be stated that the planned outcome has been achieved. However the outcome is also poorly written with no quantifiable increase in the outcome and no gender specific reference to females in the outcome.

5.9 – related to all departments data collection on EU projects and no comment regarding data collection or such protocols was provided regarding EU DSD projects.

6.4 – no response provided to detail any progress on Women in Disadvantaged Areas or the progress made by the proposed funding detailed in the action plan.

6.8 – return provided showing increase in females in NIHE management positions from 21.6% to 24.5% over the action plan period and some further information relating to the steps taken in the career development policies of NIHE. Outcome can be considered as achieved.

**DSD – Men**

Only one action point was included for DSD in the Mens action plan. This was in reference to single mens exclusion from the tax credit system, as well as encouraging sharing of family responsibilities. No return was provided. This action was also attributed to HMRC and it should be considered for future action plans that all actions must be attributed to an owner department, rather than a specific body.

**OFMDFM – Women**

There were ten action points for this section of the OFMDFM action plan. Again two were action points for all departments in relation to data gathering and EU funded projects. Given the returns provided from across the department, it could be reasonably said that of the remaining eight, one had been addressed satisfactorily over the period.

1.5 – This point related to collection and monitoring the implementation of the strategy and updating the baseline picture at the mid-term of the strategy. Research Branch in OFMDFM published a 2011 update of the Gender Equality statistics publication.
2.7 – This point involved developing a set of recommendations aimed at reducing barriers for lone parents and a focussed approach on the needs of Older People, including the appointment of an Older Peoples advocate. These issues were to be taken forward through implementation of Lifetime Opportunities. While the latter has happened, no further updates were provided by the department against this action point and it cannot be considered achieved.

2.9 – In relation to Childcare Lifetime Opportunities, this action point looked to address educational inequalities among disadvantage lone parents. As per 2.7, no detail was provided regarding any action taken in relation to this action point.

2.11 – Regarding the introduction of measures to eliminate the gender pay gap. No information was provided on this action point.

3.6 – This related to affordable childcare and the outcome was to agree actions across departments to identify a suitable range of policy options on childcare delivery. No feedback or information was provided on whether this had occurred.

5.9 – This point relates to all departments and gender balance in EU funded projects. No outcome was associated.

5.11 – Relating to an increase in the applications received from women for public appointments, a return was provided to show how appointments have proceeded over the 2008 – 2011 period. The policy target stated that only 29% of applications received were from women and, as of 2011, this was at 26% (although it had been at 36% the previous year). While the number of female appointments has fluctuated, the overall trend appears static at around one third of appointments. Proportionate appointments made are generally higher than the proportionate applications received, overall the percentage of women holding public appointments has not increased and the trend for the proportion of applications also is not showing upward movement. Therefore this action point has not been achieved.

6.6 – This action point relates specifically to the Gender Equality Strategy and to keeping momentum on the gender equality issue and encouraging debate. No specifics on the number or type of events were included so the two CEDAW events in 2009 and 2010, the equality workshop in 2010 and the WRDA report of 2011 satisfies this action point.

6.9 – This point related to UNSCR1325 and aimed to redress representation and participation issues in conflict resolution and peace building. An update was provided detailing the work of the department in funding a range of stakeholders in good relations and peace building, including several Councils and other womens groups. This action point can be considered achieved.

7.4 – This action point related to increasing awareness and respect for differing sexual orientation. Given the response this action point has not been addressed. It was stated that a consultation document on the sexual orientation strategy is under consideration but this is outside the period.
OFMDFM – Men

There was only one action point for men on this action plan. It related to monitoring the implementation of the strategy and updating the baseline picture at the mid-term of the strategy. Research Branch in OFMDFM published a 2011 update of the Gender Equality statistics publication. This publication is to be further updated as part of this review and consideration is being given to the current content of the release.

Appendix B – Full Response from Equality Practitioners Group online survey

Q5. Since you have been involved, through the Equality Practitioners Group, in the Gender Equality Strategy and its delivery, what responsibilities do you consider your role to have included?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer Options</th>
<th>Response Percent</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Finalising the content of the Strategy</td>
<td>22.2%</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raising awareness of the Strategy in my department</td>
<td>77.8%</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working with the Gender Equality Unit in OFMDFM</td>
<td>77.8%</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delivery of the Strategy within my department</td>
<td>22.2%</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measuring progress in my department against aims and objectives in the Strategy</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reporting against agreed outcomes and targets in action plans</td>
<td>55.6%</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ensuring the Strategy is monitored adequately</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ensuring action plans are relevant to my department</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sharing best practice in gender issues across departments</td>
<td>55.6%</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing feedback on progress against the Strategy to departmental colleagues</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing feedback on progress against the Strategy to the EPG</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (please specify)</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Many of the questions above are about the Strategy rather than the specific Action Plan(s) for this Department. Although we would have provided drafting input to the Strategy when it was being developed, I’m not sure that xxxxxxxxxxxxxx had a key role in ‘finalising the content’ of it. Within my Department, this Branch had discussions with our policymakers / business areas to agree on possible actions that they could commit too within a xxxxxxxxxxxxx Action Plan. The Branch co-ordinates the xxxxxxxxxxxxxx response back to OFMDFM although we are not in a position to ensure the delivery of the Strategy or the Action Plan targets. We have reported on our Action Plan targets when asked to do so by OFMDFM. We raise awareness of the xxxxxxxxxxxxx targets within our Action Plan, and when the GES went live in 2006 we would have raised awareness of this document too.

The GES was inherited when I started work in the xxxxxxxxxxxxx. The elements of the GES relating to Health and Social Care include strategies like Domestic / Sexual Violence and Abuse which are reported in their own right i.e. they would exist whether the GES was there or not. Key reporting to OFMDFM is mainly in the context of CEDAW, CSW and the occasional GES update.

Q6. Have the responsibilities or duties of this role changed since you first became involved?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer Options</th>
<th>Response Percent</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>88.9%</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
this should have a ‘not sure’ answer for me. They may have changed a bit over the years.

I used to be responsible for policy and legislation on gender in the xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx.

Q7. Do you feel the responsibilities or duties of this role, as they currently stand, need to change?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer Options</th>
<th>Response Percent</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>22.2%</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>77.8%</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

again, please record a ‘not sure’ for me. They certainly need to be discussed and worked through.

We need more joined up working in the Directorate to implement gender equality as part of a framework of rights in relation to gender and equality generally.

A lot will depend on the future direction OFMDFM see the GES going in and how it can best manage the reporting of progress so as to minimise the burden on the policy leads in departments who are required to provide input. There is considerable overlap between CEDAW, CSW and GES but they are all reported on individually. There is perhaps the need for a more joined up approach to gender equality.

Q8. Please state how you feel regarding the following statement – ‘I think my current role has value in achieving the aims and objectives of the Gender Equality Strategy’.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer Options</th>
<th>Response Percent</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>55.6%</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I think my role probably has some value in achieving the targets in the xxxxxxxxx Action Plan(s)

My role has been mainly co-ordinating input between OFMDFM and the various policy leads in the Department. Although there has been engagement with the Gender Advisory Panel the GES itself has remained largely as is. Some departments have, however, used this engagement as a means of identifying issues for their departmental equality action plans.

There are no specific objectives for xxxxxxx within the strategy therefore as the functions of xxxxxxxxxx will not have major impact on the strategy I do not feel my role will add much value in achieving the aims and objectives.

Q9. Has your involvement in this role proved an additional burden to your usual day-to-day role and responsibilities?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer Options</th>
<th>Response Percent</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>88.9%</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Although there is additional work involved it is not on a daily basis.

not sure i like use of the word burden. It is another strategy that we need to monitor from a business perspective - but that is the nature of the post that I am in.

Not on a day to day basis. In the past there have been times when the OFMDFM turn round times have been very tight and not easy to meet.

Q10. The Strategy presents a vision (page 14 of the Strategy): A society in which all men and women are equally respected and valued as individuals in all of our multiple identities, sharing equality of opportunity, rights and responsibilities in all aspects of our lives. Do you think this vision is adequate?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer Options</th>
<th>Response Percent</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

'equally respected and valued' is very important, but doesn't lead to better outcomes to address the significant inequalities and under-representation levels that continue to exist. I think this vision needs to be discussed and reviewed to reflect the society we want to see.

