Section 75 Policy Screening Form

Part 1: Policy Scoping

The first stage of the screening process involves scoping the policy or policy area. 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.

You 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 or policy area: FINANCE

Is this an existing, revised or a new policy/policy area?

Existing	Revised	New
	X	

Brief Description
The policies that have been reviewed in the third quarter
-        Business Case Policy (Revised)
-        Disposal Policy (Revised)

What is it trying to achieve? (intended aims and outcomes)

To ensure the Agency has a robust finance system to safeguard the public purse.

Are there any Section 75 categories which might be expected to benefit from the intended policy?

YES	NO	N/A
	X	

If YES, explain how.

.

Who initiated or wrote the policy?

==The policy was written by==   The Ulster Scots Agency

Who owns and who implements each element of the policy?

==Policy is led by==   Finance Department

Implementation factors

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

YES	NO	N/A
	x	

If YES, are they

Financial: YES (If YES, please detail)
No

Legislative: Y / N (If YES, please detail)

Other, please specify:

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:

<u>Other policies with a bearing on this policy</u>

What are they and who owns them?
<u>Available evidence</u>

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 relevant Section 75 categories.

Section 75 Category	Details of Evidence/Information
ALL	The policies are formed using good practice guidance from the Northern Ireland Audit Office, Internal Audit and the knowledge and professionalism of existing staff.

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
ALL	N/A

Part 2: Screening Questions

Introduction

1. If the conclusion is **none** in respect of all of the Section 75 categories, then you may decide to screen the policy <u>out</u>. If a policy is 'screened out', you should give details of the reasons for the decision taken.
2. If the conclusion is **major** in respect of one or more of the Section 75 categories, then consideration should be given to subjecting the policy to an EQIA.
3. If the conclusion is **minor** in respect of one or more of the Section 75 categories, then consideration should still be given to proceeding with an EQIA, or to measures to mitigate the adverse impact; or an alternative policy.

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 hence it would be appropriate to conduct an EQIA;
   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 among 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.

Taking into account the earlier evidence, consider and comment on the likely impact on equality of opportunity / good relations for those affected by this policy, by applying the following screening questions and the 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 grounds? **Minor/Major/None**	
Section 75 Category	**Details of Policy Impact**	**Level of Impact? Minor/Major/None**
Religious belief	None	None
Political opinion	None	None
Racial / ethnic 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

2 Are there opportunities to better promote equality of opportunity for people within any of the Section 75 categories?		
Section 75 Category	If **Yes**, provide details	If **No**, provide reasons
		No, the policies are all inclusive

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	Some religions do not deal with credit cards.	Minor
Political opinion		
Racial group		

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
		No, the policies are all inclusive.

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).

None

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

In light of your answers to the previous questions, do you feel that the policy should: (please underline one):

1. Not be subject to an EQIA (with no mitigating measures required)

2. Not be subject to an EQIA (with mitigating measures /alternative policies)

3. Not be subject to an EQIA at this time

4. Be subject to an EQIA

If 1. or 2. (i.e. not be subject to an EQIA), please provide details of the reasons why:

We do not require EQIA as the strategy does not adversely affect any of the Section 75 categories
Terms and Conditions of all contracts include reference to equality of opportunity

If 2. (i.e. not be subject to an EQIA), in what ways can identified adverse impacts attaching to the policy be mitigated or an alternative policy be introduced?

In light of these revisions, is there a need to re-screen the revised/alternative policy at a future date? YES / NO

If 3. or 4. (i.e. <u>to conduct an EQIA</u>), please provide details of the reasons:

Timetabling and Prioritising EQIA

If 3. or 4., is the policy affected by timetables established by other relevant public authorities? YES / NO

If YES, please provide details:

```



```

Please answer the following questions to determine priority for timetabling the EQIA. 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 EQIA.

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 EQIA. This list of priorities will assist you in timetabling the EQIA. Details of your EQIA timetable should be included in the quarterly Section 75 report.

Proposed date for commencing EQIA: _____

Any further comments on the screening process and any subsequent actions?

Part 4: Monitoring

Effective monitoring will help identify any future adverse impacts arising from the policy which may lead you to conduct an EQIA, as well as help with future planning and policy development. You 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, then you should monitor more broadly than for adverse impact (See Benefits, P.9-10, paras 2.13 – 2.20 of the Monitoring Guidance).

Please detail proposed monitoring arrangements below:

Policy will be reviewed every 3 years unless there is mitigating circumstances to review before the period has lapsed.

Part 5: Approval and Authorisation

Screened by:	Position/Job Title	Date
David McCallum	Director of Corporate Services	29/03/2019
Lorna Elliott	HR/Office Manager	29/03/2019
Approved by:		
Ian Crozier	CEO	29/03/2019

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 your website as soon as possible following completion and made available on request.

Section 75 Policy Screening Form

Part 1: Policy Scoping

The first stage of the screening process involves scoping the policy or policy area. 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.

You 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 or policy area: Essential Car Users
Including Car Parking Policy

Is this an existing, revised or a new policy/policy area?

Existing	Revised	New
	X	

Brief Description

Essential users are those whose duties are of such a nature that it is essential for them to have a car available whenever required. Casual users are those for whom it is desirable that a car should be available when required. It is the requirement of the post which determines whether an employee is an essential or casual car user. Any employee who is not deemed to be an essential car user will be classed as a casual car user.

What is it trying to achieve? (intended aims and outcomes)

To ensure car related expenditure is a prerequisite of the position and that conditions are applied fairly and achieve maximum value for money for the public purse.

Are there any Section 75 categories which might be expected to benefit from the intended policy?

YES	NO	N/A
	X	

If YES, explain how.

Who initiated or wrote the policy?

The policy was written by   Ulster Scots Agency

Who owns and who implements each element of the policy?

Policy is led by   Ulster Scots Agency

Implementation factors

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

YES	NO	N/A
	X	

If YES, are they

Financial: YES (If YES, please detail)

Legislative: Y / N (If YES, please detail)

Other, please specify:

Main stakeholders affected

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

Staff: Yes

Service users: No

Other public sector organisations: No

Voluntary/community/trade unions: No

Other, please specify:

Other policies with a bearing on this policy

What are they and who owns them?

Owned by the Ulster Scots Agency

1. Travel & Subsistence Policy

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 relevant Section 75 categories.

