

# PBNI Equality Impact Screening

## Part 1 Policy Scoping

### Information about the policy

*This form should be read in conjunction with the Equality Commission's revised Section 75, "A Guide for Public Authorities" April 2010 and available via the following link [S75 Guide for Public Authorities April 2010](#). Staff should complete a form for each new or revised policy for which they are responsible (see page 6 for a definition of policy in respect of section 75).*

*The purpose of screening is to identify those policies that are likely to have an impact on equality of opportunity and/or good relations and so determine whether an Equality Impact Assessment (EQIA) is necessary. Screening should be introduced at an early stage when developing or reviewing a policy.*

#### 1.1 Name of the policy

**COMMUNITY AND VOLUNTARY FUNDING POLICY**

#### 1.2 Is this an existing, revised or a new policy? (Use drop down menu)

New

#### 1.3 What is it trying to achieve? (Intended aims/outcomes)

The Probation Board (NI) Order 1982, allows PBNI to allocate funding to the Community and Voluntary Sector (CVS). The exercise of this legal ability is discretionary on the part of the Probation Board for Northern Ireland (PBNI).

PBNI aims to change the lives of offenders for safer communities. In carrying out this work, PBNI works collaboratively with others, including the Community and Voluntary Sector.

PBNI acknowledges the value, commitment and expertise of the sector. PBNI is also committed to partnership working with the CVS in respect of the delivery of secondary support services aimed at changing the lives of offenders. The funding policy puts in place an allocation framework for the distribution of community and voluntary sector funding to support PBNI's role in help make communities safer in Northern Ireland.

#### 1.4 Are there any Section 75 categories which might be expected to benefit from the intended policy? If so, explain how.

Funding has been directed at services for younger people and women.

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

Assistant Director (Rural)

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

Deputy Director

**Implementation factors**

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

N/A

If yes, are they

financial

legislative

other, please specify

**Main stakeholders affected**

**1.8** 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

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

- what are they?

Department of Justice (DOJ) Guidance on Managing Grants Delegation,  
 DOJ Review of Criminal Justice System and Community and Voluntary Sector (CVS),  
 Department of Social Development (DSD) Code of Practice for Minimising Bureaucracy in Grant Funding for the CVS,  
 Prison Reform Recommendation 31,  
 Department of Health's New Direction Strategy for Drug and Alcohol and the  
 Recommendations of the Evaluation of the PBNI Community Grants Scheme 2012-13.

- who owns them?

PBNI and Department of Justice

### Available evidence

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

Evidence presented in the table below represents equality monitoring data on 2011-12 successful applications. This data is supplied by applicants and focuses on the services that they deliver in a targeted way to communities in Northern Ireland.

Of the 63 successful applications for community development funding, 52 provided information on the equality groups targeted by their organisation however due to errors in the completion of this section information should be treated with caution. The table below shows the range in number of equality groups targeted by each organisation.

**Table: Number of Equality Groups Targeted by each Organisation**

Range of Equality Groups Targeted	Number of Organisations	Per cent (N=52)
1 Target Group	17	33%
2 to 9 Target Groups	12	23%
10 to 19 Target Groups	13	25%
20-25 Target	6	12%

Groups		
Targeted all groups	4	8%
Total	52	100%

Section 75 category				
Religious belief	<b>Community Breakdown</b>	Protestant	28	54%
		Catholic	28	54%
Political opinion	<b>Political Opinion</b>	Unionist	25	48%
		Nationalist	26	50%
Racial group	<b>Ethnic Group</b>	White	24	46%
		Chinese	10	19%
		Indian	11	21%
		Pakistani	9	17%
		Other Asian	8	15%
		Black African	10	19%
		Black Caribbean	8	15%
		Black Other	8	15%
		Bangladeshi	7	13%
		Irish Traveller	16	31%
		Other Mixed	20	38%
Age	<b>Age</b>	Young People U25	39	75%
		Older People 65+	19	37%
Marital status	<b>Marital Status</b>	Single People	28	54%
		Separated Divorced	25	48%
		Married	25	48%
		Bereaved	22	42%
Sexual orientation	<b>Sexual Orientation</b>	Lesbian/Gay or Transgendered	21	40%
Men and women generally	<b>Gender</b>	Males	31	60%
		Females	33	63%

<b>Disability</b>	<b>Disability</b>	Disabled People	29	56%
<b>Dependants</b>	<b>Dependant Responsibility</b>	People with Dependents	29	56%