It is not ambitious enough. Plus we need to look at how we are measuring success. xxxxxxxxx's decision to use the market as the comparator (in terms of proportions of women in the SCS) is not a valid measure. We need to look at the representation of women in the NICS or the population as a whole and strive to achieve equal representation on that basis.

1. It may need to include Transgender and those who see themselves as intersex/genderless etc.. 2. Perhaps it would be better to speak of something like "enjoying equality of opportunity and rights"?

Q11. Do you think the Strategy has helped to make progress towards achieving this vision?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer Options</th>
<th>Response Percent</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>77.8%</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>22.2%</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q12. Please provide any further comments on the vision of the Strategy.

In answer to Q11- I don't know if the strategy has helped to make any progress, perhaps an evaluation of it, in addition to a quick survey, would help identify exactly what progress has been made.

Q13. The Strategy described a set of actions (page 15) around the role of Government in achieving the vision of the Strategy. In the broadest sense, would you say that these actions have been delivered, partially delivered or not delivered where possible:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer Options</th>
<th>Delivered</th>
<th>Partially delivered</th>
<th>Not delivered</th>
<th>Can't say</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>improving protection against discrimination by improving legislative measures and keeping their effectiveness under review</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achieving a balance between men and women in representation and participation</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The active use of gender mainstreaming across all policy areas to identify structural inequalities which create gender inequality and taking mitigating action where appropriate</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The active use of 'gender action measures' including positive action as provided for within the Sex Discrimination Order 1976 to tackle gender inequalities and disadvantages | 0 | 2 | 1 | 5 | 8

Q14. Do you think these actions are still relevant in their current form?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer Options</th>
<th>Still relevant</th>
<th>Not relevant</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Improving protection against discrimination by improving legislative measures and keeping their effectiveness under review</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achieving a balance between men and women in representation and participation</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The active use of gender mainstreaming across all policy areas to identify structural inequalities which create gender inequality and taking mitigating action where appropriate</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The active use of 'gender action measures' including positive action as provided for within the Sex Discrimination Order 1976 to tackle gender inequalities and disadvantages</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q15. Please provide any further comment on the role of Government as laid out in the Strategy.

Note- At Q14 the use of "Not relevant" should be taken as "can't say".

Q16. The Strategy sets out four principles (page 16) to achieve the vision that departments and other relevant bodies committed to implementing. To what extent would you say these principles have been implemented?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer Options</th>
<th>Implemented by all relevant bodies</th>
<th>Implemented by some relevant bodies</th>
<th>Implemented by no relevant bodies</th>
<th>Can't say</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Identifying a positive and proactive approach to the needs of men and women</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ensuring that gender stereotypes and sexism do not influence policy development and decision-making processes</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoting a partnership approach in developing policy and service delivery</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recognising and valuing the multiple identities of women and men in order to tackle disadvantage and discrimination</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q17. Do you think these principles are still relevant in their current form?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer Options</th>
<th>Still relevant</th>
<th>Not relevant</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Identifying a positive and proactive approach to the needs of men and women</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ensuring that gender stereotypes and sexism do not influence policy development and decision-making processes</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoting a partnership approach in developing policy and service delivery</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Recognising and valuing the multiple identities of women and men in order to tackle disadvantage and discrimination

Q18. Please provide any further comment on the principles as laid out in the Strategy.

No comment provided.

Q19. The Strategy aimed to pay particular attention to tackling key action areas. Do you think these key action areas are still relevant for inclusion in the Strategy?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer Options</th>
<th>Still relevant</th>
<th>Not relevant</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Childcare / Caring</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health &amp; Well-Being</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Representation in public life &amp; decision making</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education &amp; life long learning</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to employment</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender pay gap</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work-life balance</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stereotypes &amp; prejudices</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peace-building</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poverty</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender related violence</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q20. For those areas you think are no longer relevant, please provide further detail as to why.

These areas are all still relevant but represent too many priorities. It would be better to tackle the priorities in a strategic way focusing on those that will deliver the greatest impact or where need is greatest. Developing specific SMART objectives around one or two key priorities will have more impact than continuing our current approach where attention is paid to all but little change can be evidenced. It is also important to look at where we can have the most influence; what is actually within our ability to influence and what is not; and at which areas there are clear gender issues. For example, the role of women in peace-building is well documented and there is a continuing role; however, focusing on this area as a priority is not going to have a significant impact on advancing gender equality here. One of the Equality Commission’s key inequalities is around female representation in senior positions in the SCS and on Boards and other areas of public life. We need specific policies to tackle such areas. Another often highlighted area of inequality is in relation to men’s health. Considering this under a key action area such as “health and well being” is not the most effective approach as the significance of the issues and the inequality is lost. We need to identify signature projects in the context of Delivering Social Change that will tackle key inequalities for men, women and people who are transgender.

Note- At Q19 the use of “Not relevant” should be taken as "can't say".

Q21. Please detail any key action areas not included in the Strategy that you think are now relevant and should be included.

We need to build an evidence base against appropriate measures or indicators in the context of identification specific inequalities so that policies and programmes can be specific, targeted and effective.

trans, inter-sex issues were not included in the Strategy - these are gender related and consideration needs to given to including these in the strategy. These continue to be relevant, they are not new issues.
Q22. The Strategy set out nine strategic objectives which it sought to achieve to promote gender equality. The objectives are summarised below. Please indicate how strongly you agree / disagree that progress has been made against these objectives.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer Options</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neither Agree / Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To achieve better gender disaggregated data collection, analysis and dissemination to enhance gender-based analysis.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To ensure the economic security of both men and women.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To achieve equal value for paid work done by women and men and promote their equitable participation in the paid and unpaid labour force.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To improve the health of women and men, including their reproductive health.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To achieve gender balance on all government-appointed committees boards and other relevant official bodies.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To ensure the active and equal participation of women and men at all levels of society.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To promote and protect the rights of girls and boys.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To eliminate gender based violence in society.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To ensure women and men, including girls and boys, shall have equal access to education and lifelong learning.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q23. Do you think these strategic objectives are still relevant in their current form?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer Options</th>
<th>Still relevant</th>
<th>Not relevant</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To achieve better gender disaggregated data collection, analysis and dissemination to enhance gender-based analysis.</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To ensure the economic security of both men and women.</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To achieve equal value for paid work done by women and men and promote their equitable participation in the paid and unpaid labour force.</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To improve the health of women and men, including their reproductive health.</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To achieve gender balance on all government-appointed committees boards and other relevant official bodies.</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To ensure the active and equal participation of women and men at all levels of society.</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To promote and protect the rights of girls and boys</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To eliminate gender based violence in society.</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To ensure women and men, including girls and boys, shall have equal access to education and lifelong learning.</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q24. Please provide any further comment on the strategic objectives and their relevance as laid out in the Strategy.

The objectives are still relevant. We need to be specific about how we intend to achieve this with clear actions, milestones and measures in place. Actions to achieve some will contribute to the achievement of others and we need to be focused on the ultimate aim and the best way to achieve that.

Q25. Are you familiar with the action plans and the content within them?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer Options</th>
<th>Response Percent</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>87.5%</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q26. Do you think the current model of delivery (through departmental commitments through two discrete action plans) is the best way to deliver the Strategy through departments?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer Options</th>
<th>Response Percent</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>62.5%</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>37.5%</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Departments completing a whole range of actions will not create equality or eliminate inequality. We need to tackle key inequalities through cross-cutting policies and programmes endorsed by the Executive. At present departments do not even acknowledge the significant roles they have in effecting change.

Not for xxxxxxxx All our Actions are aimed at all genders to ensure we provide equality for xxxxxxxxxxxxxx It may well be the best way for other Departments

For the Health areas there are a lot of overlaps as many of the issues are common to all genders e.g. Smoking, Drugs and Alcohol etc..

Having two separate plans can lead to duplication of categories.

Q27. Given your knowledge of the action plans, would you say the aims and targets included adequately reflect the principles, key action areas and strategic objectives of the Strategy?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer Options</th>
<th>Response Percent</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>75.0%</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t have adequate knowledge of action plans</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q28. Do you think future action plans need to change, either in content, format or delivery?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer Options</th>
<th>Response Percent</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>62.5%</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>37.5%</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Gender inequality will not be created until there is firm commitment from the NICS and Executive. Attitudes, systems and structures need to change. I do not think there is any real acknowledgement that there is an
issue to be addressed. We need published targets and commitments designed to tackle key inequalities. At present we are moving in the opposite direction in some areas with watered down comparators being used on, for example, representation of women in senior positions.

far too complicated, too lengthy and unappealing to read.

