



Northern Ireland
Assembly

SECTION 75 SCREENING FORM

What is a policy?

The Equality Commission has defined 'policies' as 'all the ways a public authority carries out, or proposes to carry out, its function relating to Northern Ireland'. The Act defines 'functions' as including powers and duties.

These are effectively catch-all definitions which cover the Secretariat's policies, strategies, schemes, procedures and functions. You should remember that the Section 75 statutory duties apply to internal policies as well as external policies. If you are in doubt please contact the Equality Unit for advice.

Part 1 Policy scoping

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

Background to the Policy/Strategy/Procedure to be screened.

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

Revised policy has been developed to reflect changes in legislation and been agreed after consultation with Trade Union Side.

1. Policy Details

Name of the policy to be screened:

Injuries, Assault and Diseases policy

Is this policy new or revised?

Revised policy

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

The purpose of this policy is to outline procedures to be followed in relation to reporting accidents which occur on the premises involving employees, agency workers, contractors or members of the public. It also provides information where an employee is absent due to a work related accident or disease.

Who initiated or wrote the policy?

Human Resources Office in consultation with Health & Safety Office and Finance Office

Directorate responsible for devising and delivering the policy?

Corporate Services

2. Implementation factors

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

Yes No

If yes, are they

- Financial
- Legislative
- Other, please specify:

3. Main stakeholders affected

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

- Staff
- Service users
- other public sector organisations
- voluntary/community/trade unions
- Other, please specify : Contractors, Agency workers, members of the public

4. Other policies with a bearing on this policy

What are these policies? Please list:
 Managing Attendance policy

5. Consideration of available data/research *(This means any data or information you currently hold in relation to the policy or gathered during policy development).*

Evidence to inform the screening process may take many forms and should help you to decide who the policy might affect the most. It will also help ensure that your screening decision is informed by relevant data.

What evidence/information (both qualitative and quantitative) do you hold to inform your decision making process?

Section 75 category	Details of evidence/information											
Religious belief	The breakdown of Assembly Commission staff by community background as at 1.5.15 is as follows: <table border="1" style="margin: 10px auto; width: 80%;"> <thead> <tr> <th>Protestant</th> <th>Roman Catholic</th> <th>Non Determined</th> <th>Total</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">212</td> <td style="text-align: center;">144</td> <td style="text-align: center;">17</td> <td style="text-align: center;">373</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>				Protestant	Roman Catholic	Non Determined	Total	212	144	17	373
Protestant	Roman Catholic	Non Determined	Total									
212	144	17	373									
Political opinion	Click here to enter text.											

Racial group	Click here to enter text.																		
Age	<p>Quantitative data on workforce composition – data includes age of staff.</p> <p>As at 1.5.15, the staff composition was as follows:</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>AGE BAND</th> <th>NO OF STAFF</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Less than 21</td> <td>0</td> </tr> <tr> <td>21 - 30</td> <td>19</td> </tr> <tr> <td>31 - 40</td> <td>125</td> </tr> <tr> <td>41 - 50</td> <td>126</td> </tr> <tr> <td>51 - 60</td> <td>81</td> </tr> <tr> <td>61 - 65</td> <td>19</td> </tr> <tr> <td>66 and above</td> <td>3</td> </tr> <tr> <td>TOTAL</td> <td>373</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	AGE BAND	NO OF STAFF	Less than 21	0	21 - 30	19	31 - 40	125	41 - 50	126	51 - 60	81	61 - 65	19	66 and above	3	TOTAL	373
AGE BAND	NO OF STAFF																		
Less than 21	0																		
21 - 30	19																		
31 - 40	125																		
41 - 50	126																		
51 - 60	81																		
61 - 65	19																		
66 and above	3																		
TOTAL	373																		
Marital status	Click here to enter text.																		
Sexual orientation	Click here to enter text.																		
Men and women generally	<p>The breakdown of permanent staff by gender as at 1.5.15 is as follows:</p> <p>Male – 215 Female – 158</p>																		
Disability	12 staff completed the Annual Disability Audit in 2014 to indicate that they consider that they have a disability.																		
Dependants	Click here to enter text.																		

6. Current Assessment of Impact

Having looked at the data/information referred to above at point 5, what does this tell you are the needs, experiences and priorities for the people who fall into the groups below, in relation to your policy? And what is the actual or likely adverse impact on equality of opportunity for those affected by the policy. (See appendix 1 for information on levels of impact).