Section 75 Category	Details of Evidence/Information
ALL	We have used the NICS as policy and procedures for the basis of our policy.

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
ALL	N/A

Part 2: Screening Questions

Introduction

1. If the conclusion is **none** in respect of all of the Section 75 categories, then you may decide to screen the policy <u>out</u>. If a policy is 'screened out', you should give details of the reasons for the decision taken.

2. If the conclusion is **major** in respect of one or more of the Section 75 categories, then consideration should be given to subjecting the policy to an EQIA.

3. If the conclusion is **minor** in respect of one or more of the Section 75 categories, then consideration should still be given to proceeding with an EQIA, or to measures to mitigate the adverse impact; or an alternative policy.

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 hence it would be appropriate to conduct an EQIA;
   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 among 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.

Taking into account the earlier evidence, consider and comment on the likely impact on equality of opportunity / good relations for those affected by this policy, by applying the following screening questions and the 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 grounds? **Minor/Major/None**		
Section 75 Category	**Details of Policy Impact**	**Level of Impact? Minor/Major/None**
Religious belief	N/A	
Political opinion	N/A	
Racial / ethnic group	N/A	
Age	N/A	
Marital status	N/A	
Sexual orientation	N/A	
Men and women generally	N/A	
Disability	N/A	
Dependants	N/A	

2 Are there opportunities to better promote equality of opportunity for people within any of the Section 75 categories?		
Section 75 Category	If **Yes**, provide details	If **No**, provide reasons
		No. These are blanket policies which apply to everyone with no exceptions

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	N/A	
Political opinion	N/A	
Racial group	N/A	

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
		No. These are blanket policies which apply to everyone with no exceptions

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).

N/A

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

N/A

Part 3: Screening Decision

In light of your answers to the previous questions, do you feel that the policy should: (please underline one):

1. Not be subject to an EQIA (with no mitigating measures required)

2. Not be subject to an EQIA (with mitigating measures /alternative policies)

3. Not be subject to an EQIA at this time

4. Be subject to an EQIA

If 1. or 2. (i.e. not be subject to an EQIA), please provide details of the reasons why:

We do not require EQIA as the strategy does not adversely affect any of the Section 75 categories
Terms and Conditions of all contracts include reference to equality of opportunity

If 2. (i.e. not be subject to an EQIA), in what ways can identified adverse impacts attaching to the policy be mitigated or an alternative policy be introduced?

In light of these revisions, is there a need to re-screen the revised/alternative policy at a future date? YES / NO

If 3. or 4. (i.e. to conduct an EQIA), please provide details of the reasons:

Timetabling and Prioritising EQIA

If 3. or 4., is the policy affected by timetables established by other relevant public authorities? YES / NO

If YES, please provide details:

```

```

Please answer the following questions to determine priority for timetabling the EQIA. 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 EQIA.

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 EQIA. This list of priorities will assist you in timetabling the EQIA. Details of your EQIA timetable should be included in the quarterly Section 75 report.

Proposed date for commencing EQIA: _____

Any further comments on the screening process and any subsequent actions?

Part 4: Monitoring

Effective monitoring will help identify any future adverse impacts arising from the policy which may lead you to conduct an EQIA, as well as help with future planning and policy development. You 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, then you should monitor more broadly than for adverse impact (See Benefits, P.9-10, paras 2.13 – 2.20 of the Monitoring Guidance).

Please detail proposed monitoring arrangements below:

Policy will be reviewed every 3 years unless there is mitigating circumstances to review before the period has lapsed.

Part 5: Approval and Authorisation

Screened by:	Position/Job Title	Date
David McCallum	Director of Corporate Services	28/06/2019
Lorna Elliott	HR/Office Manager	28/06/2019
Approved by:		
Ian Crozier	CEO	28/06/19

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 your website as soon as possible following completion and made available on request.

Section 75 Policy Screening Form

Part 1: Policy Scoping

The first stage of the screening process involves scoping the policy or policy area. 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.

You 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 or policy area: IT Policies

Is this an existing, revised or a new policy/policy area?

Existing	Revised	New
	X	

Brief Description

Mobile IT Equipment - It defines the requirements to minimise the security risks associated with mobile equipment and ensures that the person allocated the equipment assumes the appropriate level of responsibility for its security.

Mobile Phone Policy - This policy is about the use of mobile phones and similar devices

What is it trying to achieve? (intended aims and outcomes)

Protect data assets and IT Assets

Are there any Section 75 categories which might be expected to benefit from the intended policy?

	YES	NO	N/A	
If YES, explain		X		how.

.
Who initiated or wrote the policy?

The policy was written by   Ulster Scots Agency

Who owns and who implements each element of the policy?

Policy is led by   Ulster Scots Agency

Implementation factors

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

YES	NO	N/A
	X	

If YES, are they

Financial: YES (If YES, please detail)

Legislative: Y / N (If YES, please detail)

Other, please specify:

Main stakeholders affected

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

Staff: Yes

Service users: Yes

Other public sector organisations: No

Voluntary/community/trade unions: No

Other, please specify:

Other policies with a bearing on this policy

What are they and who owns them?

Owned by the Ulster Scots Agency

Email Usage & Internet Usage Policies

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 relevant Section 75 categories.

Section 75 Category	Details of Evidence/Information
ALL	We have investigated policies from similar organisations and taken the lead from similar policies and good practice guides. Also Internal Audit recommendations applied when reviewing policies

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
ALL	N/A

Part 2: Screening Questions

Introduction

1. If the conclusion is **none** in respect of all of the Section 75 categories, then you may decide to screen the policy <u>out</u>. If a policy is 'screened out', you should give details of the reasons for the decision taken.

2. If the conclusion is **major** in respect of one or more of the Section 75 categories, then consideration should be given to subjecting the policy to an EQIA.

3. If the conclusion is **minor** in respect of one or more of the Section 75 categories, then consideration should still be given to proceeding with an EQIA, or to measures to mitigate the adverse impact; or an alternative policy.

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 hence it would be appropriate to conduct an EQIA;
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 among 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.

