

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

Mental Health Court

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

New

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

To provide a problem solving approach to mental health within the criminal justice system. This is an alternative approach to offenders with mental health problems being incarcerated. It will focus on treatment for this client group as opposed to prison, and will create a therapeutic environment for rehabilitation.

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

Disability – policy is aimed to assist those with Mental Health disabilities

1.5 Who initiated or wrote the policy?

PBNI

1.6 Which Dept. owns and who implements the policy?

PBNI

Implementation factors

1.7 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

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?

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.

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>Political Opinion</th> <th>PSRs N=2,917 (47%)</th> <th>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>Ethnicity</th> <th></th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>White</td> <td>98%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Other</td> <td>2%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>Workforce Data (Oct 2016)</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>White</th> <th>Mixed Race</th> <th>Not-Disclosed</th> <th>Blank</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>355</td> <td>2</td> <td>2</td> <td>5</td> </tr> <tr> <td>98%</td> <td>1%</td> <td>1%</td> <td>1%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Ethnicity		White	98%	Other	2%	White	Mixed Race	Not-Disclosed	Blank	355	2	2	5	98%	1%	1%	1%
Ethnicity																			
White	98%																		
Other	2%																		
White	Mixed Race	Not-Disclosed	Blank																
355	2	2	5																
98%	1%	1%	1%																

Age	Service User Data (Service Users Survey 2015)				
	Age	18-24	26%		
		25-29	20%		
		30-39	25%		
		40-49	16%		
		50+	13%		
	Workforce Data (Oct 2016)				
	18-25	26-35	36-45	45-55	56+
	2	43	115	118	86
	1%	12%	32%	32%	24%
Marital status	Service User Data on those who started an order in 2011/12 (last time surveyed for this information)				
	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	Service User Data on those who started an order in 2011/12 (last time surveyed for this information)				
	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	Service user data (Service Users Survey 2015)				
	Gender	Male	88%		
		Female	12%		
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=1,658
		N=2,993 (48%)
		(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	No specific needs, experiences or priorities have been identified
Political opinion	No specific needs, experiences or priorities have been identified
Racial group	Foreign national offender while small in number may especially find this service of great assistance in accessing support and local knowledge.
Age	No specific needs, experiences or priorities have been identified
Marital status	No specific needs, experiences or priorities have been identified
Sexual orientation	No specific needs, experiences or priorities have been identified
Men and women generally	Open to both male and female offenders
Disability	The offending population has higher rates of mental health disabilities than the societal average. This policy is designed to benefit those with identified Mental Health disabilities.
Dependants	No specific needs, experiences or priorities have been 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? Minor Major None		
Section 75 category	Details of policy impact	Level of impact? Minor Major None
Religious belief		None
Political opinion		None
Racial group	Foreign Nationals can expect to benefit from one to one mentoring and this will assist with the promotion of equality buy ensuring that they can tap into local knowledge in relation to local services and opportunities – albeit that the number affected will be low.	Minor
Age	The majority of offenders are young males and therefore this multi-identity group will benefit from the provision of this project.	Minor
Marital status	No specific needs, experiences or priorities have been identified	None
Sexual orientation	No specific needs, experiences or priorities have been identified	None
Men and women generally	The majority of offenders are young males and therefore this multi-identity group will benefit from the provision of this project.	Minor
Disability	With higher levels of mental health disabilities in the sentenced population this group will benefit significantly in relation to the operation of this policy.	Major

Dependants	No specific needs, experiences or priorities have been identified	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		Equality consideration will be incorporated in the procedures that will guide this project.
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? Minor Major None		
Good relations category	Details of policy impact	Level of impact Minor Major None
Religious belief	The identified benefit is to reduce offending and to engage offenders in treatment to address their underlying mental health and criminogenic needs therefore making communities safer for everyone.	Minor
Political opinion	As above	Minor
Racial group	As 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	This project is intended to create safer communities and therefore potentially better community relations	
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).

People with Mental health issues will always be multi-identity e.g. gender, age, sexual orientation etc.

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

None available

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: -
The support offered will greatly assist offenders with mental health needs as each person will receive a tailored packager of support to address their unique needs.

Part 3 Screening decision

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

The overall impact of the project is designed to reduce offending by offering an intensive package of treatment and support to meet the unique needs of offenders with mental health problems.

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. 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.

N/A

Date Screening Completed: 2 March 2018

Department Completing this Screening: Head of Psychology with advice from PBNI Human Resources Department.