



DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

EQUALITY AND HUMAN RIGHTS POLICY SCREENING

Equality Team
Room 6.02, Rathgael House
Ext 59686/59472
equality@deni.gov.uk

Index

1. POLICY SCOPING
2. EVIDENCE
3. SCREENING QUESTIONS
4. SCREENING DECISION
5. MITIGATION
6. MONITORING
7. DISABILITY DISCRIMINATION
8. CONSIDERATION OF HUMAN RIGHTS ISSUES
9. ASSESSMENT OF OTHER IMPACTS
10. APPROVAL AND AUTHORISATION

1. POLICY SCOPING

1.1 Title of policy

Introduction of increased contributions for members of the Northern Ireland Teachers' Pension Scheme (NITPS).

1.2 Type of Policy Development

This is a Revised Policy

1.3 Description of policy

The introduction of increased member contributions in the NITPS will contribute to achieving HM Treasury's target savings of £140m across Northern Ireland public sector pension schemes by 2014/15.

The proposed contribution increases reflect the principles set out by the Coalition Government and adopted by the NI Executive, i.e. that increases should be implemented in such a way as to:

- protect the low paid;
- be progressive – so that those who earn more pay more; and
- limit the risk of increases in the rate of opt-out from schemes.

It is proposed that contribution rates will be on a sliding scale determined by the member's full-time equivalent salary, with the highest increase in contribution rates falling to those on the highest salaries.

1.4 What factors could contribute to, or detract from the intended aim/outcome of the policy?

None	
Legislative	✓
Financial	
Others please specify)	✓

The policy will require amendment of the Teachers' Superannuation Regulations (Northern Ireland) 1998.

Possible industrial action called for by Trades Unions.

1.5 Main stakeholders affected

Pupils (Actual or Potential)	
Parents	
Teaching Staff	✓
Trade Unions or Professional Organisations	✓
Other Public Sector Organisations	
Departmental Staff	
Others (please specify)	

The policy will impact only on members of the NITPS: schoolteachers, lecturers in colleges of further education, other members of the NITPS, their employers and their representatives. Similar increases in contribution rates will also apply to members of other public sector pension schemes in Northern Ireland.

1.6 Who is responsible for :
(a) Devising the policy

HM Treasury, NI Executive.

(b) Implementing it

DE, NITPS employers.

(c) Explain the relationship?

The Coalition Government is committed to meeting the savings target set out at the Spending Review of £2.8bn a year by 2014/15 from the unfunded public service pension schemes. DE manages and administers the NITPS on behalf of teachers' and lecturers' employers.

Treasury has made it clear that if the NI public sector pension schemes do not generate the targeted level of savings by means of increased member contributions, the NI Block Grant will be reduced commensurately (£4.6 million per month in 2012-13).

1.7 Other policies or objectives with a bearing on this policy

Introduction of similar policies to increase member contributions for the health and social care, civil service, police service and fire and rescue pension schemes.

Links to DHSSPS, DFP and DOJ.

2. EVIDENCE

2.1 What evidence/information (both qualitative and quantitative) have you gathered to inform this policy?

Section 75 Category	Details of Evidence/Information
Religious Belief	<p>At present this type of information is typically collected by employing authorities during recruitment activity in line with statutory monitoring requirements. This information is not usually collated and we have not been able to identify any single source of information on the workforce in relation to this measure. However, there is no indication that this policy will disproportionately impact on the basis of religious belief. The Department is considering whether this information could in future be collated and included in a DE digest of statistics on the Education Workforce which will be published on an annual basis from June 2012 onwards.</p>
Political Opinion	<p>This information is not collected by employing authorities. There is no evidence that this policy will disproportionately impact on the basis of political opinion.</p>
Racial Group	<p>At present this type of information is typically collected by employing authorities during recruitment activity in line with statutory monitoring requirements. This information is not usually collated and we have not been able to identify any single source of information on the workforce in relation to this measure. However, there is no indication that this policy will disproportionately impact on the basis of racial group. The Department is considering whether this information could in future be collated and included in a DE digest of statistics on the Education Workforce which will be published on an annual basis from June 2012 onwards.</p>

The table below shows the age and gender profile of the teaching workforce in grant-aided schools only at February 2011:

Age Range	% Female	% Male	% Total
24 and under	1.26	0.38	1.64
25 to 29	9.72	2.26	11.98
30 to 34	13.36	3.57	16.92
35 to 39	12.92	3.68	16.61
40 to 44	11.53	3.56	15.09
45 to 49	8.25	3.23	11.48
50 to 54	8.93	3.59	12.52
55 to 59	7.90	3.41	11.30
60 to 64	1.35	0.90	2.25
65 and over	0.12	0.10	0.22
Totals:	75.33	24.67	100.00

Age

Marital
Status

At present this type of information is typically collected by employing authorities during recruitment activity in line with statutory monitoring requirements. This information is not usually collated and we have not been able to identify any single source of information on the workforce in relation to this measure. However, there is no indication that this policy will disproportionately impact on the basis of marital status. The Department is considering whether this information could in future be collated and included in a DE digest of statistics on the Education Workforce which will be published on an annual basis from June 2012 onwards.