## Needs, experiences and priorities

**1.11** 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>Religious belief</b>	No issues identified
<b>Political opinion</b>	No issues identified
<b>Racial group</b>	No issues identified
<b>Age</b>	Funding is reaching younger age groups and this is proportionate in relation to PBNI's client base.
<b>Marital status</b>	No issues identified
<b>Sexual orientation</b>	No issues identified
<b>Men and women generally</b>	There is a higher proportion of funding for women
<b>Disability</b>	No issues identified
<b>Dependants</b>	No issues identified

## Part 2 Equality Screening Questions

### SCREENING QUESTIONS

- 2.1** In making a decision as to whether or not there is a need to carry out an equality impact assessment, consider questions 2.5 -2.8 listed below.
- 2.2** If the conclusion is **none** in respect of all of the Section 75 equality of opportunity and/or good relations categories, then the decision may to screen the policy out. If a policy is 'screened out' as having no relevance to equality of opportunity or good relations, give details of the reasons for the decision taken.
- 2.3** If the 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:
- i.measures to mitigate the adverse impact; or
  - ii.the introduction of an alternative policy to better promote equality of opportunity and/or good relations.
- 2.4** If the 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.

## 2.5 Equality Impact

What is the likely impact on equality of opportunity for those affected by this policy, for each of the Section 75 equality categories? <b>Minor   Major   None</b>		
Section 75 category	Details of policy impact	Level of impact? <b>Minor   Major   None</b>
Religious belief	The policy and strategic intent will not affect any one group, indeed the policy is seeking to positively impact and support the utilisation of multi-agency initiatives to target offenders with multiple needs.	None
Political opinion	As above	None
Racial group	As above	None
Age	As above	None
Marital status	As above	None
Sexual orientation	As above	None
Men and women generally	As above	None
Disability	As above	None
Dependants	As above	None

## 2.6 Promotion of Equality

Are there opportunities to better promote equality of opportunity for people within the Section 75 equalities categories?		
Section 75 category	If <b>Yes</b> , provide details	If <b>No</b> , provide reasons
Religious belief		No, the allocation of funding will be directly related to identify business needs associated with changing lives for safer communities.
Political opinion		As above
Racial group		As above
Age		As above
Marital status		As above
Sexual orientation		As above
Men and women generally		As above
Disability		As above
Dependants		As above

## 2.7 Good Relation Impact

To what extent is the policy likely to impact on good relations between people of



different religious belief, political opinion or racial group? <b>Minor   Major   None</b>		
Good relations category	Details of policy impact	Level of impact <b>Minor   Major   None</b>
Religious belief	Analysis of communities targeted by funding 2011-12 demonstrates that there is no discernible difference in impact	
Political opinion	Analysis of communities targeted by funding 2011-12 demonstrates that there is no discernible difference in impact	
Racial group	Funding is finding its way into minority ethnic communities via the groups supported under community development funding	

## 2.8 Promotion of Good Relations

4 Are there opportunities to better promote good relations between people of different religious belief, political opinion or racial group?		
Good relations category	If <b>Yes</b> , provide details	If <b>No</b> , provide reasons
Religious belief	One of the intentions is to work with community partners to ensure that services are available on a cross community basis.	
Political opinion	As above	
Racial group	As above	

## Additional considerations

### Multiple identities

**2.9** 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 women; young Protestant men; and young lesbians, gay and bisexual people).*

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

The policy intent will not affect any one group indeed the strategy is seeking to positively impact and support the utilisation of multi-agency initiatives to target offenders with multiple needs

**2.11** Is there an opportunity thorough this policy for PBNI to promote positive attitudes towards disabled people or encourage the participation of disabled people in public life?

**Yes**

**No**

If answered yes detail how this will be achieved: -

## Part 3 Screening decision

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

Based on analysis of equality monitoring information from previous year's successful applications – Funding is spread evenly across quality categories and where it is not the case (gender/age) there are good reasons to justify this.

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

N/A

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

N/A

### Mitigation

**3.4** When the likely impact is 'minor' an equality impact assessment is not to be conducted, mitigation may lessen the severity of any equality impact, or the introduction of an alternative policy to better promote equality of opportunity or good relations.

**3.5** Can the policy/decision be amended or changed or an alternative policy introduced to better promote equality of opportunity and/or good relations and if so, give the **reasons** to support your decision, together with the proposed changes/amendments or alternative policy.

**Date of Screening - 9<sup>th</sup> September 2014**

**Screened by - AD Rural and Equality Manager**