



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.

This is a new Voluntary Exit Scheme (subsequently referred to in this document as “the Scheme”) that will operate under the terms already set out in the NIA terms and conditions of service and in line with the rules of the Civil Service Compensation scheme which came into effect on 1 April 2014. The Scheme will be open to all grades of staff.

A limited number of posts will be excluded from the Scheme on the basis that if vacated, they cannot be suppressed and cannot be filled by internal redeployment (at same grade) due to the specific qualifications and/or experience that the NIAC immediately requires for business continuity.

1. Policy Details

Name of the policy to be screened:

NIA Voluntary Exit Scheme 2015-16

Is this policy new or revised?

New policy

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

The objective of the Scheme is to effect a permanent paybill reduction in the 2015-16 financial year and beyond.

Who initiated or wrote the policy?

Human Resources Office

Directorate responsible for devising and delivering the policy?

The Human Resources Office is responsible for devising the Scheme in consultation with the Clerk/Chief Executive and is seeking endorsement by the Assembly Commission. The Human Resources Office is responsible for implementation/delivery of the Scheme.

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 : [Click here to enter text.](#)

4. Other policies with a bearing on this policy

What are these policies? Please list:

None

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	<p>The Scheme is voluntary and will be open to all grades of permanent Assembly Commission staff.</p> <p>A limited number of posts (7) will be excluded from the Scheme on the basis that if vacated, they cannot be suppressed and cannot be filled by internal redeployment (at same grade) due to the specific qualifications and/or experience that the NIAC <u>immediately</u> requires for business continuity.</p>

	<p>Community Background of staff in the <u>eligible</u> group as at 1.3.15</p> <p>207 Protestant (57%)</p> <p>141 Roman Catholic (38%)</p> <p>17 Non Determined (5%)</p>												
Political opinion	Click here to enter text.												
Racial group	Click here to enter text.												
Age	<p>Age profile of staff in the eligible group as at 1.3.15</p> <table> <thead> <tr> <th>Age</th> <th>Numbers</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>21-30</td> <td>20 (5%)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>31-40</td> <td>125 (34%)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>41-50</td> <td>120 (33%)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>51-60</td> <td>79 (22%)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Over 60</td> <td>21 (6%)</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Age	Numbers	21-30	20 (5%)	31-40	125 (34%)	41-50	120 (33%)	51-60	79 (22%)	Over 60	21 (6%)
Age	Numbers												
21-30	20 (5%)												
31-40	125 (34%)												
41-50	120 (33%)												
51-60	79 (22%)												
Over 60	21 (6%)												
Marital status	Click here to enter text.												
Sexual orientation	Click here to enter text.												
Men and women generally	<p>Gender statistics of staff in the eligible group as at 28.2.15</p> <p>211 Male (58%)</p> <p>154 Female (42%)</p>												
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 eligible 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 with the exclusion of a number of 'specific' posts.

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 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. This policy would not discourage disabled people from participating in public life.

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 Scheme to ensure that there is no adverse impact arising from the Scheme.

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	Senior HR Manager	9.3.15
Karen Martin	Deputy Head of HR	9.3.15
Approved by:		
Sinead McDonnell	Head of HR	9.3.15

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.