Unless something emerges in the future or circumstances change. The strategy needs to reflect a changing society and world.

I think there is a need for a rethink about what the key inequalities are and whether existing strategies are addressing these and whether new ones are required. This should include looking at baseline positions, desired outcomes, reporting of action taken, outcomes achieved, indicators and reporting mechanisms.

A single Plan would be useful

Q29. Departments have a responsibility under the Strategy to monitor and evaluate their actions included in the action plans. Do you think the Strategy has been adequately monitored to date?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer Options</th>
<th>Response Percent</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>37.5%</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No - Not adequately monitored</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No - Not monitored at all</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td>37.5%</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q30. Have you been involved in collecting, collating or requesting data/monitoring annual progress against the departmental commitments in the action plans?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer Options</th>
<th>Response Percent</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>62.5%</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>37.5%</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

None of my comments are a reflection of the people in OFMDFM and departments efforts to effect change or develop action plans. Monitoring of the strategy has been ineffective because of delays to agree and implement actions plans, that resulted mostly from resources being withdrawn from this area or resources not being available to complete the work.

for question 29 above - This has 2 questions in one, and is perhaps misleading. This Department reports on its Action Plan targets to OFMDFM when requested to do so. However DARD does not monitor the overall Gender Equality Strategy. This question is asking if I consider that the Strategy has been adequately monitored, rather than the DARD Action Plan.

Given DFP’s remit we do not have many actions and those that we do relate mainly to NICS staff (with the exception of DSO which monitors relevant legislation and considers if NI law need changing). As stated above at 26 both our plans are very similar.

But only in the context of co-ordinating the input from policy areas.

The collating/requesting data/monitoring would be in conjunction with monitoring of the relevant policies.

Q31. Please provide any further comment you may have on the Actions Plans 2008 – 2011.

No comment provided.
Q32. Please indicate whether you agree or disagree with the following statements.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer Options</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neither Agree / Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Strategy and its progress have been monitored and reported on annually by the GAP (as stated in the Strategy document).</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Action plans are fit for purpose in their current format.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The GAP has engaged with departments to assist and advise on their commitments within the action plans.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involvement in the GAP is a good use of my time.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The GAP has advised and assisted in monitoring against the action plans.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The current monitoring process allows me to form judgement on the outcomes under the Strategy and its action plans.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The GAP has engaged positively with public bodies regarding gender issues, engagement that would not have happened without the GAP.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Given progress to date, I would say that the outcomes in the action plans for 2008 - 2011 were achieved.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q33. Please provide any further comments you may have on the role, input, structure and progress of the GAP through the Strategy period to date.

The GAP has been as effective as it was allowed to be.

Q34. Given your interactions with the GEU through your involvement in the GAP, please state how you feel regarding the role of the GEU in delivering the Strategy.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer Options</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neither Agree / Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The GEU has helped to raise awareness and understanding on gender issues.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The GEU has assisted in gender mainstreaming in Departments.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The GEU has encouraged gender issue data analysis to inform Strategy delivery.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monitoring against action plans has been managed and undertaken as required.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The GEU has provided a platform for identifying and sharing best practice.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The GEU have provided support as required to assist in my role within the delivery of the Strategy.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The GEU has been proactive in the implementation and development of the gender action plans.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q35. Do you have any thoughts on how the EPG and GEU could improve the effectiveness of their relationship and interactions in delivering the Strategy over its remaining period up to 2016?

Need to obtain senior management commitment across the NICS and in other public bodies. We need to be very clear that significant inequalities exist and to publish commitments and specific targets. Need to recognise that promoting gender equality promotes equality generally and to work within a wider equality policy context to achieve the aims of the of the strategy and gender equality generally.

yes lots of thoughts - happy to meet and discuss with the team

no

Review the Action Plan as previously indicated. Perhaps consider departmental (and where appropriate ALBs) Equality Action Plans to see if the plans can be further enhanced?

Q36. Please provide any further comments you may have on the role, input, structure and progress of the GEU through the Strategy period to date.

The GEU is clearly committed to advancing gender equality and has worked very hard to develop actions plans and to promote equality of opportunity.

The staff in the GES have maintained good working relationships with EPG and I am sure that this will provide a sound basis for future work.

Q37. What would you say are the main successes/positive changes in gender equality during the Strategy period to date?

There has been greater awareness of men's issues and the differences that can exist in the types of inequality and issues affecting men and women. There has been greater recognition of the needs of transgender people. Legislation has been developed and implemented to outlaw discrimination and to promote and protect people's rights in relation to men and women generally and in relation to pregnancy and other areas that affect either men or women.

The increased profile / awareness around Domestic / Sexual Violence and Abuse. The increase in the number of women in politics. This, however, such not be a matter of opinion but a cold hard look at what the GES has (or has not) produced.

Keeping a focus on addressing gender disadvantage.

Q38. What would you say are the areas or issues where the Strategy has not worked well or could be improved?

Female representation in public life and at senior levels in organisations has not improved and in many cases the position has worsened. There are still disparities in how women are paid in relation to men and there is little obvious action being taken to address this issue.

This, however, such not be a matter of opinion but a cold hard look at what the GES has (or has not) produced.

Q39. What changes would you make AT THIS STAGE to the Strategy?

Wholesale revision of the Strategy would result in a series of approval processes and delays and development of a new or revised strategy that might become an end in itself. I would focus, therefore, on ensuring that the objectives and actions developed now are those that will make the greatest impact on gender equality, in a focused, targeted and non-bureaucratic way.

Already answered earlier.

Q40. Broadly speaking, if you had to mark the Strategy out of 10 (where 1 is very poor and 10 is excellent) how would you rate the Strategy to date?
Q41. Do you think any successes /positive changes in gender equality since 2006 would have happened anyway, even without the Gender Equality Strategy?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer Options</th>
<th>Response Percent</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>37.5%</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>37.5%</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q42. What would you say are the areas/issues which the Strategy needs to consider most between now and 2016?

What are the key inequalities? What actions need to be taken to address these inequalities? What can be done between now and 2016 to complete these actions? How do we get the appropriate degree of high-level commitments to drive through the work required to achieve complete the actions, achieve the objectives and ensure gender equality.

happy to discuss - too much to type here

Increased representation of women Childcare Violence

Q43. Do you have any further comments at all on the Strategy and what this evaluation should consider in terms of the Strategy moving forwards?

The next strategy need to cover a shorter timescales and focus more on key inequalities, specific objectives to address these inequalities, and the appropriate delivery mechanisms.

I have a lot of comments about the Strategy and its Action Plan and what could be considered to help make more of an impact. I am happy to discuss my thoughts with the team

The key issue should not be so much about what EPG members think but what stakeholders think. What are the inequalities and how can they be addressed? In some cases there will be probably be broad agreement (e.g. Domestic Violence) but in others there will be differences in opinion as to what is needed (e.g. Reproductive Rights).
Appendix C – Full Response from Gender Advisory Panel online survey

Q5. Since you have been involved, through the Gender Advisory Panel, in the Gender Equality Strategy and its delivery, what responsibilities do you consider your role to have included?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer Options</th>
<th>Response Percent</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Finalising the content of the Strategy</td>
<td>27.3%</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raising awareness of the Strategy</td>
<td>72.7%</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working with the Gender Equality Unit in OFMDFM</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delivery of the Strategy</td>
<td>18.2%</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measuring progress against aims and objectives in the Strategy</td>
<td>54.5%</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reporting against agreed outcomes and targets in action plans</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ensuring the Strategy is monitored adequately</td>
<td>36.4%</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ensuring action plans are relevant</td>
<td>45.5%</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sharing best practice across gender issues</td>
<td>36.4%</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing feedback on progress against the Strategy</td>
<td>72.7%</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (please specify)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Also to help ensure that a multiple identity perspective is considered. Whilst I do consider my role to include some of the phrases listed above given the delays with the strategy and the action plans it has been hard to be as effective as I would like in carrying out these roles.

I have been responsible through my work in Women's Aid for delivering on key actions in respect of domestic violence and Violence Against women in conjunction with lead departments DHSSPS and DOJ.

Comment (rather than 'other': The Commission was involved at the early stages in developing the strategy. I am not sure that the GAP had maximised the potential for the responsibilities of members to extend to a role in monitoring and ensuring the effectiveness of the strategy and action plans.

I have only recently joined the GAP so responsibilities have been limited. however, as a member of the xxxxxxxxxx Board I did support the previous representative in her responsibilities relating to providing feedback on Action Plans.

