

POLICY SCREENING EXERCISE

1. Policy Scoping

Information about the policy

Name of Policy	Recruitment of Ex Offenders
Is this an existing, revised or a new policy?	New
What is it trying to achieve? (intended aims/outcomes)	To provide information to applicants on why we ask for details of convictions and how this information is used in the recruitment process. We want to ensure all applicants are treated fairly and consistently.
Are there any Section 75 categories which might be expected to benefit from the intended policy? If so, explain how.	All sections of the community will benefit from understanding how we consider the information they provide about their convictions, whether spent or unspent, particularly younger applicants who are more likely to have convictions.
Who initiated or wrote the policy?	HR Services Manager
Who owns and who implements the policy?	HR Services – Recruitment Team

Implementation Factors

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

Yes

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: Applicants / Potential Applicants**

Other policies with a bearing on this policy

What are they?
 Equal Opportunities Policy

Who owns them?
 Human Resources

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 each of the Section 75 categories

Section 75 category	Details of evidence/information
Religious Belief	Applicant breakdown 2018 Appointee breakdown 2018
Political Opinion	Applicant breakdown 2018 Appointee breakdown 2018
Racial Group	Applicant breakdown 2018 Appointee breakdown 2018
Age	Applicant breakdown 2018 Appointee breakdown 2018 Department of Justice Statistics 2013-2017
Marital Status	Applicant breakdown 2018 Appointee breakdown 2018

Sexual Orientation	Applicant breakdown 2018 Appointee breakdown 2018
Men & women generally	Applicant breakdown 2018 Appointee breakdown 2018 Department of Justice Statistics 2013-2017
Disability	Applicant breakdown 2018 Appointee breakdown 2018
Dependants	Applicant breakdown 2018 Appointee breakdown 2018

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
Religious Belief	No needs identified
Political Opinion	No needs identified
Racial Group	No needs identified
Age	The highest percentage of the working-class population who have a criminal conviction are aged 18-24. The highest percentage of applicants to Translink are in the age category 30-39, followed by those in the age category 20-29. There is a likelihood that applicants to Translink have an unspent criminal conviction when they apply albeit it is difficult to ascertain this from the evidence available because the conviction may be spent by the time they apply. The exception to this is for Bus Driver vacancies, as this role is Regulated Activity and this all spent and unspent convictions need to be declared.
Marital Status	There is no evidence to suggest that people of different marital status would be adversely impacted by this policy.
Sexual Orientation	No needs identified

Men & women generally	The highest percentage of convictions between 2013 – 2017 were by males – 74.8%. The highest percentage of applicants to Translink in 2018 were males – 80.5%. The highest percentage of appointees in Translink in 2018 were male – 81.5%. As males have a higher conviction rate than females, male applicants are more likely going to have a conviction than female applicants.
Disability	No needs identified
Dependants	No needs identified

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	Younger applicants are more likely to have a conviction. This policy will help them understand how Translink deals with applicants who have a conviction and this may encourage them to apply for a position when they may not have previously done so. There is a high percentage of younger applicants to Translink and the appointment rate is consistent with this percentage, therefore there is no evidence to suggest that they will be adversely impacted by this policy if they are recommended for appointment.	None
Marital Status	None	None

Sexual Orientation	None	None
Men & women generally	Male applicants are more likely to have a conviction. This policy will help them understand how Translink deals with applicants who have a conviction and this may encourage them to apply for a position when they may not have previously done so. There is a higher percentage of male applicants to Translink and the appointment rate is consistent with this percentage, therefore there is no evidence to suggest that they will be adversely impacted by this policy.	None
Disability	None	None
Dependants	None	None

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

Section 75 category	If Yes, provide details	If No, provide reasons
Religious Belief		No, there is no evidence to suggest that people with different religious belief will be adversely impacted by this policy.
Political Opinion		No, there is no evidence to suggest that people with different political opinions will be adversely impacted by this policy.
Racial Group		No, there is no evidence to suggest that people with different racial groups will be adversely impacted by this policy.
Age		No, there is no evidence to suggest that people of different ages will be adversely impacted by this policy.

Marital Status		No, there is no evidence to suggest that people with different marital status will be adversely impacted by this policy.
Sexual Orientation		No, there is no evidence to suggest that people with different sexual orientation will be adversely impacted by this policy
Men & women generally		No, there is no evidence to suggest that people with different gender will be adversely impacted by this policy.
Disability		No, there is no evidence to suggest that people with or without a disability will be adversely impacted by this policy.
Dependants		No, there is no evidence to suggest that people with or without dependants will be adversely impacted by this policy.

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	This policy is not likely to impact on good relations between people of different religious belief.	None
Political opinion	This policy is not likely to impact on good relations between people of different political opinion	None
Racial group	This policy in not likely to impact on good relations between people of different racial groups.	None

4. Are there opportunities to better promote 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		None
Political opinion		None
Racial group		None

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).

There is no evidence to suggest that there would be any potential impacts of this policy on people with multiple identities.

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

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

An Equality Impact Assessment will not be conducted for this policy. There is no evidence to suggest there would be an adverse impact on any particular equality category. Indeed, Translink may benefit from having this policy in place as it provides applicants and potential applicants with assurances that our approach to applicants with convictions is open and transparent.

If the decision is not to conduct an equality impact assessment, the public authority should consider if the policy should be mitigated or an alternative policy be introduced.

There are no mitigations to include within this policy.

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

All public authorities' equality schemes must state the authority's arrangements for assessing and consulting on the likely impact of policies adopted or proposed to be adopted by the authority on the promotion of equality of opportunity. The Commission recommends screening and equality impact assessment as the tools to be utilised for such assessments. Further advice on equality impact assessment may be found in a separate Commission publication: Practical Guidance on Equality Impact Assessment.

Mitigation

When the public authority concludes that the likely impact is 'minor' and an equality impact assessment is not to be conducted, the public authority 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 of opportunity and/or good relations?

N/A

If so, give the reasons to support your decision, together with the proposed changes/amendments or alternative policy.

Timetabling and prioritising

Factors to be considered in timetabling and prioritising policies for equality impact assessment.

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

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

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

Note: The Total Rating Score should be used to prioritise the policy in rank order with other policies screened in for equality impact assessment. This list of priorities will assist the public authority in timetabling. Details of the Public Authority's Equality Impact Assessment Timetable should be included in the quarterly Screening Report.

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

If yes, please provide details.

Part 4 – Monitoring

Public authorities 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, the public authority should monitor more broadly than for adverse impact.

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

Part 5 – Approval and equality impact assessment authorisation

Screened by:	Position/Job Title	Date
Paula Ludlow	HR Services Manager	1 st May 2019
Approved by:		

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 the public authority’s website and as soon as possible following completion and made available on request.