Taking into account the earlier evidence, consider and comment on the likely impact on equality of opportunity / good relations for those affected by this policy, by applying the following screening questions and the 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 grounds? **Minor/Major/None**	
Section 75 Category	**Details of Policy Impact**	**Level of Impact? Minor/Major/None**
Religious belief	N/A	
Political opinion	N/A	
Racial / ethnic group	N/A	
Age	N/A	
Marital status	N/A	
Sexual orientation	N/A	
Men and women generally	N/A	
Disability	N/A	
Dependants	N/A	

2 Are there opportunities to better promote equality of opportunity for people within any of the Section 75 categories?		
Section 75 Category	If **Yes**, provide details	If **No**, provide reasons
		No. These are blanket policies which apply to everyone with no exceptions

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	N/A	
Political opinion	N/A	
Racial group	N/A	

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
		No. These are blanket policies which apply to everyone with no exceptions

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).

N/A

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

N/A

Part 3: Screening Decision

In light of your answers to the previous questions, do you feel that the policy should: (please underline one):

1. Not be subject to an EQIA (with no mitigating measures required)

2. Not be subject to an EQIA (with mitigating measures /alternative policies)

3. Not be subject to an EQIA at this time

4. Be subject to an EQIA

If 1. or 2. (i.e. not be subject to an EQIA), please provide details of the reasons why:

We do not require EQIA as the strategy does not adversely affect any of the Section 75 categories
Terms and Conditions of all contracts include reference to equality of opportunity

If 2. (i.e. not be subject to an EQIA), in what ways can identified adverse impacts attaching to the policy be mitigated or an alternative policy be introduced?

In light of these revisions, is there a need to re-screen the revised/alternative policy at a future date? YES / NO

If 3. or 4. (i.e. to conduct an EQIA), please provide details of the reasons:

Timetabling and Prioritising EQIA

If 3. or 4., is the policy affected by timetables established by other relevant public authorities? YES / NO

If YES, please provide details:

Please answer the following questions to determine priority for timetabling the EQIA. 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 EQIA.

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 EQIA. This list of priorities will assist you in timetabling the EQIA. Details of your EQIA timetable should be included in the quarterly Section 75 report.

Proposed date for commencing EQIA: _____

Any further comments on the screening process and any subsequent actions?

Part 4: Monitoring

Effective monitoring will help identify any future adverse impacts arising from the policy which may lead you to conduct an EQIA, as well as help with future planning and policy development. You 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, then you should monitor more broadly than for adverse impact (See Benefits, P.9-10, paras 2.13 – 2.20 of the Monitoring Guidance).

Please detail proposed monitoring arrangements below:

Policy will be reviewed every three years.

Part 5: Approval and Authorisation

Screened by:	Position/Job Title	Date
David McCallum	Director of Corporate Services	28/06/2019
Lorna Elliott	HR/Office Manager	28/06/2019
Approved by:		
Ian Crozier	CEO	28/06/2019

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 your website as soon as possible following completion and made available on request.

Section 75 Policy Screening Form

Part 1: Policy Scoping

The first stage of the screening process involves scoping the policy or policy area. 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.

You 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 or policy area: IT Policies and Procedures

- Internet Usage

Is this an existing, revised or a new policy/policy area?

Existing	Revised	New
	X	

Brief Description

Internet Usage Policy - The purpose of the Agency's internet acceptable use policy is to ensure that proper use is made of the access to the Internet granted by the Agency; to establish rules for the user's conduct when using the Internet; and make users aware of what the Agency deems as acceptable and unacceptable use of the Internet system.

What is it trying to achieve? (intended aims and outcomes)

Protection of data assets and IT Assets and to mitigate against reputational risk.

Are there any Section 75 categories which might be expected to benefit from the intended policy?

YES	NO	N/A
	X	

If YES, explain how.

.

Who initiated or wrote the policy?

The policy was written by the Ulster Scots Agency

Who owns and who implements each element of the policy?

Policy is led by   Corporate Services

Implementation factors

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

YES	NO	N/A
	X	

If YES, are they

Financial: YES (If YES, please detail)
No

Legislative: Y / N (If YES, please detail)

Other, please specify:

Main stakeholders affected

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

Staff: Yes

Service users: Yes

Other public sector organisations: Yes

Voluntary/community/trade unions: Yes

Other, please specify:

Other policies with a bearing on this policy

What are they and who owns them? Policies owned by the Agency

- Display Screen Equipment DSE
- Data Protection Policy (North)
- Data protection Policy (South)
- IT Security Policy
- Information Risk Management Policy
- Email Usage Policy
- Mobile IT Equipment Loan Policy
- Mobile Phone Equipment Policy
- Social Media Policy

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 relevant Section 75 categories.

Section 75 Category	Details of Evidence/Information

ALL	We have investigated policies from similar organisations and taken the lead from similar policies and good practice guides. Also Internal Audit recommendations applied when reviewing policies

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

ALL	N/A 5

Part 2: Screening Questions

Introduction

1. If the conclusion is **none** in respect of all of the Section 75 categories, then you may decide to screen the policy out. If a policy is 'screened out', you should give details of the reasons for the decision taken.

2. If the conclusion is **major** in respect of one or more of the Section 75 categories, then consideration should be given to subjecting the policy to an EQIA.

3. If the conclusion is **minor** in respect of one or more of the Section 75 categories, then consideration should still be given to proceeding with an EQIA, or to measures to mitigate the adverse impact; or an alternative policy.

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 hence it would be appropriate to conduct an EQIA;
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 among 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.

Taking into account the earlier evidence, consider and comment on the likely impact on equality of opportunity / good relations for those affected by this policy, by applying the following screening questions and the 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 grounds? **Minor/Major/None**	
Section 75 Category	**Details of Policy Impact**	**Level of Impact? Minor/Major/None**
Religious belief	N/A	
Political opinion	N/A	
Racial / ethnic group	N/A	
Age	N/A	
Marital status	N/A	
Sexual orientation	N/A	
Men and women generally	N/A	
Disability	N/A	
Dependants	N/A	

2 Are there opportunities to better promote equality of opportunity for people within any of the Section 75 categories?		
Section 75 Category	If **Yes**, provide details	If **No**, provide reasons
		No. These are blanket policies which apply to everyone with no exceptions

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		No. These are blanket policies which apply to everyone with no exceptions
Political opinion		No. These are blanket policies which apply to everyone with no exceptions
Racial group		No. These are blanket policies which apply to everyone with no exceptions

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
		No. These are blanket policies which apply to everyone with no exceptions

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).

