Section 75 Policy/Decision 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:

Refresh of Server and Desktop Computers

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

Existing	Revised	New
X		

Brief Description

The purpose of this project is upgrade all desktop machines to Windows 10 and Install a new server to migrate to Office 365.
What is it trying to achieve? (intended aims and outcomes)

- To replace the server and desktop PCs across the organisation and move to an Office 365 environment. Office 365 will give the flexibility and the ability to mix and match apps to create our own custom solution for each user or department.

- As time moves on there is a higher risk of disk failure – we have disaster recovery facilities in place in the event of a system failure – this allows 4 persons to continue to work

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 policies were written by the Ulster Scots Agency

Who owns and who implements each element of the policy?

Policies are 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) Budget may not be available to migrate fully to the proposed solution.

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: Ulster-Scots Community Network who run the centre, Ulster-Scots Staff engaging with various groups and visitors.

Service users: General Public, Education establishments, Tour Groups, Community Groups, Grant recipients

 Other public sector organisations: Arts Council, DFC, DCHG, Foras Na Gailege,

 Other, please specify: American Consulate, Cruise Ships

Other policies with a bearing on this policy

What are they and who owns them?

- Ulster Scots Agency Corporate Plan
- Ulster Scots Agency Business Plan
- IT Suite of policies 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. IT Training, other North/ South bodies 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

Details of Needs/Experiences/Priorities	
Section 75 Category	**Details of Needs/Experiences/Priorities**
ALL	
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	Office 365 makes it easier for people with limited vision, hearing, speech, mobility and learning abilities to create, communicate and collaborate on content. It enhances the usability of the experiences with assistive technologies, ease of access settings and alternative input devices on an ongoing basis, based on insights from research studies and customer feedback. It also offer built-in settings to enhance your reading and writing experiences.
Dependants	There is a possibility the system would enable people to work from home in the event of an emergency where dependents are concerned.

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	We do not expect there to be any adverse impact on people with different religious beliefs.	None
Political opinion	We do not expect there to be any adverse impact on people with different political opinions.	None
Racial / ethnic group	We do not expect there to be any adverse impact on people with different Racial / ethnic group.	None
Age	We do not expect there to be any adverse impact on people with different ages in the office environment	Minor
Marital status	We do not expect there to be any adverse impact on people of different marital status.	None
Sexual orientation	We do not expect there to be any adverse impact on people with different sexual orientations.	None
Men and women generally	We do not expect there to be any adverse impact on men and women generally.	None
Disability	Office 365 makes it easier for people with limited vision, hearing, speech, mobility and learning abilities to create, communicate and collaborate on content	Minor
Dependants	We do not expect there to be any adverse impact on people with dependants.	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
Religious belief		This is a solution used worldwide and has one set of instruction for all
Political opinion		This is a solution used worldwide and has one set of instruction for all
Disability	. Office 365 makes it easier for people with limited vision, hearing, speech, mobility and learning abilities to create, communicate and collaborate on content. It enhances the usability of the experiences with assistive technologies, ease of access settings and alternative input devices on an ongoing basis, based on insights from research studies and customer feedback. It also offer built-in settings to enhance your reading and writing experiences.	

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
Religious belief		This is a solution used worldwide and has one set of instruction for all
Political opinion		This is a solution used worldwide and has one set of instruction for all

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 more than above

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:

Part 5: Approval and Authorisation

Screened by:	Position/Job Title	Date
David McCallum	Director of Corporate Services	23/01/20
Lorna Elliott	HR/Office Manager	23/01/20
Approved by:		
Ian Crozier	Chief Executive Officer	23/01/20

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	X

Brief Description
-   Early Retirement on Medical Grounds

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

The policies are set to achieve equality of opportunity for all staff.

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.

People with a disability – those people that have a disability or medical condition(s) which qualifies for Early retirement on medical grounds then have the opportunity to have a better work/life balance.
.

Who initiated or wrote the policies?

The policies were written by the Ulster Scots Agency

Who owns and who implements each element of the policies?

