

SECTION 75 POLICY SCREENING FORM

Section 75 Statutory Equality Duties

<http://www.equalityni.org/S75duties>

The promotion of equality of opportunity entails more than the elimination of discrimination. It may also require proactive measures to be taken to maintain and secure equality of opportunity.

Section 75 (1) requires the University in carrying out its functions, powers and duties to have *due regard to the need to promote equality of opportunity* between –

- persons of different religious belief, political opinion, racial group, age, marital status, or sexual orientation
- men and women generally
- persons with a disability and persons without
- persons with dependants and persons without.

Without prejudice to the obligations set out above, the University is also required to:

- a) have *regard to the desirability of promoting good relations* between persons of different
 - religious belief
 - political opinion; or
 - racial group
- b) meet legislative obligations under the Disability Discrimination Order.

What is a policy?

The Equality Commission for Northern Ireland state in their guidance¹ that the term 'policy' is used to denote any strategy, policy (proposed/amended/existing) or practice and/or decision, whether written or unwritten.

The University's Equality Scheme reflects the Equality Commission's definition of a policy and this should be applied in determining what needs to be screened.

If you are in doubt, please contact the Diversity and Inclusion Unit for advice. Equality screening guidance is also available at [Queen's website](#) or by contacting the Diversity and Inclusion Unit.

Part 1. Policy scoping

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

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

¹Section 75 of the Northern Ireland Act 1998, A Guide for Public Authorities' (April 2010), page 30. A policy may include planning decisions, service changes, corporate strategies, policy development, practices, guidelines, procedures and protocols; board papers

A. Information about the policy

Name of the policy to be screened and description

Tiered Recognition Policy

Is this an existing, revised or a new policy? (please append policy to the screening form)

New Policy

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

Improve and increase recognition of staff; Increase transparency and engagement with staff.

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

If so, explain how.

Yes, all staff in grades 1-10

Who initiated or wrote the policy?

Reward and Employee Relations, HR Directorate, QUB

Directorate responsible for devising and delivering the policy?

Human Resources Directorate, QUB

Background to the Policy to be screened.

Include details of any pre- consultations/consultations which have been conducted and/or whether the policy has previously been tabled at the University's Operating Board or the Standing Committee of the Senate.

The Staff Survey in 2016 highlighted a need to improve staff recognition when the statement "Good performance is recognised and appreciated at Queen's" received a low response rate of 26%.

A working group (cross section of staff across Faculties, Professional Services and job types) was created to review the current Discretionary Award process and provide alternative solutions.

The HR Directorate also formally consulted with Trade Union Representatives.

A proposal was sent to UEB in November 2017 with agreement in principle received.

The final policy (attached) will be tabled at UEB on 20 March 2018.

B. Implementation factors

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

If yes, are they

- financial?
- legislative?
- other?(please specify) lack of staff engagement_____

C. Main stakeholders affected

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

- staff
- service users
- other public sector organisations
- voluntary/community/trade unions
- other, please specify _ Potential applicants_____

D. Other policies with a bearing on this policy

- what are they? (please list)
- Corporate Plan
- People and Culture Strategy ‘People First’.
- Equality and Diversity Policy

.....

- who owns them?
- Corporate Plan (Institutional Policy)
- People and Culture Strategy ‘People First’ (HR Directorate).
- Equality and Diversity Policy (HR Directorate)

.....

E. Available evidence

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

This means any data or information you currently hold in relation to the policy or have gathered during policy development. Evidence to inform the screening process may take many forms and should help you to decide who the policy might affect the most. It will also help ensure that your screening decision is informed by relevant data.

Section 75 category	Details of evidence/information	
Religious belief	Composition of QUB workforce (religion)	Year-February 2017
	Protestant	38.0%
	Roman Catholic	42.0%