> N/A

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

> N/A

Part 3: Screening Decision

In light of your answers to the previous questions, do you feel that the policy should: (please underline one):

1. Not be subject to an EQIA (with no mitigating measures required)

2. Not be subject to an EQIA (with mitigating measures /alternative policies)

3. Not be subject to an EQIA at this time

4. Be subject to an EQIA

If 1. or 2. (i.e. not be subject to an EQIA), please provide details of the reasons why:

We do not require EQIA as the strategy does not adversely affect any of the Section 75 categories
Terms and Conditions of all contracts include reference to equality of opportunity

If 2. (i.e. not be subject to an EQIA), in what ways can identified adverse impacts attaching to the policy be mitigated or an alternative policy be introduced?

In light of these revisions, is there a need to re-screen the revised/alternative policy at a future date? YES / NO

If 3. or 4. (i.e. <u>to conduct an EQIA</u>), please provide details of the reasons:

Timetabling and Prioritising EQIA

If 3. or 4., is the policy affected by timetables established by other relevant public authorities? YES / NO

If YES, please provide details:

Please answer the following questions to determine priority for timetabling the EQIA. 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 EQIA.

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 EQIA. This list of priorities will assist you in timetabling the EQIA. Details of your EQIA timetable should be included in the quarterly Section 75 report.

Proposed date for commencing EQIA: _____

Any further comments on the screening process and any subsequent actions?

Part 4: Monitoring

Effective monitoring will help identify any future adverse impacts arising from the policy which may lead you to conduct an EQIA, as well as help with future planning and policy development. You 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, then you should monitor more broadly than for adverse impact (See Benefits, P.9-10, paras 2.13 – 2.20 of the Monitoring Guidance).

Please detail proposed monitoring arrangements below:

Part 5: Approval and Authorisation

Screened by:	Position/Job Title	Date
David McCallum	Director of Corporate Services	27/09/2019
Lorna Elliott	HR/Office Manager	27/09/2019
Approved by:		
Ian Crozier	CEO	27/09/2019

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 your website as soon as possible following completion and made available on request.

Section 75 Policy Screening Form

Part 1: Policy Scoping

The first stage of the screening process involves scoping the policy or policy area. 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.

You 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 or policy area: FINANCE

Is this an existing, revised or a new policy/policy area?

Existing	Revised	New
	X	

Brief Description
The policies that have been reviewed in the third quarter
- Income, Debtors & Petty Cash (Review)
- Month End Procedures (Review)
- Fixed Assets Policy(Review)
- Bank Reconciliation
- Procurement Policy
- Purchase Ledger Policy
- Drawdown Policy
- Travel and Subsistence Policy

What is it trying to achieve? (intended aims and outcomes)

To ensure the Agency has a robust finance system to safeguard the public purse.

Are there any Section 75 categories which might be expected to benefit from the intended policy?

YES	NO	N/A
	X	

If YES, explain how.

.

Who initiated or wrote the policy?

<mark>The policy was written by</mark>   The Ulster Scots Agency

Who owns and who implements each element of the policy?

<mark>Policy is led by</mark>   Finance Department

Implementation factors

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

YES	NO	N/A
	x	

If YES, are they

Financial: YES (If YES, please detail)
No

Legislative: Y / N (If YES, please detail)

Other, please specify:

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 policies with a bearing on this policy

What are they and who owns them?
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 relevant Section 75 categories.

Section 75 Category	Details of Evidence/Information
ALL	The policies are formed using good practice guidance from the Northern Ireland Audit Office, Internal Audit and the knowledge and professionalism of existing staff.

<u>Needs, experiences and priorities</u>

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
ALL	N/A

Part 2: Screening Questions

Introduction

1. If the conclusion is **none** in respect of all of the Section 75 categories, then you may decide to screen the policy out. If a policy is 'screened out', you should give details of the reasons for the decision taken.
2. If the conclusion is **major** in respect of one or more of the Section 75 categories, then consideration should be given to subjecting the policy to an EQIA.
3. If the conclusion is **minor** in respect of one or more of the Section 75 categories, then consideration should still be given to proceeding with an EQIA, or to measures to mitigate the adverse impact; or an alternative policy.

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 hence it would be appropriate to conduct an EQIA;
   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 among 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.

Taking into account the earlier evidence, consider and comment on the likely impact on equality of opportunity / good relations for those affected by this policy, by applying the following screening questions and the 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 grounds? **Minor/Major/None**		
Section 75 Category	**Details of Policy Impact**	**Level of Impact? Minor/Major/None**
Religious belief	None	None
Political opinion	None	None
Racial / ethnic 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

2 Are there opportunities to better promote equality of opportunity for people within any of the Section 75 categories?		
Section 75 Category	If **Yes**, provide details	If **No**, provide reasons
		No, the policies are all inclusive

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		
Political opinion		
Racial group		

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
		No, the policies are all inclusive.

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).

None

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

In light of your answers to the previous questions, do you feel that the policy should: (please underline one):

1. Not be subject to an EQIA (with no mitigating measures required)

2. Not be subject to an EQIA (with mitigating measures /alternative policies)

3. Not be subject to an EQIA at this time

4. Be subject to an EQIA

If 1. or 2. (i.e. not be subject to an EQIA), please provide details of the reasons why:

We do not require EQIA as the strategy does not adversely affect any of the Section 75 categories
Terms and Conditions of all contracts include reference to equality of opportunity

If 2. (i.e. not be subject to an EQIA), in what ways can identified adverse impacts attaching to the policy be mitigated or an alternative policy be introduced?

In light of these revisions, is there a need to re-screen the revised/alternative policy at a future date? YES / NO

If 3. or 4. (i.e. to conduct an EQIA), please provide details of the reasons:

Timetabling and Prioritising EQIA

If 3. or 4., is the policy affected by timetables established by other relevant public authorities? YES / NO

If YES, please provide details:

```
```

Please answer the following questions to determine priority for timetabling the EQIA. 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 EQIA.

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 EQIA. This list of priorities will assist you in timetabling the EQIA. Details of your EQIA timetable should be included in the quarterly Section 75 report.

Proposed date for commencing EQIA: _____

Any further comments on the screening process and any subsequent actions?