Policies are 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:

Other, please specify:

Other policies with a bearing on this policy

What are they and who owns them? Human Resource policies

- o Managing Attendance
- o Performance Management Policy
- o Inefficiency Performance – Sickness Absence

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	Northern Ireland Civil Service policies form the basis of these 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	To ensure that our policies do not discriminate or exclude anyone.

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	
Political opinion	None	
Racial / ethnic group	None	
Age	None	
Marital status	None	
Sexual orientation	None	
Men and women generally	None	
Disability	None	
Dependants	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).

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)

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

All policies are all inclusive and written with S75 in the forefront of policy development.

We do not require EQIA as the strategy does not adversely affect any of the Section 75 categories

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 1-3 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	12/03/2020
Lorna Blair	HR/Office Manager	12/03/2020
Approved by:		
Ian Crozier	CEO	13/03/2020

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

- Gifts and Hospitality

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

A conflict of interest involves a conflict between the public duty and the private interest of a public official in which the official's private-capacity interest could improperly influence the performance of his/her official duties and responsibilities. This policy intends to highlight any potential conflicts and remove that person from a situation where it may be perceived that a conflict exists.

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.

.

1

Who initiated or wrote the policy?

This policy was written by the Ulster Scots Agency

Who owns and who implements each element of the policy?

Policies are 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:

Other public sector organisations: Sponsor Departments

Other, please specify: The General Public

Other policies with a bearing on this policy

2

What are they and who owns them? Conflict of Interest 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	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 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 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

<u>Part 3: Screening Decision</u>

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

1. <u>Not be subject to an EQIA (with no mitigating measures required)</u>

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:

Policies will be refreshed every 2 years or as legislation dictates.

Part 5: Approval and Authorisation

Screened by:	Position/Job Title	Date
David McCallum	Director of Corporate Services	12/02/2020
Lorna Elliott	HR/Facilities Manager	12/03/2020
Approved by:		
Ian Crozier	CEO	13/03/2020

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
-       Credit Card 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?

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.

<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.

<u>Part 3: Screening Decision</u>

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

1. <u>Not be subject to an EQIA (with no mitigating measures required)</u>

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	25/08/2020
Lorna Elliott	HR/Office Manager	25/08/2020
Approved by:		
Ian Crozier	CEO	28/08/2020

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

IT Security.

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

The IT Security Policy is written to set the standards for IT security to include backing up servers procedures and protocols to avoiding of potential breaches. The policy is to implement strategies to mitigate IT security vulnerabilities and well as procedures on recovering network when an intrusion occurs.

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	25/08/2020
Lorna Elliott	HR/Office Manager	25/08/2020
Approved by:		
Ian Crozier	CEO	28/08/2020

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

- Information Risk Management
- Customer Complaint Procedure
- Contract Management
- Business Continuity
- Data Breach Policy
- CCTV Policy
- Event Management Policy

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

Information Risk Management intends to safeguard information and ensure it is properly graded so as it is viewed by the correct level of staff.

Customer Complaint Procedure is to ensure staff follow a system when dealing with customer complaints so as all customers receive equitable treatment.

Business Continuity – to set the standards and guidelines the Agency enforces to ensure resilience and proper risk management in the event of business disruption.

Contract Management – fundamentals to maintaining a robust framework for reviewing and engaging new contracts for the Agency resulting in minimal risks.

1

Data Breach Policy – standards and procedures to prevent any potential breaches and mitigate any breaches or suspected breaches.

CCTV Policy – sets the standards for the CCTV on Agency premises

Event Management Policy – sets the standards and procedures for Agency lead events – in order to minimise risk of injury, breaches ensuring appropriate control action in place which is co-ordinated by the event management process.

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 policies were written by the Ulster Scots Agency

Who owns and who implements each element of the policy?

Policies are 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: Sponsor Departments

Voluntary/community/trade unions:

Other, please specify: The General Public

Other policies with a bearing on this policy

What are they and who owns them? Governance Suite of policies 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. Other North/South bodies 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	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. 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:

Policies will be refreshed every 1,2, 3 years or as legislation dictates.

