

Equality Impact Screening

Part 1 Scoping

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 from Human Resources. Staff should complete a form for each new or revised policy for which they are responsible.

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

Aspire Project

1.2 Is this an existing, revised or a new policy?

New

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

By targeting those marginalised young men (aged 16-30) who are most at risk of becoming involved in criminality activity. Aspire has already started delivering a measurable improvement in the outcomes.

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

young men aged 16-30

1.5 Who initiated or wrote the policy?

PBNI Psychology

1.6 Which Dept. owns and who implements the policy?

PBNI Psychology

Implementation factors

1.7 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

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?

- who owns them?

Evidence Base

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.

Section 75 category	Details of evidence/information																		
Religious belief	<p>Service User Data (Service Users Survey 2015)</p> <table border="0"> <tr> <td>Religion</td> <td>Roman Catholic</td> <td>50%</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td>Protestant</td> <td>35%</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td>Other</td> <td>4%</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td>None</td> <td>10%</td> </tr> </table>	Religion	Roman Catholic	50%		Protestant	35%		Other	4%		None	10%						
Religion	Roman Catholic	50%																	
	Protestant	35%																	
	Other	4%																	
	None	10%																	
Political opinion	<p>Service User Data on those who started an order in 2011/12 (last time surveyed for this information)</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th data-bbox="438 996 678 1025">Political Opinion</th> <th data-bbox="742 1025 933 1086">PSRs N=2,917 (47%)</th> <th data-bbox="973 996 1141 1086">New Orders N=1,626 (44%)</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Unionist</td> <td>10%</td> <td>11%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Nationalist</td> <td>12%</td> <td>12%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>None</td> <td>60%</td> <td>58%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Other</td> <td>2%</td> <td>2%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Prefer Not To Say</td> <td>17%</td> <td>17%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Political Opinion	PSRs N=2,917 (47%)	New Orders N=1,626 (44%)	Unionist	10%	11%	Nationalist	12%	12%	None	60%	58%	Other	2%	2%	Prefer Not To Say	17%	17%
Political Opinion	PSRs N=2,917 (47%)	New Orders N=1,626 (44%)																	
Unionist	10%	11%																	
Nationalist	12%	12%																	
None	60%	58%																	
Other	2%	2%																	
Prefer Not To Say	17%	17%																	
Racial group	<p>Service User Data (Service Users Survey 2015)</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th data-bbox="438 1456 574 1485">Ethnicity</th> <th data-bbox="598 1456 1157 1485"></th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>White</td> <td>98%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Other</td> <td>2%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Ethnicity		White	98%	Other	2%												
Ethnicity																			
White	98%																		
Other	2%																		

Age	<p>Service User Data (Service Users Survey 2015)</p> <table border="1"> <tr> <td>Age</td> <td>18-24</td> <td>26%</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td>25-29</td> <td>20%</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td>30-39</td> <td>25%</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td>40-49</td> <td>16%</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td>50+</td> <td>13%</td> </tr> </table>	Age	18-24	26%		25-29	20%		30-39	25%		40-49	16%		50+	13%			
Age	18-24	26%																	
	25-29	20%																	
	30-39	25%																	
	40-49	16%																	
	50+	13%																	
Marital status	<p>Service User Data on those who started an order in 2011/12 (last time surveyed for this information)</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Marital Status</th> <th>PSRs N=2,958 (48%)</th> <th>New Orders N=1,635 (45%)</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Single (Never Married)</td> <td>70%</td> <td>77%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Married</td> <td>16%</td> <td>12%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Separated</td> <td>7%</td> <td>5%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Divorced</td> <td>6%</td> <td>5%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Widowed</td> <td>1%</td> <td>1%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Marital Status	PSRs N=2,958 (48%)	New Orders N=1,635 (45%)	Single (Never Married)	70%	77%	Married	16%	12%	Separated	7%	5%	Divorced	6%	5%	Widowed	1%	1%
Marital Status	PSRs N=2,958 (48%)	New Orders N=1,635 (45%)																	
Single (Never Married)	70%	77%																	
Married	16%	12%																	
Separated	7%	5%																	
Divorced	6%	5%																	
Widowed	1%	1%																	
Sexual orientation	<p>Service User Data on those who started an order in 2011/12 (last time surveyed for this information)</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Sexual Orientation</th> <th>PSRs N=2,914 (47%)</th> <th>New Orders N=1,615 (44%)</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Heterosexual/ Straight</td> <td>99%</td> <td>99%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Gay/ Lesbian</td> <td>1%</td> <td>1%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Bisexual</td> <td>*</td> <td>*</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Sexual Orientation	PSRs N=2,914 (47%)	New Orders N=1,615 (44%)	Heterosexual/ Straight	99%	99%	Gay/ Lesbian	1%	1%	Bisexual	*	*						
Sexual Orientation	PSRs N=2,914 (47%)	New Orders N=1,615 (44%)																	
Heterosexual/ Straight	99%	99%																	
Gay/ Lesbian	1%	1%																	
Bisexual	*	*																	
Men and women generally	<p>Service user data (Service Users Survey 2015)</p> <table border="1"> <tr> <td>Gender</td> <td>Male</td> <td>88%</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td>Female</td> <td>12%</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td>29%</td> <td>71%</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td></td> <td>100%</td> </tr> </table>	Gender	Male	88%		Female	12%		29%	71%			100%						
Gender	Male	88%																	
	Female	12%																	
	29%	71%																	
		100%																	