Part 4: Monitoring

Effective monitoring will help identify any future adverse impacts arising from the policy which may lead you to conduct an EQIA, as well as help with future planning and policy development. You 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, then you should monitor more broadly than for adverse impact (See Benefits, P.9-10, paras 2.13 – 2.20 of the Monitoring Guidance).

Please detail proposed monitoring arrangements below:

Policy will be reviewed every 3 years unless there is mitigating circumstances to review before the period has lapsed.

Part 5: Approval and Authorisation

Screened by:	Position/Job Title	Date
David McCallum	Director of Corporate Services	27/09/2019
Lorna Elliott	HR/Office Manager	27/09/2019
Approved by:		
Ian Crozier	CEO	27/09/2019

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 your website as soon as possible following completion and made available on request.

Section 75 Policy Screening Form

Part 1: Policy Scoping

The first stage of the screening process involves scoping the policy or policy area. 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.

You 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 or policy area: Governance

Is this an existing, revised or a new policy/policy area?

Existing	Revised	New
	x	

Brief Description

Policies reviewed in the third quarter 2016 relating to governance.
- Risk Policy Framework (Review)
- Anti Bribery Policy
- Fraud Prevention Plan
- Fraud Response Plan
- Visitor Security
- Project Management
- Core funding Procedures
- Grants Appeal Procedures
- Customer Charter

What is it trying to achieve? (intended aims and outcomes)

Contribute to a robust system of Corporate Governance.

Are there any Section 75 categories which might be expected to benefit from the intended policy?

YES	NO	N/A
	X	

If YES, explain how.

.

Who initiated or wrote the policy?

<mark>The policy was written by</mark>   The Ulster Scots Agency

Who owns and who implements each element of the policy?

<mark>Policy is led by</mark>   Corporate Services

Implementation factors

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

YES	NO	N/A
	X	

If YES, are they

Financial: YES (If YES, please detail)
No

Legislative: Y / N (If YES, please detail)

Other, please specify:

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:

Other policies with a bearing on this policy

What are they and who owns them?
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 relevant Section 75 categories.

Section 75 Category	Details of Evidence/Information
ALL	All policies have been informed by Good Practice and Internal Audit reporting.

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
ALL	N/A

Part 2: Screening Questions

Introduction

1. If the conclusion is **none** in respect of all of the Section 75 categories, then you may decide to screen the policy <u>out</u>. If a policy is 'screened out', you should give details of the reasons for the decision taken.

2. If the conclusion is **major** in respect of one or more of the Section 75 categories, then consideration should be given to subjecting the policy to an EQIA.

3. If the conclusion is **minor** in respect of one or more of the Section 75 categories, then consideration should still be given to proceeding with an EQIA, or to measures to mitigate the adverse impact; or an alternative policy.

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 hence it would be appropriate to conduct an EQIA;
   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 among 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.

Taking into account the earlier evidence, consider and comment on the likely impact on equality of opportunity / good relations for those affected by this policy, by applying the following screening questions and the impact on the group i.e. minor, major or none.

<u>Screening questions</u>

1	What is the likely impact on equality of opportunity for those affected by this policy, for each of the Section 75 grounds? **Minor/Major/None**	
Section 75 Category	**Details of Policy Impact**	**Level of Impact? Minor/Major/None**
Religious belief	None	None
Political opinion	None	None
Racial / ethnic 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

2 Are there opportunities to better promote equality of opportunity for people within any of the Section 75 categories?		
Section 75 Category	If **Yes**, provide details	If **No**, provide reasons
		No, the policies are all inclusive

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	None	None
Political opinion	None	None
Racial group	None	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
		No, the policies are all inclusive

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).

N/A

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

N/A

Part 3: Screening Decision

In light of your answers to the previous questions, do you feel that the policy should: (please underline one):

1. Not be subject to an EQIA (with no mitigating measures required)

2. Not be subject to an EQIA (with mitigating measures /alternative policies)

3. Not be subject to an EQIA at this time

4. Be subject to an EQIA

If 1. or 2. (i.e. not be subject to an EQIA), please provide details of the reasons why:

We do not require EQIA as the strategy does not adversely affect any of the Section 75 categories
Terms and Conditions of all contracts include reference to equality of opportunity

If 2. (i.e. not be subject to an EQIA), in what ways can identified adverse impacts attaching to the policy be mitigated or an alternative policy be introduced?

In light of these revisions, is there a need to re-screen the revised/alternative policy at a future date? YES / NO

If 3. or 4. (i.e. to conduct an EQIA), please provide details of the reasons:

Timetabling and Prioritising EQIA

If 3. or 4., is the policy affected by timetables established by other relevant public authorities? YES / NO

If YES, please provide details:

```
```

Please answer the following questions to determine priority for timetabling the EQIA. 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 EQIA.

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 EQIA. This list of priorities will assist you in timetabling the EQIA. Details of your EQIA timetable should be included in the quarterly Section 75 report.

Proposed date for commencing EQIA: _____

Any further comments on the screening process and any subsequent actions?

Part 4: Monitoring

Effective monitoring will help identify any future adverse impacts arising from the policy which may lead you to conduct an EQIA, as well as help with future planning and policy development. You 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, then you should monitor more broadly than for adverse impact (See Benefits, P.9-10, paras 2.13 – 2.20 of the Monitoring Guidance).

Please detail proposed monitoring arrangements below:

Policy will be reviewed every 3 years unless there is mitigating circumstances to review before the period has lapsed.

Part 5: Approval and Authorisation

Screened by:	Position/Job Title	Date
David McCallum	Director of Corporate Services	27/09/2019
Lorna Elliott	HR/Office Manager	27/09/2019
Approved by:		
Ian Crozier	CEO	27/09/2019

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 your website as soon as possible following completion and made available on request.

Section 75 Policy Screening Form

Part 1: Policy Scoping

The first stage of the screening process involves scoping the policy or policy area. 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.

You 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 or policy area: Staffing

Is this an existing, revised or a new policy/policy area?

Existing	Revised	New
	x	

Brief Description

The Ulster-Scots Agency recognises that employee engagement continues to be an issue for organisations including:

Flexi Policy
Clear Desk Policy
Employee Exit – This will look at the end of the employment Cycle.
Career Break
Managing Attendance

What is it trying to achieve? (intended aims and outcomes)

- To enable improved management of departmental systems and resources
- To enable the Agency to benefit from employee feedback
- To improve the efficiency of the process of terminating employment

Are there any Section 75 categories which might be expected to benefit from the intended policy?