	<table border="1"> <tr> <td>Non determined</td> <td>20.0%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Unknown</td> <td>0.2%</td> </tr> </table>	Non determined	20.0%	Unknown	0.2%				
Non determined	20.0%								
Unknown	0.2%								
Political opinion	No evidence or information identified that would have an impact.								
Racial group	<table border="1"> <tr> <td>Composition of QUB workforce (broad ethnic group)</td> <td>Year-February 2017</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Ethnic</td> <td>5.8%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>White</td> <td>90.0%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Unknown</td> <td>3.2%</td> </tr> </table>	Composition of QUB workforce (broad ethnic group)	Year-February 2017	Ethnic	5.8%	White	90.0%	Unknown	3.2%
Composition of QUB workforce (broad ethnic group)	Year-February 2017								
Ethnic	5.8%								
White	90.0%								
Unknown	3.2%								
Age	<table border="1"> <tr> <td>Composition of QUB workforce (age- 5 year bands)</td> <td>Year-February 2017</td> </tr> <tr> <td>20-24</td> <td>0.7%</td> </tr> </table>	Composition of QUB workforce (age- 5 year bands)	Year-February 2017	20-24	0.7%				
Composition of QUB workforce (age- 5 year bands)	Year-February 2017								
20-24	0.7%								

	25-29	8.5%
	30-34	14.0%
	35-39	19.0%
	40-44	14.8%
	45-49	13.7%
	50-54	13.5%
	55-59	9.2%
	60-64	5.1%
	65+	1.4%
	Composition of QUB workforce (age- 10 year bands)	Year –February 2017
	20-29	9.2%
	30-39	33.0%
	40-49	28.5%
	50-59	22.7%
	60+	6.6%

Marital status	Composition of QUB workforce (Marital status)	Year –February 2017
	Civil partnership	1.1%
	Divorced	2.9%
	Married	54.6%
	Not specified	2.4%
	Other	2.5%
	Separated	1.5%
	Single	31.9%
	Widowed	0.5%
	Unknown	2.5%
Sexual orientation	Composition of QUB workforce (Sexual Orientation)	Year –February 2017

	I do not wish to answer	13.8%
	Of a different sex	66.3%
	Of either sex	0.6%
	Of the same sex	2.5%
	Unknown	16.8%
Men and women generally	Composition of QUB workforce (Gender)	Year-February 2017
	Male	46.7%
	Female	53.3%
Disability	Composition of workforce (Disability)	Year-February 2017
	Disability	6.6%
	No disability	78.1%
	Unknown	15.3%

Dependants	Composition of workforce (Dependants)	Year-February 2017
	Yes	43.0%
	No	43.9%
	Unknown	13.1%

F. Needs, experiences and priorities

Having looked at the data/information you have collected in the question above, what does this tell you are the needs, experiences and priorities for the people who fall into the groups below, in relation to your policy²? And what is the actual or likely impact on equality of opportunity for those affected by the policy. (See appendix 1 for information on levels of impact).

Section 75 category	Details of needs/experiences/priorities and details of policy impact	Level of Impact
Religious belief	<p>The criteria for assessing contribution must be applied fairly and consistently. Procedures for consideration of a performance award must be fairly and transparently applied.</p> <p>In accordance with the policy, Departments should seek advice from their HR Business Partner as necessary</p>	Minor

² If you do not have enough data to tell you about potential or actual impacts you may need to generate more data to distinguish what groups are potentially affected by your policy.

	and are reminded to be mindful of all protected characteristics of staff. The policy will potentially have a positive impact on all staff, regardless of religious belief.	
Political opinion	As above with regard to political opinion.	Minor
Racial group	As above with regard to racial group	Minor
Age	<p>The criteria for assessing contribution must be applied fairly and consistently. Procedures for consideration of a performance award must be fairly and transparently applied.</p> <p>The policy specifies that staff due to leave or retire should be reviewed on the same basis as all other staff. The policy will potentially have a positive impact in all staff regardless of age.</p>	Minor
Marital status	As above with regard to marital status	Minor
Sexual orientation	<p>The criteria for assessing contribution must be applied fairly and consistently. Procedures for consideration of a performance award must be fairly and transparently applied.</p> <p>In accordance with the policy, Departments should seek advice from their HR Business Partner as necessary and are reminded to be mindful of all protected characteristics of staff. The policy will potentially have a positive</p>	Minor

	impact on all staff, regardless of sexual orientation.	
Men and women generally	The Tiered Recognition policy makes provision for improved transparency and increased monitoring to ensure fair distribution of awards. Decisions regarding awards will be taken solely on the assessment of the contribution, irrespective of irrelevant factors, including employment status, working hours and personal circumstances. Part-time, fixed term and variable hours staff should be reviewed on the same basis as all other staff. The policy will potentially have a positive impact between men and women generally.	Minor
Disability	The policy said that those who have been absent for part of the year due to sickness should also be reviewed. The policy has been amended to reflect that absence related to disability or long term condition should also be reviewed and considered. As per the policy, departments should seek advice from their HR Business Partner and are reminded to be mindful of all protected characteristics of staff. The policy will potentially have a positive impact on persons with long- term conditions or disabilities.	Minor
Dependants	The policy states that those who are absent due to family reasons. The policy has been amended in section 7.1.3 and in an accompanying footnote to include those on extended leave due to maternity, paternity, parental, shared parental and dependants leave. Therefore the policy will potentially have a positive impact on	Minor