Part 5: Approval and Authorisation

Screened by:	Position/Job Title	Date
David McCallum	Director of Corporate Services	25/08/2020
Lorna Elliott	HR/Office Manager	25/08/2020
Approved by:		
Ian Crozier	CEO	28/08/2020

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
- Code of Conduct for Staff
- Social Media Policy
- Staff Development Training Policy
- Travel and Subsistence Policy

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

The policies are set to achieve equality of opportunity for all staff. The policies and procedures are a mix revised policies relating to Human resources and the management of staff resources. From Code of Conduct, Staff Development and Travel and Subsistence.

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.

These policies are written to set the required standard and expectations of all staff regardless of their protective characteristic status. The policies are there to ensure all staff are treated fairly and equally and have the same opportunities within the workplace.

Who initiated or wrote the policies?

The policies were written by the Ulster Scots Agency

Who owns and who implements each element of the policies?

Policies are 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: They relate to the standards expected and code of conduct required.

Other, please specify:

Other policies with a bearing on this policy

What are they and who owns them? Human Resource policies

- o Grievance and Disciplinary
- o Performance Management 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	Northern Ireland Civil Service policies form the basis of these 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	To ensure that our policies do not discriminate or exclude anyone.

<u>Part 2: Screening Questions</u>

<u>Introduction</u>

1. If the conclusion is **<u>none</u>** 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 **<u>major</u>** 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 **<u>minor</u>** 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	
Political opinion	None	
Racial / ethnic group	None	
Age	None	
Marital status	None	
Sexual orientation	None	
Men and women generally	None	
Disability	None	
Dependants	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).

None

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

<u>Part 3: Screening Decision</u>

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

1. <u>Not be subject to an EQIA (with no mitigating measures required)</u>

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

All policies are all inclusive and written with S75 in the forefront of policy development.

We do not require EQIA as the strategy does not adversely affect any of the Section 75 categories

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 1-3 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	25/08/2020
Lorna Elliott	HR/Office Manager	25/08/2020
Approved by:		
Ian Crozier	CEO	28/08/2020

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.

Ulster Scots Agency FnG Section 75 Screening Form

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
- Purchase Ledger (Revised)
- Disposal Policy (Revised)
- Procurement Policy (Revised)
- USA Budget Process (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 policies was written by: The Ulster Scots Agency

Who owns and who implements each element of the policy?

Policies are 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:

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	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. 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	01/12/2020
Lorna Elliott	HR/Office Manager	01/12/2020
Approved by:		
Ian Crozier	CEO	01/12/2020

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 fourth quarter of 2020 seen several policies relating to staff revised
- Van Policy (Revised)
- Fire Evacuation Policy (Revised)
- Health & Safety at Work ROI (Revised)
- Health & Safety at Work NI (Revised)
- Staff Induction Policy

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

The policies are set to achieve equality of opportunity for all staff.

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 policies?

The policies were written by Ulster Scots Agency

Who owns and who implements each element of the policies?

Policies are 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:

Other, please specify:

Other policies with a bearing on this policy

What are they and who owns them? Human Resource policies

- o Staff Induction Policy
- o Fire & Safety Evacuation
- o Health & Safety at Work ROI
- o Health & Safety at Work NI
- o Van Policy
- o

<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	Northern Ireland Civil Service policies form the basis of these policies.

<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	To ensure that our policies do not discriminate or exclude anyone.

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	
Political opinion	None	
Racial / ethnic group	None	
Age	None	
Marital status	None	
Sexual orientation	None	
Men and women generally	None	
Disability	The Van policy may have an effect on persons with a disability as the van has had no adjustment to cater for such persons.	None at present, however if the situation arises we can make the reasonable adjustment.
Dependants		

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).

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)

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

All policies are all inclusive and written with S75 in the forefront of policy development.

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:

9

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	01/12/2020
Lorna Elliott	HR/Office Manager	01/12/2020
Approved by:		
Ian Crozier	CEO	01/12/2020

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.