YES	NO	N/A
	X	

1

If YES, explain how.

.

Who initiated or wrote the policy?

The policy was written <mark>by</mark>   The Ulster Scots Agency

Who owns and who implements each element of the policy?

Policy is led by   Corporate Services

Implementation factors

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

YES	NO	N/A
	X	

If YES, are they

Financial: YES (If YES, please detail)
No

Legislative: Y / N (If YES, please detail)

Other, please specify:

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:

<u>Other policies with a bearing on this policy</u>

What are they and who owns them? Staff Induction Policy

<u>Available evidence</u>

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 relevant Section 75 categories.

Section 75 Category	Details of Evidence/Information
ALL	These policies have been informed by Good Practice and Internal Audit reporting.

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
ALL	N/A

Part 2: Screening Questions

Introduction

1. If the conclusion is **none** in respect of all of the Section 75 categories, then you may decide to screen the policy out. If a policy is 'screened out', you should give details of the reasons for the decision taken.
2. If the conclusion is **major** in respect of one or more of the Section 75 categories, then consideration should be given to subjecting the policy to an EQIA.
3. If the conclusion is **minor** in respect of one or more of the Section 75 categories, then consideration should still be given to proceeding with an EQIA, or to measures to mitigate the adverse impact; or an alternative policy.

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 hence it would be appropriate to conduct an EQIA;
   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 among 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.

Taking into account the earlier evidence, consider and comment on the likely impact on equality of opportunity / good relations for those affected by this policy, by applying the following screening questions and the 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 grounds? **Minor/Major/None**	

Section 75 Category	Details of Policy Impact	Level of Impact? Minor/Major/None
Religious belief	None	None
Political opinion	None	None
Racial / ethnic 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

2 Are there opportunities to better promote equality of opportunity for people within any of the Section 75 categories?		
Section 75 Category	If **Yes**, provide details	If **No**, provide reasons
		No, all policies are all inclusive.

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	None	None
Political opinion	None	None
Racial group	None	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
		No, all policies are all inclusive.

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).

N/A

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

N/A

Part 3: Screening Decision

In light of your answers to the previous questions, do you feel that the policy should: (please underline one):

1. Not be subject to an EQIA (with no mitigating measures required)

2. Not be subject to an EQIA (with mitigating measures /alternative policies)

3. Not be subject to an EQIA at this time

4. Be subject to an EQIA

If 1. or 2. (i.e. not be subject to an EQIA), please provide details of the reasons why:

We do not require EQIA as the strategy does not adversely affect any of the Section 75 categories
Terms and Conditions of all contracts include reference to equality of opportunity

If 2. (i.e. not be subject to an EQIA), in what ways can identified adverse impacts attaching to the policy be mitigated or an alternative policy be introduced?

In light of these revisions, is there a need to re-screen the revised/alternative policy at a future date? YES / NO

If 3. or 4. (i.e. <u>to conduct an EQIA</u>), please provide details of the reasons:

Timetabling and Prioritising EQIA

If 3. or 4., is the policy affected by timetables established by other relevant public authorities? YES / NO

If YES, please provide details:

```



```

Please answer the following questions to determine priority for timetabling the EQIA. 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 EQIA.

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 EQIA. This list of priorities will assist you in timetabling the EQIA. Details of your EQIA timetable should be included in the quarterly Section 75 report.

Proposed date for commencing EQIA: _____

Any further comments on the screening process and any subsequent actions?

Part 4: Monitoring

Effective monitoring will help identify any future adverse impacts arising from the policy which may lead you to conduct an EQIA, as well as help with future planning and policy development. You 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, then you should monitor more broadly than for adverse impact (See Benefits, P.9-10, paras 2.13 – 2.20 of the Monitoring Guidance).

Please detail proposed monitoring arrangements below:

Policy will be reviewed every 3 years unless there is mitigating circumstances to review before the period has lapsed.

Part 5: Approval and Authorisation

Screened by:	Position/Job Title	Date
David McCallum	Director of Corporate Services	07/09/2019
Lorna Elliott	HR/Office Manager	27/09/2019
Approved by:		
Ian Crozier	CEO	27/09/2019

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 your website as soon as possible following completion and made available on request.

Section 75 Policy Screening Form

Part 1: Policy Scoping

The first stage of the screening process involves scoping the policy or policy area. 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.

You 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 or policy area: FINANCE

Is this an existing, revised or a new policy/policy area?

Existing	Revised	New
	X	

Brief Description
The policies that have been reviewed in the third quarter
-         Payroll Procedure

What is it trying to achieve? (intended aims and outcomes)

To ensure the Agency has a robust finance system to safeguard the public purse.

Are there any Section 75 categories which might be expected to benefit from the intended policy?

YES	NO	N/A
	X	

If YES, explain how.

.

Who initiated or wrote the policy?

1

<mark>The policy was written by</mark>   The Ulster Scots Agency

Who owns and who implements each element of the policy?

<mark>Policy is led by</mark>   Finance Department

Implementation factors

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

YES	NO	N/A
	x	

If YES, are they

Financial: YES (If YES, please detail)
No

Legislative: Y / N (If YES, please detail)

Other, please specify:

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 policies with a bearing on this policy

What are they and who owns them?
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 relevant Section 75 categories.

Section 75 Category	Details of Evidence/Information
ALL	The policies are formed using good practice guidance from the Northern Ireland Audit Office, Internal Audit and the knowledge and professionalism of existing staff.

3

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
ALL	N/A

Part 2: Screening Questions

Introduction

1. If the conclusion is **none** in respect of all of the Section 75 categories, then you may decide to screen the policy <u>out</u>. If a policy is 'screened out', you should give details of the reasons for the decision taken.

2. If the conclusion is **major** in respect of one or more of the Section 75 categories, then consideration should be given to subjecting the policy to an EQIA.

3. If the conclusion is **minor** in respect of one or more of the Section 75 categories, then consideration should still be given to proceeding with an EQIA, or to measures to mitigate the adverse impact; or an alternative policy.

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 hence it would be appropriate to conduct an EQIA;
   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 among 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.

Taking into account the earlier evidence, consider and comment on the likely impact on equality of opportunity / good relations for those affected by this policy, by applying the following screening questions and the impact on the group i.e. minor, major or none.