Disability	Service User Data (Service Users Survey 2015)	
	Disability	
	None	52%
	Mental Health Condition	35%
	Learning Disability / Difficulty	12%
	Long Term Illness	11%
	Physical Impairment	8%
	Other	4%
	Sensory Impairment	1%
Dependants	Service User Data on those who started an order in 2011/12 (last time surveyed for this information)	
	Dependants	New Orders
	PSRs N=2,993 (48%)	N=1,658 (45%)
	None	53%
	Child/ Children	45%
	Person with disability	2%
	Elderly Person	2%
		56%
		42%
		2%
		1%

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

Section 75 category	Details of needs/experiences/priorities
Religious belief	None specific to Religious belief
Political opinion	None specific to Political Opinion
Racial group	None specific to ethnicity

Age	<p>Research (Millward and Brown, Morrow et al, and PBNI's own analysis) tells us that there are a number of characteristics which indicate those most likely to become involved or further involved in criminality:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Originating from families experiencing inter-generational trauma Originating from families living in high social deprivation; Those from households where lack of parental control is an issue; Those with mental health issues and low levels of self-esteem; Those who are in drug debt Those with a lack of prospects and social marginalisation Those who are unemployed, with low educational attainment Those involved in drug and/or alcohol abuse Those involved in anti-social behaviour Those who may be under threat within their community Those looking to "find their place, a sense of belonging" and of the attraction of gangs which can provide a "home" while fostering extreme behaviour. Many of these characteristics are common to any young man involved in criminality.
Marital status	None
Sexual orientation	None
Men and women generally	See age for gender issues – This policy seeks to address already known equality issues for young men.
Disability	Mental health and low levels of esteem are known issues
Dependants	None

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? Minor Major None		
Section 75 category	Details of policy impact	Level of impact? Minor Major None
Religious belief	None	
Political opinion	None	
Racial group	None	
Age	This policy seeks to promote equality for young people	
Marital status	None	
Sexual orientation	None	
Men and women generally	This policy seeks to promote equality for young men. The Aspire project continues to build on elements that have already demonstrated effectiveness, and is informed by the Inspire model (for women) which has provided PBNI with significant skills and learning regarding a gender based community partnership approach.	
Disability	This policy promotes equality to young people with disability	
Dependants	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 Yes , provide details	If No , provide reasons
Religious belief	No	This policy is addressing a known need to promote equality to young males.
Political opinion	No	
Racial group	No	
Age	No	
Marital status	No	
Sexual orientation	No	
Men and women generally	No	
Disability	No	
Dependants	No	

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? Minor Major None		
Good relations category	Details of policy impact	Level of impact Minor Major None
Religious belief	The Aspire project provides intensive additional and innovative interventions with young men to enable them to access alternative pro social pathways including: employment or training; stable housing; personal development, and health and wellbeing. The approach is innovative, based on co design/production and partnerships involving the Community and Voluntary Sector. The project is providing additionally to existing PBNI work in a targeted and focussed manner and will lead to safer communities.	Minor
Political opinion	See Above	Minor
Racial group	See Above	Minor

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 Yes , provide details	If No , provide reasons
Religious belief	The policy is designed t bring about safer communities through a reduction in re-offending.	
Political opinion	See above	
Racial group	See 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).

Marginalised young men (aged 16-30)

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

This policy seeks to promote equality for young men The Aspire project continues to build on elements that have already demonstrated effectiveness, and is informed by the Inspire model (for women) which has provided PBNI with significant skills and learning regarding a gender based community partnership approach.

2.11 Is there an opportunity through 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: -

PBNI will work with young people with mental health and low levels of esteem to promote better outcomes for this cohort.

Part 3 Screening decision

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

PBNI has not identified any significant equality concerns in relation to the implementation of this policy.

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.

No applicable

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

Not applicable

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. 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.

Not Applicable

Date Screening Completed: 1st March 2018
Department Completing this Screening: Psychology and HR