

# 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:**

Business Growth Programme

#### **Is this an existing, revised or a new policy?**

New Policy

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

The programme will accelerate business growth for participating companies through specific workshops, which will complement the existing provision being delivered by Invest NI and which aims to reduce disadvantage as referenced in our Equality Scheme and Action Plan. This new support will include workshops, one to one mentoring and specialist consultancy support. Participants will receive two £7.5K employment grants to employ two new key workers in the business. Target of 150 new jobs to be created over the next three year period.

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

#### **If so, explain how.**

This will be open to existing Invest NI clients with growth potential. Participants will be selected through a competitive process set against programme criteria.

#### **Who initiated or wrote the policy?**

Invest NI and DETI

**Who owns and who implements the policy?**

The new Short Term Employment Scheme (STES) team within Invest NI

**Implementation factors**

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

If yes, are they

Financial: Y Participating businesses will receive financial support towards mentoring costs and employment grant assistance for two workers.

Legislative: N

Other, please specify: \_\_\_\_\_

**Main stakeholders affected**

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

Staff: The new Short Term Employment Scheme (STES) team within Invest NI

**Service users:Yes**

Other public sector organisations: N

Voluntary/community/trade unions: N

Other, please specify \_\_\_\_\_

**Other policies with a bearing on this policy**

- What are they?

The Short Term Employment Scheme (STES) encompasses a set of proposed measures to provide short-term assistance to the local labour market. Although the economic consensus is that the primary focus of economic development policy should normally be on competitiveness, the current state of the local labour market means that there is a need for a temporary shift in emphasis towards job creation.

In the context of the continued upward trend in unemployment and the consequential reduction in the employment rate, a working group of officials from DETI and Invest NI have worked to develop a package of measures to provide a temporary boost to employment over the next four years (2011-2015) in line with the Programme for Government. These measures have been developed on the assumption that the need for a set of special measures should decline once labour market conditions have improved.

The proposals contained within STES are consistent with the agreed framework for growth that has been developed by the Executive sub-committee on the economy. The proposed measures would fall under the Rebuilding Theme and, in particular, the need to increase employment and improve employability.

- Who owns them?

Invest NI STES Team

**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.

<b>Section 75 category</b>	<b>Details of evidence/information</b>
Religious Belief Political Opinion Racial Group Age Men and Women Generally Disability	This is a positive action measure which complements existing Invest NI programmes such as Northstar Mentoring, which has been equality screened previously. Existing monitoring information for Northstar has not demonstrated any adverse impact to date. However we will continue to monitor uptake of this programme in order to assess any future possible adverse impact.

**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

<b>Section 75 category</b>	<b>Details of needs/experiences/priorities</b>

<b>All</b>	The scheme can be accessed by companies meeting the programme criteria.
------------	---

## **Part 2: Screening Questions**

### **Introduction**

1. If the public authority's 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 public authority's 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 public authority's 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? <b>Minor/None</b>		
Section 75 category	Details of policy impact	Level of impact? Minor/Major/None
Religious belief	This programme is likely to have a positive impact on marginalised groups attached to this category and is likely to help ameliorate disadvantage.	Minor
Political opinion	This programme is likely to have a positive impact on marginalised groups attached to this category and is likely to help ameliorate disadvantage.	Minor
Racial group	This programme is likely to have a positive impact on marginalised groups attached to this category and is likely to help ameliorate disadvantage.	Minor
Age	This programme is likely to have a positive impact on marginalised groups attached to this category and is likely to help ameliorate disadvantage.	Minor
Marital status		None
Sexual		None

orientation		
Men and women generally		None
Disability	This programme is likely to have a positive impact on marginalised groups attached to this category and is likely to help ameliorate disadvantage.	Minor
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
All	The STES programmes in general provide this opportunity.	

Good relations	Details of policy impact	Level of impact

category		Minor/Major/None
Religious belief	Through this programme which is aiming to promote employment and overcome barriers, it is hoped that good relations will improve. Admittedly there may not be a direct corollary but it is likely to be a side benefit.	Likely to be minor, however we will await the results of our monitoring exercise.
Political opinion	Through this programme which is aiming to promote employment and overcome barriers, it is hoped that good relations will improve. Admittedly there may not be a direct corollary but it is likely to be a side benefit.	Likely to be minor, however we will await the results of our monitoring exercise.
Racial group	Through this programme which is aiming to promote employment and overcome barriers, it is hoped that good relations will improve. Admittedly there may not be a direct corollary but it is likely to be a side benefit.	Likely to be minor, however we will await the results of our monitoring exercise.

4. Are there opportunities to better promote good relations between people of different religious beliefs, political opinion or racial groups?		
Good relations category	If Yes, provide details	If No, provide reasons

	See above	
--	-----------	--

**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).

No

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:

Not felt necessary at this time, particularly as the workshops , one to one coaching and specialist mentoring support have already been referenced within our Business Development Solutions EQIA.

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?

As this is a positive action measure there is no need at this stage to amend the policy, however we do commit to continuing to monitor and review the programme, particularly with regard to uptake by S75 groups.

In light of these revisions, is there a need to re-screen the revised/alternative policy? Yes / No. If No, please explain why

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 question	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: \_\_\_\_\_

## **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:

**Companies will be asked to complete a data capture form which includes monitoring questions relating to political opinion, religion, racial group, age, gender and disability. This information will then be examined in relation to the staff backgrounds of those companies who are taking part in this programme.**

## **Part 5: Approval and Authorisation**

<b>Screened by:</b>	<b>Position/Job Title</b>	<b>Date</b>
<i>Paulette Marnier</i>	<i>Equality Manager</i>	<i>14/6/11</i>
<b>Approved by:</b>		
<i>Donal Durkan</i>	<i>Director</i>	<i>17/6/11</i>

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.