****

**Screening flowchart and template *(taken from Section 75 of the Northern Ireland Act 1998 – A Guide for public authorities April 2010 (Appendix 1)).***

**Introduction**

**Part 1. Policy scoping** – asks public authorities to provide details about the policy, procedure, practice and/or decision being screened and what available evidence you have gathered to help make an assessment of the likely impact on equality of opportunity and good relations.

**Part 2. Screening questions** – asks about the extent of the likely impact of the policy on groups of people within each of the Section 75 categories. Details of the groups consulted and the level of assessment of the likely impact. This includes consideration of multiple identity and good relations issues.

**Part 3. Screening decision** –guides the public authority to reach a screening decision as to whether or not there is a need to carry out an equality impact assessment (EQIA), or tointroducemeasures to mitigate the likely impact, or the introduction of an alternative policy to better promote equality of opportunity and/or good relations.

**Part 4. Monitoring** –provides guidance to public authorities on monitoring for adverse impact and broader monitoring.

**Part 5. Approval and authorisation** – verifies the public authority’s approval of a screening decision by a senior manager responsible for the policy.

A screening flowchart is provided overleaf.
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**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 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.

Public authorities should remember that the Section 75 statutory duties apply to internal policies (relating to people who work for the authority), as well as external policies (relating to those who are, or could be, served by the authority).

**Information about the policy**

|  |
| --- |
| Name of the policy  Witness Policy  Is this an existing, revised or a new policy?  Revised  What is it trying to achieve? (intended aims/outcomes)  The aim of the policy is to set out the standards of integrity required by those staff who may be called upon to provide evidence in court on behalf of the Office.  Are there any Section 75 categories which might be expected to benefit from the intended policy?  If so, explain how.  All categories should benefit.  Who initiated or wrote the policy?  Human Resources Manager.  Who owns and who implements the policy?  Chief Executive, SMT and Human Resources Manger |

**Implementation factors**

Are there any factors which could contribute to/detract from the intended aim/outcome of the policy/decision? No

If yes, are they

financial

legislative

other, please specify \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

**Main stakeholders affected**

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

x

staff

service users

other public sector organisations

voluntary/community/trade unions

X

other, please specify : Candidates for employment

##### [Other policies with a bearing on this policy](#Onefour)

* what are they?

Discipline Policy

* who owns them?

Human Resources Manager

**Available evidence**

Evidence to help inform the screening process may take many forms. Public authorities should ensure that their screening decision is informed by relevant data.

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

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Section 75 category** | **Details of evidence/information** |
| Religious belief | Staff in post as at 1 January 2017 (Source Fair Employment Monitoring Report):  48.8% Protestant Background  39.3% Roman Catholic Background  11.9% Non Determined Background |
| Political opinion | No relevant data |
| Racial group | No relevant data available |
| Age | Current Workforce (HR Report 14/4/2017)  5% Age 22-29  6% Age 30-34  11% Age 35-39  20% Age 40-44  18% Age 45-49  16% Age 50-54  13% Age 55-59  10% Age 60 – 64  1% Age > 65 |
| Marital status | 69% Married  7% Divorced  22% Single  1% Separated  1% Civil Partnership |
| Sexual orientation | No relevant data available |
| Men and women generally | Staff in post as at 1 January 2017 (Source Fair Employment Monitoring Report):  54% Female  46% Male  Females under represented at Senior Management Level.  Males under represented at Junior administrative, customer service and secretarial level. |
| Disability | 4% staff with a disability |
| Dependants | No relevant data |

**Needs, experiences and priorities**

Taking into account the information referred to above, what are the different needs, experiences and priorities of each of the following categories, in relation to the particular policy/decision? Specify details for each of the Section 75 categories

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Section 75 category** | **Details of needs/experiences/priorities** |
| Religious belief | None identified |
| Political opinion | None identified |
| Racial group | None identified |
| Age | None identified |
| Marital status | None identified |
| Sexual orientation | None identified |
| Men and women generally | None identified |
| Disability | None identified |
| Dependants | None Identified |

**Part 2. Screening questions**

**Introduction**

In making a decision as to whether or not there is a need to carry out an equality impact assessment, the public authority should consider its answers to the questions 1-4 which are given on pages 66-68 of this Guide.

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

If the public authority’s 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 the public authority’s 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**

1. The policy is significant in terms of its strategic importance;
2. 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;
3. 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;
4. 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;
5. The policy is likely to be challenged by way of judicial review;
6. The policy is significant in terms of expenditure.

**In favour of ‘minor’ impact**

1. The policy is not unlawfully discriminatory and any residual potential impacts on people are judged to be negligible;
2. 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;
3. 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;
4. By amending the policy there are better opportunities to better promote equality of opportunity and/or good relations.

**In favour of none**

1. The policy has no relevance to equality of opportunity or good relations.
2. 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.