I feel that the main role of the Gender Advisory Panel has been to remind OFMDFM of what is needed and what is falling short. However, voluntary sector members of the Panel do not have any power to 'deliver' or 'ensure' or 'finalise' etc. these things.

I have also been engaged in persuading officials within the Gender Unit to hold meetings of the GAP; this has included convening meetings with members of the GAP where we have been able to express our frustration at inactivity and from there, to liaise with OFMDFM officials.

Q6. Have the responsibilities or duties of this role changed since you first became involved?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer Options</th>
<th>Response Percent</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>54.5%</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>45.5%</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I think the role has largely stayed the same but it changes given the context of that time period, with meetings having different pro dominant themes; CEDAW, gender action plans, economic downturn etc. I see part of my role as assisting in linking the Racial Equality Strategy(RES) to the Gender Equality Strategy in order to advocate the needs of BME women but without the new RES in place this is challenging. I also see my role in informing BME women of the strategy and we continue to do this through policy and community development work in xxxxxxxxxx and in the context of our work on awareness raising on rights contained in CEDAW. I can also inform officials and others of recent research developments etc from NICEM dependant on the time and theme of the meeting.
The work on domestic violence and broader violence against women issues, eg support for victims of human trafficking has expanded but this has not been linked to the Gender Equality Strategy in any obvious way.

Responsibilities began in a more targeted and cohesive fashion but became very ad hoc.

But I think there was a change around the time I became involved. they have become more focused

When I first got involved, there wasn't any mention of men's issues in the document and there wasn't any men's actions plans. The men's representatives spent a lot of time with OFMDFM GEU getting them to get departments to implement actions for men. This was a difficult task as they haven't anything to measure men's inequalities on, like CEDAW, for example

I believe that over the last at least two years the Gender Advisory Meetings became focused on presentations which were not always relevant to the review of the strategy and more importantly the Action Plans. Also meetings were not regular and not agreed in advance. It felt that being a Panel member was not that important and that the views of women - especially the views of women from disadvantaged communities which xxxxxxxxxx represents was not always heard or made feel relevant. The enthusiasm which accompanied the initial launch was not maintained and the role of a Panel Member was not properly defined.

I have been involved since the first consultation on the draft GES. At that time there was no GAP. It was only after the women's sector organised a north-south conference to consider the GES and the RoI Strategy for Women (in 2005) and chaired by myself, that OFMDFM agreed to convene a Gender Advisory Panel. There was still dissatisfaction with the content of the Gender Equality Strategy and we eventually had to appeal to Direct Rule ministers because our comments were not being listened to. After that, some modifications were made to the GES before it was launched. In recent times the meetings of the GAP have not coherently looked at the GES but instead the agenda for meetings have been random and not connected particularly with the content of the strategy or its review. We have as a GAP tried to make helpful suggestions regarding the review but these have not been followed up. I am pleased to note that this is now changing and new personnel in OFMDFM are taking the responsibility of the mid-term review seriously.

Q7. Do you feel the responsibilities or duties of this role, as they currently stand, need to change?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer Options</th>
<th>Response Percent</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>72.7%</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>27.3%</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Whilst it can generally be a useful forum, I would like to see Departments incorporating actions which will impact upon the complexities that women of multiple identity face, this may require more initiatives that link strategies together so that work does not happen in silos.

The role of the Gender Advisory panel is indistinct and insubstantial. It appears that it operates at a remove from the decisions taken about the strategy and action plans with no coherent role or place in the decision-making.

I believe the role and responsibilities need to be revisited with a clear plan of action to develop and monitor the action plans. The monitoring and development needs to be done in an atmosphere of the Panel working together with Departments to support the development and implementation of their action plans.

It would be useful to revisit the ToR for the GAP and test both them and the extent to which the GAP fulfilled them.

My understanding is that the responsibilities which the GAP now has and which are envisaged for the future are perhaps clearer and more meaningful than in the past. From my experience, in terms of xxxxxxxxxx previous involvement this is a welcome development in that organisations are clear about why they should have people on the panel and what they are there to do, that their input may actually make a difference and that there is a desire for the panel to work more effectively.
They need to become more proactive and have an influence on the tangible outcomes. Often Panel meetings are little more than hearing what has happened / will happen, rather than about having an impact upon these things.

More involvement of the Gender Advisory Panel in shaping any future strategy. More involvement of workers from the wider Men's Sector. Departments need to have a measuring tool for measuring men's inequalities. Currently there's nothing so men's issues have just become an add on. Meeting’s with department equality officers helped with getting some actions on departments overall actions. Opportunities need to be created to meet outside of Belfast. The panel is made up of people from regional areas.

Yes as I said in question 6 we need a defined role for a Panel member with clear duties identified. As with all roles the contribution of Panel members should be reviewed annually, this could be carried out by questionnaire. I am currently unclear about the duties and role of a Panel member and I feel that this whole area would need to be revisited.

The terms of reference of the GAP are fine. What is important is ensuring the meetings enable the GAP members to have an input.

Q8. Please state how you feel regarding the following statement – ‘I think my current role has value in achieving the aims and objectives of the Gender Equality Strategy’.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer Options</th>
<th>Response Percent</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>9.1%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>36.4%</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>54.5%</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I feel very removed from the strategy, which has in many ways I fear become a paper exercise. (This is not true in respect of the DV and VAW work - but that is driven by government’s domestic and sexual violence strategy. I feel the potential in the panel to help drive the strategy forward has been wasted, linked to a lack of ownership, with the strategy seen as belonging to OFMDFM only.

I think there is enormous untapped potential in GAP for pre-consultation etc.

I think my role - and that of other voluntary sector members - might help to inform the process, but has little direct value in achieving the overall aims and objectives. This is especially true for representatives of men's work - as their are no national / international obligations upon government to meet targets (e.g. CEDAW or Beijing Declaration) and little appetite to create meaningful aims in this field which are not based upon existing obligations.

A don't know question would have been useful here because while I feel that, in some sense my role has made an impact, I also feel that in some sense it hasn't. I have felt that at times we have took two steps forward and then took 3 back. I do value the opportunity to contribute and have my voice heard but at times in the past, I have scratched and just wondered what has happened.

I feel my current role has value as I am involved in the review of the Strategy which will involve reviewing how the Panel works in partnership with the Unit in the future and how the strategy action plans are operating.

The members of the GAP have asked that their specific areas of expertise be utilised better, particularly with regards departmental action plans, where we could support departments to develop meaningful plans rather than have them simply list on-going work. We have also suggested rather than a scatter gun approach that there would be concentration on a few key areas, eg representation, violence, health, and these would be carefully monitored. These suggestions have not been followed and it leads to questioning what exactly the advisory role consists of.

Q9. Has your involvement in this role proved an additional burden to your usual day-to-day role and responsibilities?
The meetings are infrequent enough that they do not pose a burden but sometimes continuity between meetings can be an issue, especially if I have to miss a meeting there may not be another one for may months, maybe some sort of online forum to keep people linked in to developments would help.

On a practical level I would point out that dates for the meetings are not set out in advance and that therefore i have had to miss some meetings because of other obligations. Again I do no feel the potential to harness the energy of the panel has been well used.

Travelling to and from meetings from a rural area to Belfast is time consuming and creates childcare implications if meetings are at 10am in Belfast.

Some useful information exchange and networking / contact with other GAP members.

My work on the xxxxxxxxxx board is voluntary so is in addition to my ‘day job’. My involvement on the panel adds a bit more to my xxxxxxxxxx responsibilities but is also valuable in terms of the xxxxxxxxxx responsibility I carry with regard to CEDAW.

as a member of the voluntary sector time commitments for involvement can be demanding

I am xxxxxxxxxx, and do most of my work for the xxxxxxxxxx in Ireland in a voluntary capacity. Meetings (and follow-up activities), therefore, impact upon my capacity to earn money and the amount of time that I can give to other areas of men's work. xxxxxxxxxx has few resources in Northern Ireland, little by way of infrastructure, and no policy workers to coordinate informed debate / decisions. For all of us, this is a tag-on to what we already struggle to do.

I have committed a lot of time to this - travel - (live in xxxxxxxxxx; Based in xxxxxxxxxx); GAP meetings; meetings with OFMDFM Staff; equality officers etc. and sometimes I have wondered what I have got out of it. There has been lots done but still more needs to be done.