5

Screening questions

1	What is the likely impact on equality of opportunity for those affected by this policy, for each of the Section 75 grounds? **Minor/Major/None**	
Section 75 Category	**Details of Policy Impact**	**Level of Impact? Minor/Major/None**
Religious belief	None	None
Political opinion	None	None
Racial / ethnic 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

2 Are there opportunities to better promote equality of opportunity for people within any of the Section 75 categories?		
Section 75 Category	If **Yes**, provide details	If **No**, provide reasons
		No, the policies are all inclusive

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		
Political opinion		
Racial group		

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
		No, the policies are all inclusive.

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).

None

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

In light of your answers to the previous questions, do you feel that the policy should: (please underline one):

1. Not be subject to an EQIA (with no mitigating measures required)

2. Not be subject to an EQIA (with mitigating measures /alternative policies)

3. Not be subject to an EQIA at this time

4. Be subject to an EQIA

If 1. or 2. (i.e. not be subject to an EQIA), please provide details of the reasons why:

We do not require EQIA as the strategy does not adversely affect any of the Section 75 categories
Terms and Conditions of all contracts include reference to equality of opportunity

If 2. (i.e. not be subject to an EQIA), in what ways can identified adverse impacts attaching to the policy be mitigated or an alternative policy be introduced?

In light of these revisions, is there a need to re-screen the revised/alternative policy at a future date? YES / NO

If 3. or 4. (i.e. <u>to conduct an EQIA</u>), please provide details of the reasons:

Timetabling and Prioritising EQIA

If 3. or 4., is the policy affected by timetables established by other relevant public authorities? YES / NO

If YES, please provide details:

```



```

Please answer the following questions to determine priority for timetabling the EQIA. 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 EQIA.

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 EQIA. This list of priorities will assist you in timetabling the EQIA. Details of your EQIA timetable should be included in the quarterly Section 75 report.

Proposed date for commencing EQIA: _____

Any further comments on the screening process and any subsequent actions?

Part 4: Monitoring

Effective monitoring will help identify any future adverse impacts arising from the policy which may lead you to conduct an EQIA, as well as help with future planning and policy development. You 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, then you should monitor more broadly than for adverse impact (See Benefits, P.9-10, paras 2.13 – 2.20 of the Monitoring Guidance).

Please detail proposed monitoring arrangements below:

> Policy will be reviewed every 3 years unless there is mitigating circumstances to review before the period has lapsed.

Part 5: Approval and Authorisation

Screened by:	Position/Job Title	Date
David McCallum	Director of Corporate Services	20/12/2019
Lorna Elliott	HR/Office Manager	20/12/2019
Approved by:		
Ian Crozier	CEO	20/12/2019

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 your website as soon as possible following completion and made available on request.

Section 75 Policy Screening Form

Part 1: Policy Scoping

The first stage of the screening process involves scoping the policy or policy area. 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.

You 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 or policy area: Governance

Is this an existing, revised or a new policy/policy area?

Existing	Revised	New
	X	

Brief Description

- Whistleblowing Northern (Revised)

What is it trying to achieve? (intended aims and outcomes)

To protect all those who have a genuine reason to Whistle blow. Sets out the procedures and the excepted responsibilities of the individuals and organisation if a disclosure is made. It informs the whistleblower of their rights throughout the process and thereafter.

Are there any Section 75 categories which might be expected to benefit from the intended policy?

YES	NO	N/A
	X	

If YES, explain how.

.

Who initiated or wrote the policy?

The policy was written by   Ulster Scots Agency

Who owns and who implements each element of the policy?

Policy is led by Corporate Services

Implementation factors

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

YES	NO	N/A
	X	

If YES, are they

Financial: YES (If YES, please detail)
No

Legislative: Y / N (If YES, please detail)

Other, please specify:

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:

Other policies with a bearing on this policy

What are they and who owns them? Fraud Prevention Plan and Fraud Prevention Policy owned by Ulster Scots Agency

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 relevant Section 75 categories.

Section 75 Category	Details of Evidence/Information
ALL	Good Practice, Government policies, Internal Audit recommendations.

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
ALL	N/A

Part 2: Screening Questions

Introduction

1. If the conclusion is **none** in respect of all of the Section 75 categories, then you may decide to screen the policy <u>out</u>. If a policy is 'screened out', you should give details of the reasons for the decision taken.

2. If the conclusion is **major** in respect of one or more of the Section 75 categories, then consideration should be given to subjecting the policy to an EQIA.

3. If the conclusion is **minor** in respect of one or more of the Section 75 categories, then consideration should still be given to proceeding with an EQIA, or to measures to mitigate the adverse impact; or an alternative policy.

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 hence it would be appropriate to conduct an EQIA;
   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 among 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.

Taking into account the earlier evidence, consider and comment on the likely impact on equality of opportunity / good relations for those affected by this policy, by applying the following screening questions and the 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 grounds? **Minor/Major/None**	
Section 75 Category	**Details of Policy Impact**	**Level of Impact? Minor/Major/None**
Religious belief	None	None
Political opinion	None	None
Racial / ethnic 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

2 Are there opportunities to better promote equality of opportunity for people within any of the Section 75 categories?		
Section 75 Category	If **Yes**, provide details	If **No**, provide reasons
		No, the policy is all inclusive.

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		None
Political opinion		None
Racial group		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
		No, the policy is all inclusive.

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).

N/A

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

N/A

Part 3: Screening Decision

In light of your answers to the previous questions, do you feel that the policy should: (please underline one):

1. Not be subject to an EQIA (with no mitigating measures required)

2. Not be subject to an EQIA (with mitigating measures /alternative policies)

3. Not be subject to an EQIA at this time

4. Be subject to an EQIA

If 1. or 2. (i.e. not be subject to an EQIA), please provide details of the reasons why:

We do not require EQIA as the strategy does not adversely affect any of the Section 75 categories
Terms and Conditions of all contracts include reference to equality of opportunity

If 2. (i.e. not be subject to an EQIA), in what ways can identified adverse impacts attaching to the policy be mitigated or an alternative policy be introduced?