Section 75 category	Details of needs/experiences/priorities and details of policy impact	Level of Impact
Religious belief	None	None
Political opinion	None	None
Racial group	None	None
Age	None	None
Marital status	None	None
Sexual orientation	None	None
Men and women generally	None	None
Disability	None	None
Dependants	None	None

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

Part 2 Screening Questions

1 Are there any steps/actions which could be taken to reduce any adverse impact as addressed in question 6?		
Section 75 category	Issue	Mitigating Measure
Religious belief	The Policy will be applied to all staff irrespective of Section 75 category	None
Political opinion	As above	None
Racial group	As above	None
Age	As above	None
Marital status	As above	None
Sexual orientation	As above	None
Men and women generally	As above	None
Disability	As above	None
Dependants	As above	None

2. Is there an opportunity to better promote equality of opportunity and/or good relations in what you are proposing to do?

Please provide reasons.

No, the Policy sets out a procedure which applies to all staff.

3. Consultation

Tell us about who you have talked to about your proposals, either internally or externally, to help you decide if the policy needs further or no further equality investigation?

Consulted with Trade Union Side and senior HR management and decided that no further equality investigation was required

4 Disability Duties?

Consider whether the policy:

- a) Discourages disabled people from participating in public life and fails to promote positive attitudes towards disabled people.
This policy would not discourage disabled people from participating in public life.
- b) Provides an opportunity to better positive attitudes towards disabled people or encourages their participation in public life.
This policy does not impact on attitudes towards disabled people.

Additional considerations

Multiple identities

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

(For example; disabled minority ethnic people; disabled women; young Protestant men; and young lesbians, gay and bisexual people).

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

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

Part 3 Screening decision

1. If the decision is not to conduct an equality impact assessment (*none*), please provide details of the reasons.

No level of impact on any specific/multiple Section 75 categories has been identified

during screening

2. If the decision is not to conduct an equality impact assessment, but the policy has minor equality impacts which can be mitigated/provided by an alternative policy, and therefore does not require an EQIA (*minor*), provide details of the reason for the decision with proposed changes/amendments for an alternative policy to be introduced.

Not applicable

3. If the decision is to subject the policy to an equality impact assessment (*major*), please provide details of the reasons.

Not applicable

4. Timetabling and prioritising for EQIA

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

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

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

Priority criterion	Rating (1-3)
Effect on equality of opportunity and good relations	Click
Social need	Click
Effect on people’s daily lives	Click
Relevance to a public authority’s functions	Click

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

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

Yes No

If yes, please provide details

[Click here to enter text.](#)

Part 4 Monitoring

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

The Equality Commission for NI (ECNI) recommends that where a policy has been amended or an alternative policy introduced, the public authority should monitor more broadly for adverse impact.

See ECNI Monitoring Guidance for use by Public Authorities (July 2007) pages 9-10, paragraphs 2.13 – 2.20

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

What are these policies? Please list: We will monitor the implementation of the policy to ensure that there is no adverse impact arising from the policy.

Part 5 - Data Protection

1. If applicable, has legal advice been given due consideration?
Yes No N/A
2. Has due consideration been given to information security in relation to this policy?
Yes No

Part 6 - Approval and authorisation

Screened by:	Position/Job Title	Date
Diane Lamont Karen Martin	Senior HR Manager Deputy Head of HR	23.10.15
Approved by:		
Sinead McDonnell	Head of HR	19.11.15

Note: A copy of the Screening Template, for each policy screened should be 'signed off' and approved by a senior manager responsible for the policy. A copy of the completed screening template and any other relevant associated documentation should be forwarded to the Equality Manager.

The Equality Manager will make the completed screening template available on the NIA website as soon as possible following completion, and approval of the screening form.

Appendix 1 Screening Questions

Introduction

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

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

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

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

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

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

In favour of a ‘major’ impact

- a) The policy is significant in terms of its strategic importance;
- b) Potential equality impacts are unknown, because, for example, there is insufficient data upon which to make an assessment or because they are complex, and it would be appropriate to conduct an equality impact assessment in order to better assess them;
- c) Potential equality and/or good relations impacts are likely to be adverse or are likely to be experienced disproportionately by groups of people including those who are marginalised or disadvantaged;

- d) Further assessment offers a valuable way to examine the evidence and develop recommendations in respect of a policy about which there are concerns amongst affected individuals and representative groups, for example in respect of multiple identities;
- e) The policy is likely to be challenged by way of judicial review;
- f) The policy is significant in terms of expenditure.

In favour of 'minor' impact

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

In favour of none

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