

Equality Screening Template

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.

Information about the policy

Name of the policy: Policy on Offers and the Acceptance of Gifts and Hospitality.
Is this an existing, revised or a new policy? New
What is it trying to achieve? (intended aims/outcomes) The Policy sets out the principles governing the acceptance of gifts and hospitality by staff and provides specific advice on how these principles should be interpreted across CCEA. The Policy is designed to remind staff of their responsibility to exercise judgement and propriety, conducting themselves with honesty and impartiality.
Are there any Section 75 categories which might be expected to benefit from the intended policy? If so, explain how. The policy applies to all categories.
Who initiated or wrote the policy? Director of Corporate Services.
Who owns and who implements the policy? Director of Corporate Services/CEO/Council

Implementation factors

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

If yes, are they:

Financial

Legislative

Other, please specify

Nolan Principles, Governing Principles

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

Contract for Service Providers

Other policies with a bearing on this policy

What are they? Provision of Gifts and Hospitality (work in progress Oct 11)

Who owns them?

Director of Corporate Services

Available evidence

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

Section 75 category	Details of evidence/information
Religious Belief	The existing guidance was no longer fit for purpose. We used our public sector knowledge and reviewed other public sector guidance to ensure our policy was mainstreamed with other similar organisations.
Political Opinion	
Racial Group	
Age	
Marital Status	
Sexual Orientation	
Men and Women generally	
Disability	
Dependants	

Needs, experiences and priorities

Taking into account the information referred to previously, are there different needs, experiences and priorities of each of the following categories, in relation to the particular policy/decision? Please specify details as appropriate for each of the Section 75 categories.

All applications for homeworking will be given careful consideration.

Section 75 category	Yes/No/Not sure	If yes, please provide details of needs/experiences/priorities
Religious Belief	No	
Political Opinion	No	
Racial Group	No	
Age	No	
Marital Status	No	
Sexual Orientation	No	
Men and Women generally	No	
Disability	No	
Dependants	No	

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 (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 group	None	None
Age	None	None
Marital status	None	None
Sexual orientation	None	None
Men and women generally	None	None
Disability	None	None
Dependents	None	None

2. Are there opportunities to better promote equality of opportunity for people within the Section 75 categories?

Section 75 category	Is <u>Yes</u>, provide details	If <u>No</u>, provide reasons
Religious belief		No. Policy applies to all.
Political opinion		No. Policy applies to all.
Racial group		No. Policy applies to all.
Age		No. Policy applies to all.
Marital status		No. Policy applies to all.
Sexual orientation		No. Policy applies to all.
Men and women generally		No. Policy applies to all.
Disability		No. Policy applies to all.
Dependents		No. Policy applies to all.

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	Policy applies to all.	None
Political opinion	Policy applies to all.	None
Racial group	Policy applies to all.	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 <u>Yes</u>, provide details	If <u>No</u>, provide reasons
Religious belief	Yes. To avoid potential offence, careful consideration should be given regarding gifts received from those from different cultures/beliefs.	
Political opinion		No. Policy applies to all.
Racial group		No. Policy applies to 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? **Yes** **No**
(For example: disabled minority ethnic people; disabled women; young Protestant men; and young lesbians, gay and bisexual people).

If yes, please provide details of data on the impact of the policy on people with multiple identities. Specify relevant Section 75 categories concerned.

None.

Part 3: Screening decision

Decision	Please select as appropriate
The policy has been 'screened in' for equality impact assessment.	<input type="checkbox"/>
The policy has been 'screened out' for equality impact assessment.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
If the decision is to subject the policy to an equality impact assessment, please provide details of the reasons.	
If the decision is not to conduct an equality impact assessment, please provide details of the reasons.	
<p>Taking into account the answers to the screen questions ie level of impact none in respect of all the categories, it has been concluded that there is no need to carry out an equality impact assessment.</p>	

Mitigation

If the decision is not to conduct an equality impact assessment you may consider mitigation to lessen the severity of any equality impact, or the introduction of an alternative policy to better promote equality of opportunity or good relations.

Can the policy/decision be amended or changed or an alternative policy introduced to better promote equality or opportunity and/or good relations?	Yes	No
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
If yes, give the reasons to support your decision, together with the proposed changes/amendments or alternative policy.		
<p>To avoid any potential offence, the policy will be amended to reflect consideration given regarding gifts received from those from different cultures/beliefs.</p>		

Timetabling and prioritising

If the policy has been 'screened in' for equality impact assessment, then please answer the following questions to determine its priority for timetabling the equality impact assessment.

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

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

The total rating score will be used to prioritise the policy in rank order with other policies screened in for equality impact assessment. This list of priorities will assist CCEA in timetabling.

Part 4: Monitoring

Where a policy has been amended or an alternative policy introduced, effective monitoring will help you identify any future adverse impact arising from the policy, which may lead to carrying out an equality impact assessment, as well as helping with future planning and policy development.

Part 5: Approval and authorisation

Screened by	Position and Department
Martin Quinn	Director of Corporate Services
Maureen McKay	Senior HR advisor, PSE
Emma Stinson	HR Advisor, PSE

Approved by:	Martin Quinn
Position:	Director of Corporate Services
Date:	