In light of these revisions, is there a need to re-screen the revised/alternative policy at a future date? YES / NO

If 3. or 4. (i.e. <u>to conduct an EQIA</u>), please provide details of the reasons:

Timetabling and Prioritising EQIA

If 3. or 4., is the policy affected by timetables established by other relevant public authorities? YES / NO

If YES, please provide details:

```
┌─────────────────────────────────────────────────────────────────────┐
│                                                                     │
│                                                                     │
│                                                                     │
│                                                                     │
└─────────────────────────────────────────────────────────────────────┘
```

Please answer the following questions to determine priority for timetabling the EQIA. 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 EQIA.

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 EQIA. This list of priorities will assist you in timetabling the EQIA. Details of your EQIA timetable should be included in the quarterly Section 75 report.

Proposed date for commencing EQIA: _____

Any further comments on the screening process and any subsequent actions?

Part 4: Monitoring

Effective monitoring will help identify any future adverse impacts arising from the policy which may lead you to conduct an EQIA, as well as help with future planning and policy development. You 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, then you should monitor more broadly than for adverse impact (See Benefits, P.9-10, paras 2.13 – 2.20 of the Monitoring Guidance).

Please detail proposed monitoring arrangements below:

Policy will be refreshed every 3 years or as legislation dictates.

Part 5: Approval and Authorisation

Screened by:	Position/Job Title	Date
David McCallum	Director of Corporate Services	20/12/2019
Lorna Elliott	HR/Facilities Manager	20/12/2019
Approved by:		
Ian Crozier	CEO	20/12/2019

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 your website as soon as possible following completion and made available on request.

Section 75 Policy Screening Form

Part 1: Policy Scoping

The first stage of the screening process involves scoping the policy or policy area. 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.

You 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 or policy area: Staffing

Is this an existing, revised or a new policy/policy area?

Existing	Revised	New
	x	

Brief Description

The Ulster-Scots Agency recognises that employee engagement continues to be an issue for organisations including:

- Performance Management Framework Policy
- Inefficiency – Performance Policy
- Inefficiency – Sickness Absence Policy
- Secondment Policy
- Probation Policy

What is it trying to achieve? (intended aims and outcomes)

- To enable improved management of departmental systems and resources
- To enable the Agency to benefit from employee feedback
- To improve the efficiency of the process of terminating employment

Are there any Section 75 categories which might be expected to benefit from the intended policy?

YES	NO	N/A
	X	

If YES, explain how.

.

Who initiated or wrote the policy?

The policy was written <mark>by</mark> The Ulster Scots Agency

Who owns and who implements each element of the policy?

Policy is led by   Corporate Services

Implementation factors

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

YES	NO	N/A
	X	

If YES, are they

Financial: YES (If YES, please detail)
No

Legislative: Y / N (If YES, please detail)

Other, please specify:

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:

Other policies with a bearing on this policy

What are they and who owns them? Staff Induction Policy

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 relevant Section 75 categories.

Section 75 Category	Details of Evidence/Information
ALL	These policies have been informed by Good Practice and Internal Audit reporting.

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
ALL	N/A

Part 2: Screening Questions

Introduction

1. If the conclusion is **none** in respect of all of the Section 75 categories, then you may decide to screen the policy <u>out</u>. If a policy is 'screened out', you should give details of the reasons for the decision taken.

2. If the conclusion is **major** in respect of one or more of the Section 75 categories, then consideration should be given to subjecting the policy to an EQIA.

3. If the conclusion is **minor** in respect of one or more of the Section 75 categories, then consideration should still be given to proceeding with an EQIA, or to measures to mitigate the adverse impact; or an alternative policy.

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 hence it would be appropriate to conduct an EQIA;

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 among 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.

Taking into account the earlier evidence, consider and comment on the likely impact on equality of opportunity / good relations for those affected by this policy, by applying the following screening questions and the 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 grounds? **Minor/Major/None**	
Section 75 Category	**Details of Policy Impact**	**Level of Impact? Minor/Major/None**
Religious belief	None	None
Political opinion	None	None
Racial / ethnic 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

2 Are there opportunities to better promote equality of opportunity for people within any of the Section 75 categories?		
Section 75 Category	If **Yes**, provide details	If **No**, provide reasons
		No, all policies are all inclusive.

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	None	None
Political opinion	None	None
Racial group	None	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
		No, all policies are all inclusive.

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).

N/A

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

N/A

Part 3: Screening Decision

In light of your answers to the previous questions, do you feel that the policy should: (please underline one):

1. Not be subject to an EQIA (with no mitigating measures required)

2. Not be subject to an EQIA (with mitigating measures /alternative policies)

3. Not be subject to an EQIA at this time

4. Be subject to an EQIA

If 1. or 2. (i.e. not be subject to an EQIA), please provide details of the reasons why:

We do not require EQIA as the strategy does not adversely affect any of the Section 75 categories
Terms and Conditions of all contracts include reference to equality of opportunity

If 2. (i.e. not be subject to an EQIA), in what ways can identified adverse impacts attaching to the policy be mitigated or an alternative policy be introduced?

In light of these revisions, is there a need to re-screen the revised/alternative policy at a future date? YES / NO

If 3. or 4. (i.e. to conduct an EQIA), please provide details of the reasons:

Timetabling and Prioritising EQIA

If 3. or 4., is the policy affected by timetables established by other relevant public authorities? YES / NO

If YES, please provide details:

| |
| |

Please answer the following questions to determine priority for timetabling the EQIA. 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 EQIA.

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 EQIA. This list of priorities will assist you in timetabling the EQIA. Details of your EQIA timetable should be included in the quarterly Section 75 report.

Proposed date for commencing EQIA: _____

Any further comments on the screening process and any subsequent actions?

Part 4: Monitoring

Effective monitoring will help identify any future adverse impacts arising from the policy which may lead you to conduct an EQIA, as well as help with future planning and policy development. You 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, then you should monitor more broadly than for adverse impact (See Benefits, P.9-10, paras 2.13 – 2.20 of the Monitoring Guidance).

Please detail proposed monitoring arrangements below:

> Policy will be reviewed every 3 years unless there is mitigating circumstances to review before the period has lapsed.

Part 5: Approval and Authorisation

Screened by:	Position/Job Title	Date
David McCallum	Director of Corporate Services	20/12/2019
Lorna Elliott	HR/Office Manager	20/12/2019
Approved by:		
Ian Crozier	CEO	20/12/2019

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 your website as soon as possible following completion and made available on request.