There have been times when I, and other members of the GAP have worked over and above the role of attending meetings - eg, giving evidence to the OFMDFM committee regarding inaction on the GES, as a way of trying to move this forward. Some of us attended several meetings with NISRA, looking at a survey to test the Gender Equality Strategy. In the end, this came to nothing. Some of us also attended several meetings as an advisory group to look at the review of funding to the sector. It is an indication of our commitment that we are willing to undertake additional work.

**Q10. The Strategy presents a vision (page 14 of the Strategy): A society in which all men and women are equally respected and valued as individuals in all of our multiple identities, sharing equality of opportunity, rights and responsibilities in all aspects of our lives. Do you think this vision is adequate?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer Options</th>
<th>Response Percent</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>72.7%</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>27.3%</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Whilst there are significant issues which affect men, I think the disadvantaged position of women should be explicitly acknowledged within the strategy, this would bring the strategy in line with international obligations as per the CEDAW convention and would enable the strategy to be more targeted and effective in assisting those most disadvantaged.

I do not disagree with the vision statement, however I feel that as this is the Gender Equality Strategy it needs to spell out clearly the fundamental inequality, based on gender, between women and men. This current
The vision statement is gender neutral and therefore, in effect, gender blind to some of the major gendered issues which must be addressed in order to achieve true gender equality. (For example the majority of domestic and sexual violence is perpetrated by men against women.)

Adequate but maybe just so and with the potential of improving the language.

Think this is ok

The gender neutral thrust of this ignores the reality that women have structural barriers to equality that do not exist with men.

Q11. Do you think the Strategy has helped to make progress towards achieving this vision?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer Options</th>
<th>Response Percent</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>54.5%</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>45.5%</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q12. Please provide any further comments on the vision of the Strategy.

Unfortunately I think the strategy has been ineffective to date. There also appears to have been a serious lack of political drive to take it forward. On very, very fundamental issues eg provision of decent, affordable childcare there have been no tangible outcomes to date. This is in stark contrast to other countries where a greater measure of gender equality has been achieved.

The Strategy has helped to make progress but has fallen far short of its potential, I don't believe Gender Action Plans and gender mainstreaming are amongst Departmental priorities.

I think it did raise awareness of CEDAW and the Beijing Platform for Action and put women's equality under that lens and so also gave a focus to men's inequalities.

It has helped to some extent. I think in many respects the strategy was commendable. It referenced the international obligations and integrated these into the vision and targets. However, implementation of the strategy has certainly been a problem.

My actual answer to Question 11 would have been 'to some extent', but this wasn't an option. The Strategy reminds us of the framework and obligations needed to achieve this vision. However, on its own, it lacks the power / teeth to enforce it.

The vision is good but needs backed up with actions, including a mechanism for actually reporting on actions to targets for men's inequalities.

I think that there is still a lot of work to be done to ensure that policies are not gender neutral. There is occasion when special interventions are required for example in the Criminal Justice system there is a clear understanding that women on probation and in prison require a different 'women only service' to meet their particular needs.

There has been very little progress in terms of women's representation, access to reproductive health care, violence against women etc. While men have particular issues, male suicide, educational under-achievement, etc, there are particular reasons for these, that do not comprise overt discrimination and sexual oppression. The strategy should be capable of differentiating and not be afraid of positive action to support women.

Q13. The Strategy described a set of actions (page 15) around the role of Government in achieving the vision of the Strategy. In the broadest sense, would you say that these actions have been delivered, partially delivered or not delivered where possible:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer Options</th>
<th>Delivered</th>
<th>Partially delivered</th>
<th>Not delivered</th>
<th>Can’t say</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Improving protection against discrimination by improving legislative measures and keeping their effectiveness under review</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achieving a balance between men and women in representation and participation</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The active use of gender mainstreaming across all policy areas to identify structural inequalities which create gender inequality and taking mitigating action where appropriate</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The active use of ‘gender action measures’ including positive action as provided for within the Sex Discrimination Order 1976 to tackle gender inequalities and disadvantages</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q14. Do you think these actions are still relevant in their current form?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer Options</th>
<th>Still relevant</th>
<th>Not relevant</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Improving protection against discrimination by improving legislative measures and keeping their effectiveness under review</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achieving a balance between men and women in representation and participation</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The active use of gender mainstreaming across all policy areas to identify structural inequalities which create gender inequality and taking mitigating action where appropriate</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The active use of ‘gender action measures’ including positive action as provided for within the Sex Discrimination Order 1976 to tackle gender inequalities and disadvantages</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q15. Please provide any further comment on the role of Government as laid out in the Strategy.

The response and engagement across departments in respect of drawing up the Action Plans was painstakingly slow. There appears to be very little understanding of gender equality issues within government and indeed a positive resistance in some quarters. As stated earlier the lack of political champions has been very disappointing. A stark example of the lack of government's action in this area remains all the outstanding issues to be addressed in respect of the implementation of CEDAW for eg access to reproductive rights for women in Northern Ireland.

2.5 We recognise clearly that treating men and women the same - that is being ‘gender neutral’- is not the solution to eradicating gender inequality has simply not been taken into account in government planning and action within and through the delivery of their functions and these needs fundamentally to change.

I would be interested in hearing how this is promulgated.

There are very specific areas where actions in relation to the role of government have not been taken. This includes the lack of response from government to issues recommendations made by the CEDAW Committee in 2008 regarding the use of positive action measures to address the under representation of women in decision making; gender mainstreaming has not been used to identify and address structural inequalities and there continues to be evidence of ‘gender neutral’ approaches to policy making.
Government needs to focus upon a smaller number of priority issues / actions which will make a real and tangible difference, rather than reporting on a massive range of ‘tick box’ areas which, sometimes, have little direct relevance to gender equality.

I get the impression some times that government departments and statutory bodies and agencies feel that Section 75 implementation meets all the requirements on equality. Actions plans need to go further and tackle the root cause of some areas of inequality and put plans in place that will make a difference.

Government needs to take a clear lead, to be an enabling government.

Q16. The Strategy sets out four principles (page 16) to achieve the vision that departments and other relevant bodies committed to implementing. To what extent would you say these principles have been implemented?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer Options</th>
<th>Implemented by all relevant bodies</th>
<th>Implemented by some relevant bodies</th>
<th>Implemented by no relevant bodies</th>
<th>Can’t say</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Identifying a positive and proactive approach to the needs of men and women</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ensuring that gender stereotypes and sexism do not influence policy development and decision-making processes</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoting a partnership approach in developing policy and service delivery</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recognising and valuing the multiple identities of women and men in order to tackle disadvantage and discrimination</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q17. Do you think these principles are still relevant in their current form?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer Options</th>
<th>Still relevant</th>
<th>Not relevant</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Identifying a positive and proactive approach to the needs of men and women</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ensuring that gender stereotypes and sexism do not influence policy development and decision-making processes</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoting a partnership approach in developing policy and service delivery</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recognising and valuing the multiple identities of women and men in order to tackle disadvantage and discrimination</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q18. Please provide any further comment on the principles as laid out in the Strategy.

My positive comments relate to the domestic and sexual violence strategy and its Regional Strategic Group, on which I sit for xxxxxxxxxxxx, which has been an example of successful partnership which is worked at hard by all participants. The Gender Equality Panel and strategy has the same potential but needs to be driven forward by officials and a partnership model established that is not an ‘add-on’ but is genuinely engaged in promoting and monitoring the strategy and associated action plans.
Torn between ‘implemented by some’ and ‘can’t say’ for question 16 as I know there have been occasions of implementing the principles but I can’t quantify that. The principles are still relevant (question 17) but could be examined, explained and developed - eg ‘positive and proactive approach to the needs of men and women’ and the nature of partnership.

Q19. The Strategy aimed to pay particular attention to tackling key action areas. Do you think these key action areas are still relevant for inclusion in the Strategy?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer Options</th>
<th>Still relevant</th>
<th>Not relevant</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Childcare / Caring</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health &amp; Well-Being</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Representation in public life &amp; decision making</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education &amp; life long learning</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to employment</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender pay gap</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work-life balance</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stereotypes &amp; prejudices</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peace-building</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poverty</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender related violence</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q20. For those areas you think are no longer relevant, please provide further detail as to why.

All still extremely relevant!

Q21. Please detail any key action areas not included in the Strategy that you think are now relevant and should be included.

Discrimination linked to multiple identity

The lack of reproductive rights and the impact of this on equality for women. The impact of welfare reform measures now being implemented which research has proved will have a disproportionate effect on women.

