

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: CCEA Performance Related Pay Policy and Framework 2010/2011 and 2011/2012.
Is this an existing, revised or a new policy? Revised policy, policy approved by DE each year.
What is it trying to achieve? (intended aims/outcomes) The policy sets the parameters for determining which CCEA employees will be subject to PRP.
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? People Services and Equality
Who owns and who implements the policy? TMT/People Services and Equality. DE/DFP approve.

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

Main stakeholders affected

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

Staff

Service users

Other public sector organisations

Voluntary/community/trade unions

Other, please specify

Other policies with a bearing on this policy

What are they? Terms and Conditions, CCEA Policy on Performance Related Pay, ICT Allowance Scheme, Multimedia Allowance Scheme, Reward Policy.

Who owns them? People Services and Equality

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.

All data is taken from 08/09 PRP (last approved/paid PRP) against age etc. at that time.

NB: Eligibility is based on level of responsibility (grade) or function (ICT/MM).

Section 75 category	Details of evidence/information
Religious Belief	<p>Of those currently eligible for PRP the religious breakdown is as follows: Catholic – 40% Protestant – 47% Undetermined – 13%</p> <p>The mean performance rating for members of staff who are catholic is 68.9%. The mean performance rating for members of staff who are protestant is 69.3%. The mean performance rating for members of staff of undetermined religion is 70.9%. The performance ratings for all groups are similar.</p>
Political Opinion	No specific issues identified
Racial Group	<p>No specific issues identified Please note no statistics are noted as they could potentially identify individuals. The performance ratings for all groups are similar</p>
Age	<p>Age profile of those eligible for PRP/Allowances is as follows: 20-29 – 14% 30-39 – 34% 40-49 – 24% 50-59 – 22% 60-69 – 6%</p> <p>The mean performance ratings for each age group are as follows: 20-29 – 74% 30-39 – 71% 40-49 – 69% 50-59 – 64% 60-69 – 67%</p> <p>The performance ratings for all groups are similar.</p>
Marital Status	No specific issues identified
Sexual Orientation	No specific issues identified

<p>Men and Women generally</p>	<p>Of those currently eligible for PRP and Multimedia/ICT allowances 70% are male and 30% are female.</p> <p>PRP is reflective of the team make-up.</p> <p>The mean performance rating for males is 71%. The mean performance rating for females is 67%. The performance ratings for males and females are similar.</p>
<p>Disability</p>	<p>Of those currently eligible for PRP and Multimedia/ICT allowances 11% have declared a disability. Reasonable adjustments are made to ensure achievement of realistic work objectives on which PRP/Allowances are determined The mean performance rating for those with a disability is 68% The mean performance rating for those without a disability is 70% The performance ratings for both groups are similar</p>
<p>Dependants</p>	<p>Those with dependents who have opted to work part time will have PRP allowance calculated on a pro rata basis.</p>

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.

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. Eligible staff all have equal access to PRP.
Political opinion		No. Eligible staff all have equal access to PRP.
Racial group		No. Eligible staff all have equal access to PRP.
Age		No. Eligible staff all have equal access to PRP.
Marital status		No. Eligible staff all have equal access to PRP.
Sexual orientation		No. Eligible staff all have equal access to PRP.
Men and women generally		No. Eligible staff all have equal access to PRP.
Disability		No. Eligible staff all have equal access to PRP.
Dependents		No. Eligible staff all have equal access to PRP.

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 <u>Yes</u>, provide details	If <u>No</u>, provide reasons
Religious belief		No. Eligible staff all have equal access to PRP.
Political opinion		No. Eligible staff all have equal access to PRP.
Racial group		No. Eligible staff all have equal access to PRP.

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).

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

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.	
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.	

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 type="checkbox"/>
If yes, give the reasons to support your decision, together with the proposed changes/amendments or alternative policy.		

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
Lisa Johnston	People Services Manager

Approved by:	Sean Smart
Position:	People Services Manager
Date:	1.11.11