	those with caring responsibilities and dependants.	
--	--	--

Part 2 Screening questions

1 What is the likely impact on equality of opportunity for those affected by this policy, for each of the Section 75 equality categories?		
Section 75 category	Issue	Minor/major/none?
Religious belief	The policy is likely to have a positive impact on equality of opportunity for all staff, regardless of religious belief.	Minor
Political opinion	The policy is likely to have a positive impact on equality of opportunity for all staff, regardless of political opinion.	Minor
Racial group	The policy is likely to have a positive impact on equality of opportunity for all staff, regardless of race.	Minor
Age	The policy is likely to have a positive impact on equality of opportunity for all staff, regardless of age.	Minor

Marital status	N/A The policy is likely to have a positive impact on equality of opportunity for all staff, regardless of marital status.	Minor
Sexual orientation	N/A The policy is likely to have a positive impact on equality of opportunity for all staff, regardless of sexual orientation.	Minor
Men and women generally	The policy is likely to have a positive impact on equality of opportunity for men and women generally.	Minor
Disability	The policy is likely to have a positive impact on equality of opportunity for persons with disabilities and those without.	Minor
Dependants	The policy is likely to have a positive impact on equality of opportunity for all staff, including those with dependants or caring responsibilities.	Minor

2 Are there any actions which could be taken to reduce any adverse impact which has been identified or opportunities to better promote equality of opportunity?

Section 75 category	Issue	Mitigating Measure
Religious belief	N/A	None
Political opinion	N/A	None
Racial group	N/A	None
Age	N/A	None
Marital status	N/A	None
Sexual orientation	N/A	None
Men and women generally	N/A	None
Disability	The policy said that those who have been absent for part of the year due to sickness should also be reviewed on the same basis as other staff. The policy has been amended in section 7.1.3 to reflect that absence related to disability or long term	Minor

	condition should also be reviewed and considered.	
Dependants	The policy states that those who are absent due to family reasons will also be reviewed on the same basis as other staff. The policy has been amended in section 7.1.3 and in accompanying footnote to clarify that those on extended leave due to maternity, paternity, parental, shared parental and dependents leave will be reviewed and considered.	Minor

3 To what extent is the policy likely to impact on good relations between people of different religious belief, political opinion or racial group?		
Good relations category	Details of policy impact	Level of impact minor/major/none
Religious belief	N/A	None
Political opinion	N/A	None
Racial group	N/A	None

4 Are there opportunities to better promote good relations between people of different religious belief, political opinion or racial group?

Good relations category	If Yes , provide details	If No , provide reasons
Religious belief		The Policy will likely provide equality of opportunity for a Performance/ Recognition Award regardless of religious beliefs.
Political opinion		The Policy will likely provide equality of opportunity for a Performance/ Recognition Award regardless of political opinions.
Racial group		The Policy will likely provide equality of opportunity for a Performance/ Recognition Award regardless of race, ethnicity or nationality.

E 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).

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

We do not hold data which would indicate the potential impact of the policy on people with multiple identities. This would require further analysis for whom the policy may impact on an intersectional level including young and older people with disabilities, women with dependants/ caring responsibilities etc.

F Disability Duties

Disability Duties

Consider whether the policy:

- a) Discourages disabled people from participating in public life and fails to promote positive attitudes towards disabled people.
No. However the policy has been amended to clarify that absence related to disability or long term conditions should also be reviewed and considered for eligibility.
- b) Provides an opportunity to better positive attitudes towards disabled people or encourages their participation in public life.
Yes. Performance awards given to staff with disabilities promotes positive attitudes and encourages participation.