Equity of delivery across NI of the key action areas. Rural areas continue to be under resourced heightening already existing inequalities.

Rights to economic independence? Maybe some more thinking on multiple inequalities.

Social security specifically - as opposed to being an aspect of poverty) (as there are now issues resulting from welfare reform clearer analysis and breakdown of health and well being - to include ageing.

There also needs to be actions around eliminating violence between young men & men. It is seen as an acceptable form of dealing with issues between men to use violence so a stronger message needs to be delivered that all forms of violence needs to be eliminated. Sexuality identity needs addressed in the Gender Strategy, to actively address inequalities experienced by those that identify themselves as other than heterosexual. To quote Catriona Ruane when she was Education Minister: “LGBT young people should have access to support and a full range of learning opportunities to help them develop to their full potential. I am keen to support any resource which gives youth workers the opportunity to understand more about the specific experiences facing all our young people.”

Self employment and enterprise. Mental Health

While peace building is included, there needs to be much more emphasis. including the legacy of the past and the role of women and women as victims etc.
Q22. The Strategy set out nine strategic objectives which it sought to achieve to promote gender equality. The objectives are summarised below. Please indicate how strongly you agree / disagree that progress has been made against these objectives.

1. To achieve better gender disaggregated data collection, analysis and dissemination to enhance gender-based analysis.
2. To ensure the economic security of both men and women.
3. To achieve equal value for paid work done by women and men and promote their equitable participation in the paid and unpaid labour force.
4. To improve the health of women and men, including their reproductive health.
5. To achieve gender balance on all government-appointed committees, boards and other relevant official bodies.
6. To ensure the active and equal participation of women and men at all levels of society.
7. To promote and protect the rights of girls and boys.
8. To eliminate gender-based violence in society.
9. To ensure women and men, including girls and boys, shall have equal access to education and lifelong learning.

Please indicate how strongly you agree / disagree that progress has been made against the strategic objectives in the Strategy.

Strongly Disagree Disagree Neither Agree / Disagree Agree Strongly Agree
Q23. Do you think these strategic objectives are still relevant in their current form?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer Options</th>
<th>Still relevant</th>
<th>Not relevant</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To achieve better gender disaggregated data collection, analysis and dissemination to enhance gender-based analysis.</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To ensure the economic security of both men and women.</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To achieve equal value for paid work done by women and men and promote their equitable participation in the paid and unpaid labour force.</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To improve the health of women and men, including their reproductive health.</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To achieve gender balance on all government-appointed committees boards and other relevant official bodies.</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To ensure the active and equal participation of women and men at all levels of society.</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To promote and protect the rights of girls and boys</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To eliminate gender based violence in society</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To ensure women and men, including girls and boys, shall have equal access to education and lifelong learning.</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q24. Please provide any further comment on the strategic objectives and their relevance as laid out in the Strategy.

Current government policy and the impact of the economic downturn has impact disproportionately upon women and therefore progress against the above objectives can not have been made significantly.

Comments earlier apply to this section. The monitoring of the Action Plans appeared slow and inconclusive.

It is impossible, in the face of figures, especially in relation to women's participation and men's health issues, to say the job has been done.

They are all still relevant as much more needs done to actively address them in wider society. Collection of men's data is vitally important as currently there isn't anyone responsible for that. A Men's Health Strategy will help with this, similar to the strategy in the South.

For example under economic security, the impact of the Welfare Reform Bill will have a bigger impact on women and this is an area that can go unchallenged if actions are not put in place.

This gender neutral approach obscures the fact that it is women who do not have equal participation etc - not men. And who are responsible for most gender based violence?

Q25. Are you familiar with the action plans and the content within them?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer Options</th>
<th>Response Percent</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q26. Do you think the current model of delivery (through departmental commitments through two discrete action plans) is the best way to deliver the Strategy through departments?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer Options</th>
<th>Response Percent</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>72.7%</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>27.3%</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There should be designated gender champions in departments who are accountable

The lack appears to be for a more vigorous driver for the action plans - and more partnership work, including with other departments.

This model has the potential to be effective if monitored and supported but is not currently efficient.

I think the model of the departmental action plans is good but it should be - more inter departmental - more intra departmental - reflective of mainstreaming measures - reflective of specific positive action measures

I have ticked 'no ' but am actually rather unsure about this. I do not think that the current model has been successful but whether this is due to the model or to other factors is a moot point. I do not know enough about the process of actually developing the action plans to comment on whether, if this was different, departments may have felt more ownership of the action plans and responsibility for the implementation of the measures.

Before the differing action plans there was no real sense of what was being done for men and women differently

I would support a strategy for women that has a clear focus on women's unequal status within society and which proposes remedies. Men's issues are of a different order and can be tackled through various departmental policies.

Q27. Given your knowledge of the action plans, would you say the aims and targets included adequately reflect the principles, key action areas and strategic objectives of the Strategy?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer Options</th>
<th>Response Percent</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>36.4%</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>36.4%</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>27.3%</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't have adequate knowledge of action plans</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q28. Do you think future action plans need to change, either in content, format or delivery?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer Options</th>
<th>Response Percent</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>90.9%</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>9.1%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

They need to be more focussed, time driven and outcomes monitored. Again there appears to be no driving force to keep the action plans rolling.

I think the Action Plans are not up to date and Departments generally failed to include any challenging actions or targets and in many cases failed to include some of the progressive work they are engaged in. If the content and delivery mechanisms were improved the format is sufficient.
As in answer to question 26.

Perhaps in all three respects. They do need to change in content as some issues have changed and some plans to not adequately reflect issues that departments should have been considering. It does seem that there has been a problem both with development and implementation and quite a bit of variability across departments with some very good work in some departments. I do not know enough to comment on the extent to which good practice is shared, or in fact to whether officials feel they have sufficient understanding of the substantive equality visioned by the international obligations. I am afraid that some of the Action Plans exhibit the ‘proceduralism’ that has come to be associated with S75

The Men’s Action Plans often look like an after-thought, and have little by way of practical actions that meet priority needs. It sometimes appears as if a number of government departments just felt they had to include something without giving much thought to what. The Action Plans need to: start with identifying a small number of key issues; set a timescale for delivery; rigorously review what progress (if any) has been made … At the moment, the whole process involves a huge paperchase, with few real outputs. The Plans also need to look at what is needed rather than what are we already doing.

Men’s Actions Plans need more detail and all government departments need to sign up to them. Like stated earlier, a way of monitoring men’s actions need to be implemented and government departments made accountable for the actions. At this stage, it’s not acceptable to say ‘there’s nothing in place to measure this with’

Clearer actions with annual review and achievement dates

They need to be pro-active, look at DARD as a model would be a start.

Q29. Departments have a responsibility under the Strategy to monitor and evaluate their actions included in the action plans. Do you think the Strategy has been adequately monitored to date?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer Options</th>
<th>Response Percent</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No - Not adequately monitored</td>
<td>90.9%</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No - Not monitored at all</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td>9.1%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q30. Please provide any further comment you may have on the Actions Plans 2008 – 2011.

Issues impacting on ethnic minority women are often inadequately addressed in the plans

I think the general lack of outcomes from these Action Plans should provide the focus for a sharp review, restructure and different approach to the next set of Action Plans. I would stress the value of a multi-departmental, cross agency partnership approach that develops shared learning, ownership of the strategy and action plans and a clear timebound, monitoring framework.

More awareness of the actions plans need to be circulated right throughout departments - it’s not just the responsibility of the equality departments

these should be reviewed annually and changes made where necessary to reflect current situations for example Welfare Reform

The GAP should have been having meetings with all departments, at which progress on action plans could have been discussed. Bringing all departments together in cafe style conversations was meaningless and no progress was made or understanding developed of what departments were doing.

Q31. Please indicate whether you agree or disagree with the following statements.
1. The Strategy and its progress have been monitored and reported on annually by the GAP (as stated in the Strategy document).

2. Action plans are fit for purpose in their current format.

3. The GAP has engaged with departments to assist and advise on their commitments within the action plans.

4. Involvement in the GAP is a good use of my time.

5. The GAP has advised and assisted in monitoring against the action plans.

6. The current monitoring process allows me to form judgement on the outcomes under the Strategy and its action plans.

7. The GAP has engaged positively with public bodies regarding gender issues, engagement that would not have happened without the GAP.