Sexual Orientation	This information is not collected by employing authorities. There is no indication that this policy will disproportionately impact on the basis of sexual orientation.
Men And Women Generally	The policy will affect both men and women. At February 2011 the makeup of the teaching workforce was 75.3% female and 24.7% male. There is no indication that this policy will impact disproportionately on men or on women.
Disability	At present this type of information is typically collected by employing authorities during recruitment activity in line with statutory monitoring requirements. This information is not usually collated and we have not been able to identify any single source of information on the workforce in relation to this measure. However, there is no indication that this policy will disproportionately impact on the basis of disability. The Department is considering whether this information could in future be collated and included in a DE digest of statistics on the Education Workforce which will be published on an annual basis from June 2012 onwards.
Dependants	This information is not collected by employing authorities. There is no evidence that this policy will disproportionately impact on the basis of dependant status.

2.2 Taking into account the evidence gathered at 2.1 what are the needs, experiences and priorities of each of the categories in relation to this particular policy?

Section 75 category	Needs/Experiences/Uptake/Priorities
Religious Belief	Policy applicable to all sub categories

Political Opinion	Policy applicable to all sub categories
Racial Group	Policy applicable to all sub categories
Age	Policy applicable to all sub categories
Marital Status	Policy applicable to all sub categories
Sexual Orientation	Policy applicable to all sub categories
Men And Women Generally	Policy applicable to all sub categories
Disability	Policy applicable to all sub categories
Dependants	Policy applicable to all sub categories

3. SCREENING QUESTIONS

3.1 What is the likely impact of this policy on equality of opportunity for each of the Section 75 equality categories?

Section 75 category	Level of impact?			Details of policy impact
	None	Minor	Major	
Religious belief	✓			
Political opinion	✓			
Racial group	✓			
Age		✓		<p>Younger members of NITPS may be more likely to opt out of scheme membership as a result of increases to contribution rates.</p> <p>However, the sliding scale of the increase in contribution rates according to salary level is designed to mitigate this potential impact.</p>
Marital status	✓			
Sexual Orientation	✓			

Men and women generally	✓			
Disability	✓			
Dependants	✓			

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

Section 75 category	No	Yes	Provide Details
Religious belief	✓		The policy relates exclusively to contributions paid by members of the NITPS.
Political opinion	✓		The policy relates exclusively to contributions paid by members of the NITPS.
Racial group	✓		The policy relates exclusively to contributions paid by members of the NITPS.
Age	✓		The policy relates exclusively to contributions paid by members of the NITPS.
Marital status	✓		The policy relates exclusively to contributions paid by members of the NITPS.

Sexual Orientation	✓		The policy relates exclusively to contributions paid by members of the NITPS.
Men and women generally	✓		The policy relates exclusively to contributions paid by members of the NITPS.
Disability	✓		The policy relates exclusively to contributions paid by members of the NITPS.
Dependants	✓		The policy relates exclusively to contributions paid by members of the NITPS.

3.3 To what extent is the policy likely to impact on good relations between: people of different religious belief, political opinion or racial group?

Good relations category	No impact	Minor impact	Major impact	Details of policy impact
Religious belief	✓			The policy will not impact on good relations.
Political opinion	✓			The policy will not impact on good relations.
Racial group	✓			The policy will not impact on good relations.

3.4 Are there opportunities to better promote good relations between people of different religious belief, political opinion or racial group?

Good relations category	NO	YES	Provide Details
Religious belief	✓		The policy relates exclusively to contributions paid by members of the NITPS.
Political opinion	✓		The policy relates exclusively to contributions paid by members of the NITPS.
Racial group	✓		The policy relates exclusively to contributions paid by members of the NITPS.

3.5 Additional considerations - Multiple identities

Please provide details of data on the impact of the policy on people with multiple identities and specify relevant Section 75 categories concerned.

Not applicable.

4. SCREENING DECISION

Not to conduct an equality impact assessment; although there is a minor impact on one or more of the equality of opportunities and/or good relations categories, mitigation will offset the minor adverse impact(s).