Taking into account the evidence presented above, consider and comment on the likely impact on equality of opportunity and good relations for those affected by this policy, in any way, for each of the equality and good relations categories, by applying the screening questions given overleaf and indicate the level of impact on the group i.e. minor, major or none.**Screening questions**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **1** What is the likely impact on equality of opportunity for those affected by this policy, for each of the Section 75 equality categories? minor/major/none | | |
| Section 75 category | Details of policy impact | Level of impact? minor/major/none |
| Religious belief | It is not anticipated that the policy will impact on equality of opportunity in this category. All employees will be treated fairly and consistently in line with the policy. | None |
| Political opinion | It is not anticipated that the policy will impact on equality of opportunity in this category. All employees will be treated fairly and consistently in line with the policy. | None |
| Racial group | It is not anticipated that the policy will impact on equality of opportunity in this category. All employees will be treated fairly and consistently in line with the policy. | None |
| Age | It is not anticipated that the policy will impact on equality of opportunity in this category. All employees will be treated fairly and consistently in line with the policy. | None |
| Marital status | It is not anticipated that the policy will impact on equality of opportunity in this category. All employees will be treated fairly and consistently in line with the policy. | None |
| Sexual orientation | It is not anticipated that the policy will impact on equality of opportunity in this category. All employees will be treated fairly and consistently in line with the policy. | None |
| Men and women generally | It is not anticipated that the policy will impact on equality of opportunity in this category. All employees will be treated fairly and consistently in line with the policy. | None |
| Disability | It is not anticipated that the policy will impact on equality of opportunity in this category. All employees will be treated fairly and consistently in line with the policy. | None |
| Dependants | It is not anticipated that the policy will impact on equality of opportunity in this category. All employees will be treated fairly and consistently in line with the policy. | None |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **2** Are there opportunities to better promote equality of opportunity for people within the Section 75 equalities categories? | | |
| Section 75 category | If **Yes**, provide details | If **No**, provide reasons |
| Religious belief |  | No the policy is intended to be applied equitably across all Section 75 categories. |
| Political opinion |  | No the policy is intended to be applied equitably across all Section 75 categories. |
| Racial group |  | No the policy is intended to be applied equitably across all Section 75 categories. |
| Age |  | No the policy is intended to be applied equitably across all Section 75 categories. |
| Marital status |  | No the policy is intended to be applied equitably across all Section 75 categories. |
| Sexual orientation |  | No the policy is intended to be applied equitably across all Section 75 categories. |
| Men and women generally |  | No the policy is intended to be applied equitably across all Section 75 categories. |
| Disability |  | No the policy is intended to be applied equitably across all Section 75 categories. |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **3** To what extent is the policy likely to impact on good relations between people of different religious belief, political opinion or racial group? minor/major/none | | | |
| Good relations category | Details of policy impact | | Level of impact minor/major/none |
| Religious belief | It is unknown if the policy will have an impact on good relations. | | None |
| Political opinion | It is unknown if the policy will have an impact on good relations. | | None |
| Racial group | It is unknown if the policy will have an impact on good relations. | | None |
| **4** Are there opportunities to better promote good relations between people of different religious belief, political opinion or racial group? | | | |
| Good relations category | If **Yes**, provide details | If **No**, provide reasons | |
| Religious belief |  | The Office does not think it can make any adjustments to the current policy which could make a contribution to the promotion of good relations. | |
| Political opinion |  | The Office does not think it can make any adjustments to the current policy which could make a contribution to the promotion of good relations. | |
| Racial group |  | The Office does not think it can make any adjustments to the current policy which could make a contribution to the promotion of good relations. | |

**Additional considerations**

**Multiple identity**

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).*

There is no available evidence which could inform the impact of this policy.

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

**Part 3. Screening decision**

If the decision is not to conduct an equality impact assessment, please provide details of the reasons.

|  |
| --- |
| The Office does not believe this policy would have a major impact and therefore an EQIA is not necessary. |

If the decision is not to conduct an equality impact assessment the public authority should consider if the policy should be mitigated or an alternative policy be introduced.

|  |
| --- |
| No negative impact is anticipated therefore mitigation or an alternative policy is not appropriate. |

If the decision is to subject the policy to an equality impact assessment, please provide details of the reasons.

|  |
| --- |
| N/A |

All public authorities’ equality schemes must state the authority’s arrangements for assessing and consulting on the likely impact of policies adopted or proposed to be adopted by the authority on the promotion of equality of opportunity. The Commission recommends screening and equality impact assessment as the tools to be utilised for such assessments. Further advice on equality impact assessment may be found in a separate Commission publication: Practical Guidance on Equality Impact Assessment.

**Mitigation**

When the public authority concludes that the likely impact is ‘minor’ and an equality impact assessment is not to be conducted, the public authority may consider mitigation to lessen the severity of any equality impact, or the introduction of an alternative policy to better promote equality of opportunity or good relations.

Can the policy/decision be amended or changed or an alternative policy introduced to better promote equality of opportunity and/or good relations?

If so, give the **reasons** to support your decision, together with the proposed changes/amendments or alternative policy.

|  |
| --- |
| N/A |

**Timetabling and prioritising**

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 |  |
| Social need |  |
| Effect on people’s daily lives |  |
| Relevance to a public authority’s functions |  |

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 public authority in timetabling. Details of the Public Authority’s Equality Impact Assessment Timetable should be included in the quarterly Screening Report.

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

If yes, please provide details

**Part 4. Monitoring**

Public authorities should consider the guidance contained in the Commission’s Monitoring Guidance for Use by Public Authorities (July 2007).

The Commission recommends that where the policy has been amended or an alternative policy introduced, the public authority should monitor more broadly than for adverse impact (See Benefits, P.9-10, paras 2.13 – 2.20 of the Monitoring Guidance).

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

**Part 5 - Approval and authorisation**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Screened by:** | **Position/Job Title** | **Date** |
| Paula Gillespie | HR Manager | 29/12/2017 |
| **Approved by:** |  |  |
| Olwen Laird | Director of Corporate Services | 05/01/2018 |

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, made easily accessible on the public authority’s website as soon as possible following completion and made available on request.