8. Given progress to date, I would say that the outcomes in the action plans for 2008 - 2011 were achieved.

Q32. Please provide any further comments you may have on the role, input, structure and progress of the GAP through the Strategy period to date.

Please see all earlier comments. I do not feel the GAP has been accorded a substantial lead role in the strategy nor has it had a key monitoring role of the Action Plans.

The role, input, structure and progress of the GAP through the Strategy period to date has fallen short of its potential. It needs much greater focus in the future if it is to perform the role it should do.

I wish question 31 hadn't been obligatory. There are issues about how the GAP operated and I will come back to this question if there isn't a later question to consider that.

GAP is an advisory body, which does not have the power to over-turn or stop decisions which it feels are inappropriate, or to initiate new developments / ways of working. While the Panel receives regular updates and reports, it doesn't actually 'monitor' anything per se. Rather, it is informed about progress and, in turn, gives feedback.

The GAP has very little input into plans or monitoring of plans.

Q33. Given your interactions with the GEU through your involvement in the GAP, please state how you feel regarding the role of the GEU in delivering the Strategy.
Q34. Do you have any thoughts on how the GAP and GEU could improve the effectiveness of their relationship and interactions in delivering the Strategy over its remaining period up to 2016?

Proactive Departmental champions and greater linkages between GES and other strategies

See earlier comments. A fundamental realignment needs to take place that will encourage real partnership working with all its benefits.

I think a much tighter focus on the role of the GAP is needed.

More information on how departments are monitoring and implementing actions, information on how departments perceive the strategy and how they see their role Unsure as the extent to which key public bodies are aware of Strategy and obligations required of them in relation to it. Could GEU have a stronger role in this respect?

More involvement of the GAP to help shape the departments actions plans Practice inputs from those involved Members of GAP having an input into shaping the agenda for GAP meetings - makes it more relevant to members - rather than things getting slotted in under AOB Host meetings outside of Stormont, particularly for those having to travel from regional locations

Regular meetings. Subject sub groups when required. Review of the TOR and an action plan for the GAP and GEU reviewed annually.

The agenda for meetings needs to allow for input by GAP members. There needs to be acceptance that the challenge role by GAP members is a constructive one, that we all want robust action plans and a robust strategy. Having meetings with individual departments would help with this.

Q35. Please provide any further comments you may have on the role, input, structure and progress of the GEU through the Strategy period to date.

I believe officials in the GEU have been working hard to fulfil a difficult task, however would again urge that a more open, partnership approach would be more productive for achieving good outcomes.
The role, input, structure and progress of the GEU through the Strategy period to date together with the GAP has fallen very short of its potential and initial role; this has had a detrimental effect on building relationships and awareness of gender issues across Departments.

As I am very much a newcomer to the Panel I cannot comment comprehensively on the past. however, I do get a sense currently of much stronger engagement on part of GEU with genuine desire to develop more effective working and achieve progress.

The GEU cannot force other government departments to do anything - even if this is necessary for progress to be made. There needs to be some mechanism to ensure compliance with the overall vision of the Strategy (outside the current role of the Equality Commission NI).

Relationships with staff have been build up and some progress made on different issues. When things seem to be happening, staff have moved on with little notice and this has an impact on what has happened. Notice of when key people are moving and more importantly, giving contact details of new staff asap to help with the interim period.

The GAP has always supported the GEU. In the past we have lobbied on behalf of the GEU to ensure that it had more resources to enable it to do its work. With the new personnel in place we hope that there are sufficient resources and political will for a fruitful partnership for the second half of the lifetime of the GES.

Q36. What would you say are the main successes /positive changes in gender equality during the Strategy period to date?

Successes are definitely in the area of domestic violence, with firm government support for victims. The development of the government's sexual violence strategy (soon to be merged with the domestic violence one) is also a great step forwards, particularly with the building of the new Sexual Assault Referral Centre.

The successes and positive changes to date have been driven by those Department's who have demonstrated an understanding of and commitment to the Strategy e.g. DARD.

There has been a heightened awareness of men's inequalities and issues and a greater awareness of CEDAW as a baseline.

Some progress re violence against women policies and services including new SARC Some progress re women in education - accessing STEM subjects etc - but continues to be issue re follow through into labour market.

It was important that men were included in the Strategy - despite the early attempts to exclude them from it. This was a brave step by the key members of the Gender Equality Unit during the time of development.

Getting men's inequalities into the actions plans

Recognition that gender neutral policies do not work. The networking of the sector Meeting to discuss issues hard to say

Q37. What would you say are the areas or issues where the Strategy has not worked well or could be improved?

Women's participation in key decision-making arenas is as low as it ever was, including in the Assembly. With the projected move to fewer Councils women's representation is projected to be even further decreased. This is an example of where gender equality is critical and where inaction by government is most pronounced. The issue of reproductive rights is generally sidelined although it is known internationally to be a fundamental issue that must be addressed to achieve gender equality.

Commitment and focus is not mirrored across Departments. The Strategy is simply not a consideration for some Departments or Bodies or indeed the Government at times.

Translation of the Strategy to an effective set of action plans.
women's representation in decision making reproductive health women and vocational training - better link to labour market and to jobs with adequate pay and progression. Vocational courses continue to be very stereotypically gender segregated. Overall - issue re departments and public bodies connection to the strategy and its commitments.

The Strategy talks about 'men's disadvantage' rather than 'inequality'. This needs to be changed. Also, the document often confuses (and inter-changes) the terms 'sex' and 'gender'.

Departments taking men's issues seriously Monitoring in place for men's actions plans

Set Action plan for the GAP

The Strategy is not referenced as a baseline strategy that should inform government policy - not even when the policy comes from OFMDFM. It is a matter of huge concern that the draft CSI policy did not reference the GES particularly in terms of representation and women's role in peace building. Nor has the 'Toward a Childcare Strategy' referenced the GES, which should be fundamental. It would therefore seem that policy makers are unaware of the GES or do not regard it as important in terms of influencing policy

Q38. What changes would you make AT THIS STAGE to the Strategy?

Develop a process to achieve multi ownership and a way to drive it forward.

I would revisit the role of the GAP and GEU and look at what can be achieved in the short term.

Refresh some of the language, consider where, other than language, there may be misunderstanding and look at the action plans.

At this stage a substantive focus should be on implementation of strategy commitments. An added dimension could be explicit positive measures re addressing political and public representation, clearer and more specific commitments to reproductive health issues; inclusion of equality in access to adequate and appropriate social security protection.

I would look to set effective and realistic Action Plans which target a limited number of key areas each year.

Needs developed more

Review TOR and duties for Panel Members. Calendar of meetings agreed for the year.

I would ensure it was disseminated - if it was an important living document, that would be a great improvement. And women's role in peace building etc given more prominence. The issue of quotas is more important than it was when the GES was first developed and I think that needs to be given serious consideration.

Q39. Broadly speaking, if you had to mark the Strategy out of 10 (where 1 is very poor and 10 is excellent) how would you rate the Strategy to date?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer Options</th>
<th>Response Percent</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q40. Do you think any successes /positive changes in gender equality since 2006 would have happened anyway, even without the Gender Equality Strategy?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer Options</th>
<th>Response Percent</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes - they would have happened anyway</td>
<td>40.0%</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No - they would not have happened without the Strategy</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In my view, no successes / positive changes have come from the Strategy</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q41. What would you say are the areas/issues which the Strategy needs to consider most between now and 2016?

All of above!!

In question 40, I do think it is important that the GES was there. Just more to be done. - positive action on women's participation (RPA and CSI are very immediate opportunities) - positive action on men and masculinities (men's role) - positive action on men's health including suicide

Men's needs - which are, broadly, seen as a tag-on to date.

Addressing Violence against men being an action Sexual Identity being included as an action

Childcare/caring Mental Health Economic issues - poverty Employment Life Long learning

Welfare reform and women's economic independence Quotas

Q42. Do you have any further comments at all on the Strategy and what this evaluation should consider in terms of the Strategy moving forwards?

The safe option will be to whitewash a little on the outcomes of the Strategy. I believe it would be more fruitful if the lack of progress was clearly acknowledged, with the obstacles noted, and a collective way forward was developed. It is finally in everyone's interests that this gender equality strategy is successful.

Would be interested in Equality Commission having a further discussion with the researchers.

Public bodies - HSC Trusts, Youth services etc

Just to say that a review is overdue and I am sure we can improve the work of the GAP going forward.