Part 3. Screening decision

Through screening, an assessment is made of the likely impacts, either major, minor or none, of the policy on equality of opportunity and/or good relations for the relevant categories. Completion of screening should lead to one of the following three outcomes; please mark an x in the appropriate box:

- 'Screened out'** i.e. the likely impact is none and no further action is required
- 'Screened out' with mitigation** i.e. the likely impact is minor and measures will be taken to mitigate the impact or an alternative policy will be proposed
- 'Screened in' for an equality impact assessment (EQIA)** i.e. the likely impact is major and the policy will now be subject to an EQIA

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

[Click here to enter text.](#)

The policy potentially has positive impacts for all staff in each of the section 75 groups as criteria and procedures assessing contribution must be applied fairly and consistently in accordance with this policy.

Mitigations have been include to ensure no adverse impact in relation to persons with disabilities and those with dependants or caring responsibilities.

If the decision is not to conduct an equality impact assessment, but the policy has minor equality impacts, please provide details of the reasons for this decision and of any proposed mitigating measures or proposed alternative policy.

[Click here to enter text.](#)

The policy has been reviewed and mitigations have been included to ensure no adverse impact in relation to staff with disabilities and long term conditions, as well as those with dependants or caring responsibilities.

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

[Click here to enter text.](#)

D Timetabling and prioritising

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

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

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

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

If yes, please provide details

Part 4. Monitoring

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

Please detail how you will monitor the effect of the policy?

In accordance with the policy, nomination forms, including the rationale for each award made must be kept and maintained by the Faculty/Directorate and provided as necessary to the Reward Team for reporting purposes.

The Heads of School/Directors and Reward Team will be responsible for annually monitoring the awards issued to ensure these are made fairly and transparently.

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

Analysis of rewards given, employment status and protected characteristics such as age, gender, disability, race (including colour, nationality and ethnicity), sexual orientation, religion and political opinion, marital status and having or not having dependants.

Part 5 - Data Protection

If applicable, has legal advice been given due consideration?

Yes No N/A

Has due consideration been given to information security in relation to this policy?

Yes No

Part 6 - Approval and authorisation

Screened by:	Position/Job Title	Date
Elaine Coleman	Reward Manager	26.06.18
Approved by:		
Joyce Johnston	Head of Reward and Employee Relations	26.06.18

A copy of the screening form, for each policy screened, should be 'signed off' and approved by the senior manager responsible for the policy

In instances where a screening decision concludes that an EQIA is required then the screening form should be countersigned by a Director.

There may at times be policy issues which fall within the scope of being novel, contentious or politically sensitive and could only be taken forward following consultation with the University's Operating Board and/or Standing Committee of the Senate. Where a policy screening highlights such issues the screening form must be signed off by the Director prior to proceeding to the University's Operating Board and/or the Standing Committee of the Senate.

Following ratification, a copy of the approved screening form, and associated policy must be forwarded to the Diversity and Inclusion Unit for publication on the University's website.

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION TO INFORM THE ANNUAL EQUALITY PROGRESS REPORT TO THE EQUALITY COMMISSION

1. Please provide details of any measures taken to enhance the level of engagement with individuals and representative groups as part of screening.

Communication plan re launch of Scheme with monthly reminders via round-up. Scheme champions at a local level to engage with staff and encourage participation.

2. In developing this policy were any changes made as a result of equality issues raised during :

- (a) pre-consultation / engagement;
- (b) formal consultation;
- (c) the screening process; and/or
- (d) monitoring / research findings.

If so, please provide a brief summary including how the issue was identified, what changes were made, and what will be the expected outcomes / impacts for those affected.

n/a

3. Does this policy / decision include any measure(s) to improve access to services including the provision of information in accessible formats? If so please provide a short summary.

The Policy document will be written in Arial 12 and saved as a pdf so it can be enlarged.

Appendix 1

Levels of Impact (Questions 6-9)

Introduction

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

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

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

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

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

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

In favour of a 'major' impact

- a) The policy is significant in terms of its strategic importance;
- b) Potential equality impacts are unknown, because, for example, there is insufficient data upon which to make an assessment or because they are complex, and it would be appropriate to conduct an equality impact assessment in order to better assess them;
- c) Potential equality and/or good relations impacts are likely to be adverse or are likely to be experienced disproportionately by groups of people including those who are marginalised or disadvantaged;
- d) Further assessment offers a valuable way to examine the evidence and develop recommendations in respect of a policy about which there are concerns amongst affected individuals and representative groups, for example in respect of multiple identities;
- e) The policy is likely to be challenged by way of judicial review;
- f) The policy is significant in terms of expenditure.

In favour of 'minor' impact

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

In favour of none

- a) The policy has no relevance to equality of opportunity or good relations.

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.