Please provide details which support the decision

In October 2010 the Coalition Government announced that it planned to increase member contributions to public sector pension schemes in order to save £2.8bn a year by 2014/15. Treasury has made it clear that if the NI public sector pension schemes do not generate the targeted level of savings by means of increased member contributions, the NI Block Grant will be reduced commensurately (£4.6 million per month in 2012-13). The Executive agreed on 22 September 2011 to:

- (i) Commit to the principle of delivering the targeted level of savings to the cost of public sector pension schemes in Northern Ireland, subject to the details of how those savings will be delivered being worked through over time;
- (ii) Agree to adopt this approach consistently for each of the different public sector pension schemes; and
- (iii) Authorise engagement with the unions to discuss a graduated approach which protects lower paid public sector workers.

In implementing the increases to contribution rates this policy proposes that contributions will be on a sliding scale determined by the member's full-time equivalent salary, which will reduce the impact on lower earners.

5. TIMETABLING AND PRIORITISING

5.1 If the policy has been ‘screened in’ for equality impact assessment, then please answer the following questions to determine its priority.

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 equality impact assessment.

Criterion	Priority Rating
Effect on equality of opportunity and good relations	
Social need	
Effect on people’s daily lives	
Relevance to a public authority’s functions	
Total	

Details of the Department’s Equality Impact Assessment Timetable will be included in a Quarterly Screening Report.

5.2 If the policy is affected by timetables established by other relevant Public Authorities please provide details

6. MITIGATION

If you conclude that the likely impact is ‘**minor**’ and an equality impact assessment is not to be conducted, you should 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.

Why and how will the policy/decision be amended or changed or an alternative policy introduced to better promote equality of opportunity and/or good relations?

The Department is proposing to introduce a system of tiered contributions. The proposed tiers are designed to be consistent with the principles of protecting the low paid, introducing increased contributions in a way that is progressive and reducing the risk of opt-outs. Thus younger members on lower incomes can expect to be subject to the lowest increases in contributions. Conversely the highest increases in contribution rates would fall to those members earning the highest full-time equivalent salaries.

7. MONITORING

Effective monitoring will help identify any future adverse impact arising from the policy, as well as help with future planning and policy development.

Please detail what data you will collect in the future in order to monitor the effect of the policy on any of Section 75 equality categories.

The Department will regularly collect data on the level of opt-outs from the NITPS by age group.

8. DISABILITY DISCRIMINATION

8.1 Please state if the policy/decision in any way discourages persons with disabilities from participating in public life or fails to promote positive attitudes towards persons with disabilities.

Not applicable.

8.2 Please state if there is an opportunity to better promote positive attitudes towards persons with disabilities or encourage participation in public life by making changes to the policy/decision or introducing additional measures.

Not applicable.

8.3 Please detail what data you will collect in the future in order to monitor the effect of the policy with reference to the disability duties.

Not applicable.

9. CONSIDERATION OF HUMAN RIGHTS ISSUES

9.1 How does the policy/decision affect anyone’s Human Rights?

I.E.

[The Human Rights Act \(1998\)](#)

[The United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child \(UNCRC\)](#)

[The United Nations Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities \(UNCRPD\)](#)

[The United Nations Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination Against Women \(CEDAW\)](#)

Category	No	Yes
Positive Impact	✓	
Negative Impact (human right interfered with or restricted)	✓	
Neutral Impact		✓

9.2 If you have identified a negative impact who is affected and how?

At this stage you should determine whether to seek legal advice and to refer to the issue to the Equality and Sectoral Support Team to consider:

- *whether there is a law which allows you to interfere with or restrict rights*
- *whether this interference or restriction is necessary and proportionate*
- *what action would be required to reduce the level of interference or restriction).*

9.3 Outline any actions which could be taken to promote or raise awareness of human rights or to ensure compliance with the legislation in relation to the policy/decision.

Not applicable.

10. APPROVAL AND AUTHORISATION

Screened By:	Position	Date
Seamus Gallagher	Staff Officer, Teacher Negotiating & Pensions Policy Branch	11/10/2011
Approved By:	Position	Date
Mark Mawhinney	G7 / Head of Teacher Negotiating & Pensions Policy Branch	11/10/2011

Note: A copy of the Screening Form must be approved and 'signed off' by a senior manager responsible for the policy. It must be made easily accessible on the Department's website as soon as possible following completion and made available in alternative formats on request.

FOR COMPLETION BY EQUALITY TEAM

Quality Assured by: Richard Magowan Date: 13.10.11

Screening Out Agreed / ~~Screening Out Not Agreed~~

Comments: Details of the Screening decision should be placed on the Department's Internet site and notified to individuals/organisations on the Equality Database.

Date Directorate/Team Informed: 13.10.11

If Screened Out:

Start of Consultation: 31 October 2011 End of Consultation: 23 January 2012

Placed on Internet by: Gillian Skimin Date: 31 October 2012

If Screened In:

Date EQIA issued: _____

Please forward a copy of the completed Screening Form to:-

Equality Team
Room 6.02, Rathgael House
Ext 59686/59472
equality@deni.gov.uk