For the evaluation to be more than a tick box exercise. It needs to involve politicians, policy makers and civil society. Could OFMDFM organise an event which looks at the findings of the mid-term review and provides an opportunity for meaningful discussion?
## Appendix D – Indicators included in 2011 Gender Statistics publication

### EDUCATION

1.1 Proportion of persons of working age without a qualification, Labour Force Survey, 2009
1.2 Proportion of school leavers not achieving 5+ GCSEs (A*-C) or equivalent qualifications, School Leaver’s Survey, DENI, 2009/10
1.3 Proportion of school leavers not achieving 5+ GCSEs (A*-G) or equivalent qualifications, School Leaver’s Survey, DENI, 2009/10
1.4 Proportion of school leavers with no GCSEs, School Leaver’s Survey, DENI, 2009/10
1.5 Proportion of school leavers achieving no formal qualifications, School Leaver’s Survey, DENI, 2009/10
1.6 Highest qualification of school leavers (at least 5 GCSE's A*-C including equivalent qualifications), School Leaver’s Survey, DENI, 2009/10
1.7 Highest qualification of school leavers (2 or more A levels including equivalent qualifications), School Leaver’s Survey, DENI, 2009/10
1.8 Composition of GCSE full-time courses, CCEA, 2010
1.9 Composition of those achieving at least Grade C in GCE full-time courses, CCEA, 2010
1.10 Proportion of school leavers progressing to higher education institutions, School Leaver’s Survey, DENI, 2009/10
1.11 Proportion of school leavers progressing to further education institutions, School Leaver’s Survey, DENI, 2009/10
1.12 Composition of full-time enrolments at Northern Ireland higher education institutions by subject area, DEL, 2009/10
1.13 Proportion of full-time enrolments at Northern Ireland higher education institutions by subject area, DEL, 2009/10
1.14 Composition of full-time new entrant enrolments at further education institutions by subject area, DEL, 2009/10
1.15 Proportion of full-time new entrant enrolments at further education institutions by subject area, DEL, 2009/10
1.16 Northern Ireland domiciled students gaining qualifications at UK higher education institutions by qualifications obtained, DEL, 2009/10
1.17 Teachers in Northern Ireland by school type, DE, 2009/10
1.18 Full-time academic staff at NI Higher Education Institutions, DEL, 2009/10
1.19 Part-time academic staff at NI Higher Education Institutions, DEL, 2009/10

EMPLOYMENT
(all from 2009 Labour Force Survey, DETI unless stated otherwise)

2.1 Proportion of working age persons in employment
2.2 Proportion of working age persons who are unemployed
2.3 Proportion of people with a disability of working age in employment
2.4 Proportion of working age people aged 50+ in employment
2.5 Working age economic inactivity rates and main reasons for economic inactivity
2.6 Proportion of economic inactive persons of working age who would like a job
2.7 Proportion of working age persons in workless households
2.8 Proportion of working age adults living in work-rich households
2.9 Proportion of employees by standard occupational classification
2.10 Composition of employees by standard occupational classification
2.11 Proportion of employees by industry sector
2.12 Composition of employees by industry sector
2.13 Full-time/Part-time split of employees
2.14 Composition of full-time and part-time employees
2.15 Basic weekly hours, all employee jobs, Annual Survey of Hours and Earnings, DETI 2010
2.16 Median overtime hours worked, Annual Survey of Hours and Earnings, DETI 2010

EARNINGS
(all from 2010 Annual Survey of Hours and Earning, DETI)

3.1 Average full-time Gross Weekly Earnings
3.2 Median full-time gross weekly earnings
3.3 Ratio of the 10th percentile to 90th percentile of full-time gross weekly earnings (90/10 ratio)
3.4 Median full-time gross hourly earnings excluding overtime
3.5 Mean full-time gross hourly earnings excluding overtime
3.6 Ratio female/male full-time gross hourly earnings excluding overtime
3.7 Median part-time gross hourly earnings excluding overtime
3.8 Mean part-time gross hourly earnings excluding overtime
3.9 Ratio female/male part-time gross hourly earnings excluding overtime

INCOME AND POVERTY

4.1 Mean total individual income and composition by source of income, Individual Income Series, DSD, 2007/08
4.2 Single homeless households, Northern Ireland Housing Executive, 2008/09
4.3 Composition of working age adults and pensioners in low income households, Family Resources Survey, 2008/09
4.4 Risk of low-income for working age adults and pensioners, Family Resources Survey, 2008/09
4.5 Working age claimants of key benefits, DSD, 2010
4.6 Income Support claimants, DSD, 2010
4.7 Job Seekers Allowance claimants, DSD, 2010

CHILDCARE

5.1 Childcare places, DHSSPS, 2010
5.2 Pre-school places, DE, 2010/11

CARING

6.1 Informal adult carers by number of hours per week providing care, Family Resources Survey, 2008/09
6.2 Employment status of Informal adult carers, Family Resources Survey, 2008/09

HEALTH

7.2 Standardised death rates, Annual Report of the Registrar General, 2009
7.3 Sport or physical activity, Continuous Household Survey, 2009/10
7.4 General health self-reported as good, Continuous Household Survey, 2009/10
7.5 Reported limiting longstanding illness, Continuous Household Survey, 2009/10
7.6 Prevalence of cigarette smoking, Continuous Household Survey, 2009/10
7.7 Prevalence of alcohol consumption, Continuous Household Survey, 2008/09
7.8 Incidence of all cancers, Northern Ireland Cancer Registry, 2008
7.9 Incidence of lung cancer, Northern Ireland Cancer Registry, 2008
7.10 Deaths from suicide, General Registrar’s Office, 2009

TRANSPORT

8.1 Proportion of males and females with full driving license, Travel Survey for Northern Ireland, 2007-2009
8.2 Journeys by means of travel, Travel Survey for Northern Ireland, 2008/09
8.3 Journeys by purpose, Travel Survey for Northern Ireland, 2008/09
8.4 Seatbelt wearing rate of drivers, Northern Ireland Seatbelt Survey, 2010
8.5 Exceeding the speed limit, DOE Road Safety Monitor, 2010

VIOLENCE AND CRIME

9.1 Victims of domestic violence, PSNI, 2010/11
9.2 Effect of fear of crime on quality of life, Department of Justice, 2009/10
9.3 Adult victimisation rates by crime type, Department of Justice, 2009/10
9.5 Average Northern Ireland prison population, by sex, Department of Justice, 2009

DECISION MAKING ROLES

10.1 Senior management in the Northern Ireland Civil Service workforce, Human Resource Consultancy Services, 2010
10.2 Northern Ireland Health and Personal Social Services staff by occupational family, DHSSPS Workforce Census, 2010
Appendix E – Terms of Reference of Gender Advisory Panel
Gender Advisory Panel – Membership and Terms of Reference (September 2005-September 2006)

Background

In September 2004, OFMDFM issued a consultation document seeking views on proposals for a gender equality framework strategy. Responses to that consultation have identified a number of key issues with respect to gender equality including the future engagement with key stakeholders including representatives of women and men who reflect their multiple identities. To ensure continued engagement and a partnership approach to working with our stakeholders we propose to set up a gender advisory panel.

This document sets out the role, membership and business of the advisory panel.

Role of the Gender Advisory Panel

Working in partnership with the Gender Equality Unit the panel will advise and assist in the finalisation of the Gender Equality Framework Strategy and in the development and monitoring of the implementation of the action plans for women and men.

In advising the Gender Equality Unit members of the Panel will ensure that they reflect the views and opinions of their organisations and ensure that the multiple identities of their members are considered. The Gender Equality Unit will ensure that the views of the Panel are reflected in advice to the Minister.
Members of the Panel will ensure that information is appropriately provided by them to other interested groups and stakeholders.

**Membership**

Invited as members to the Gender Advisory Panel are representatives of women’s organisations, representatives of men’s organisations, the ECNI, NIC/ICTU and CBI.

The Panel will review its membership as work on the gender strategy and two action plans progresses.

**Chair**

A senior official from OFMDFM will chair the meetings with the Panel.

**Meetings**

Meetings will be held to facilitate progress on the development and completion of the final gender framework strategy and action plans for women and men. Members of the advisory panel will be given two optional dates 4 weeks in advance of a meeting. Discussion can also be completed by e-mail and post. Meetings with particular panel members may be held separately.

**Support**

The Gender Equality Unit will support meetings of the panel.

**Review**

These terms of reference will be kept under review as the work on the strategy and action plans progresses.