

UNIVERSITY OF ULSTER POLICY SCREENING PRO-FORMA

Introduction

In line with Section 75 of the Northern Ireland Act 1998, the University is required to ensure that its policies are reviewed to assess their likely impact on equality of opportunity and good relations on specific groups of people (i.e. the Section 75 categories¹). This review is called policy screening. Screening ensures that equality of opportunity and good relations are central to policy decision-making and service provision (i.e. they are mainstreamed).

During policy screening, the impacts associated with a policy are assessed using relevant quantitative or qualitative data. These data provide evidence to inform the screening decision. The screening decision may be to carry out an equality impact assessment (i.e. 'screen in' the policy), or not to carry out an equality impact assessment (i.e. 'screen out' the policy). Furthermore, where policies are screened out, there may also be a decision to introduce measures to mitigate the likely impact of the policy, or to introduce an alternative policy to better promote equality of opportunity and/or good relations.

In the context of Section 75, the term 'policy' is very broadly defined. 'Policy' includes any strategy, policy (proposed/amended/existing) or practice and/or decision, whether written or unwritten, internal (relating to staff) or external (relating to those who are, or could be served by the University). This means that all of the University's planning decisions, service changes, corporate strategies, policy development, practices, guidelines, procedures and protocols, board/council papers and corporate/strategic decisions etc, both written and unwritten, must be screened.

Policy screening is usually carried out by the policy decision-maker who has the authority to make changes to that policy, in conjunction with any other staff members who implement the policy, staff members from other relevant work areas) and/or any key stakeholders. Equality and Diversity Services staff assist in the screening process. It is more effective and efficient if screening takes place whilst the policy is in the early stages of development or policy review.

This policy screening pro-forma has been developed using the Equality Commission for Northern Ireland's (ECNI's) template to ensure that all policies are reviewed systematically and consistently. Part 1 of the pro-forma focuses on the scope of the policy (i.e. information about the policy), whilst Part 2 contains the screening questions. Part 3 contains the screening decision, and Part 4 contains the approval, authorisation and review date details.

Parts 1-3 of the pro-forma must be completed and attached to the final draft of the policy before each can be considered (*and approved*) by Senior Management Group.

¹ The Section 75 categories are religious belief, political opinion, racial group, age, marital status, sexual orientation, sex, disability and dependants.

UNIVERSITY OF ULSTER POLICY SCREENING PRO-FORMA

Following this, and in line with the University's 'Procedures for developing, introducing and reviewing University of Ulster Policies', the policy owner must inform the Head of Governance and Legal Services that the policy has been approved. Once the Council of the University has been informed of the policy (either directly or through an appropriate Committee), the policy owner can then promulgate the policy and develop appropriate training or awareness raising material in relation to the policy.

The final approved pro-forma and policy will be made available to the general public during the University's quarterly policy screening consultation exercises and will be available on the University's web pages.

Part 1

Information about the policy

Note: 'Policy' includes any strategy, policy (proposed/amended/existing) or practice and/or decision, whether written or unwritten.

Name of the policy

Intellectual Property Policy and Procedures

Is this an existing, revised or a new policy?

Revised

What is it trying to achieve? (intended aims/outcomes) See below
What is the aim, objective or purpose of the Policy?

- Fostering academic entrepreneurship within University
- Providing "best practice" policy & procedures for management of IP
- Providing guidance to academics and students alike on the role and responsibilities of Office of Innovation/IUL from IP disclosure to eventual IP exploitation
- Providing guidance on ownership of IP and responsibilities of staff and students to disclose when required.
- Encouraging early submission of invention disclosures to ensure results of research are successfully exploited- identifying IP opportunities early.
- Translating of IP into tangible assets for maximisation of socio-economic and commercial performance of the University
- Incentivising staff and students to create and develop exploitable IP by ensuring fair and equitable reward scheme
- Reflecting core strategic aims and cross cutting goals of the University

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

The category "Gender" may benefit as there appears to be a gender gap in certain

Part 1

sectors/schools given the data analysis carried out on the inventor database taken from the period 01/07/07 to 31/07/09.

Who initiated or wrote the policy?

Office of Innovation

Who owns and who implements the policy?

The Policy is defined and implemented by Office of Innovation

Part 1

Implementation factors

Are there any factors which could contribute to/detract from the intended aim/outcome of the policy/decision? (Please select one answer)

Yes

If yes, are they

Financial. Yes. Government funding or University reserve changes may impact on the procedures and remuneration policy.

Legislative No

other, please specify _____

Main stakeholders affected

Who are the internal and external stakeholders (actual or potential) that the policy will impact upon?

staff -Yes

service users -Yes

other public sector organisations Yes DEL, DETI, Invest NI

voluntary/community/trade unions Yes

other, please specify , Students .

Other policies with a bearing on this policy

- what are they? None (Please note that copyright ownership aspects of Copyright Policy have been incorporated into the revised IP policy. Therefore once the Copyright Policy is amended to reflect this, it will have no further bearing on the revised IP Policy)

- who owns them?

Part 1

Available evidence

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

Note: evidence can come from many sources. Examples include the University's management information systems, internal or external research, surveys or consultation exercises. Anecdotal evidence such as feedback from service users may also be used.

We have analysed the Equal Opportunities (EO) data relating to inventors and compared it with the University EO profile, with those persons participating in the 2008 RAE and Equality Monitoring returns data received from inventors that have applied for funding to the Business Innovation Link (BIL) during the period Apr 2008 - March 2009. We also compared the inventor data with academic/research composition on 4 August 2010 between certain schools, i.e. Biomedical Sciences, Built Environment, Engineering, Health Sciences, Art & Design, Computing & Intelligent Systems and Computing & Mathematics

Section 75 category	Details of evidence/information
Religious belief	There is a slightly greater proportion of protestant inventors than catholic inventors compared with the RAE proportions. However, the proportion aligns with the University's 'Religious Belief' profile. Likewise such proportions were observed in Biomedical Sciences and Art & Design when compared with the academic/research composition ratio. Computing & Intelligent Systems appeared to attract a greater proportion of catholic inventors over protestant inventors but this is aligned with the academic/research composition ratio.
Political opinion	No evidence gathered
Racial group	In line with the university's EO profile, there is a greater proportion of white inventors compared to black and minority ethnic groups. This ratio is also comparable with the RAE composition. Health Sciences and Art & Design have no

Part 1

	inventors from BME groups.
Age	The highest proportion of inventors is from the age group 35-44, which is comparable with the RAE composition. A small proportion of inventors is in the age group 25-34 and is approximately half the RAE proportion. This is surprising but may be down to higher workloads and domestic responsibilities (such as having children) associated with this age group.
Marital status	A higher proportion of inventors are married compared to those that are single. This compares with RAE compositions so no obvious actions/impact.
Sexual orientation	Could not assess as 61.3% of those persons analysed are not known.
Men and women generally	<p>Whilst the University has a higher proportion of female staff, the IP data suggests that there is a much higher proportion of male inventors compared to female inventors within the University. However, This ratio is similar to the RAE compositions and with the gender composition of inventor data supplied from BIL.</p> <p>Within the schools, the ratio of male to females varies depending on the area of research. In Biomedical sciences the proportions of M:F ratio in terms of inventorship is the less pronounced when compared with the RAE composition. However in Engineering, this is predominantly male led in relation to inventors but proportional to the RAE composition. Likewise Health Sciences is predominantly female led and inventorship gender reflects this trend.</p> <p>No female inventors were identified in Computing & Mathematics and Built Environment.</p> <p>In Art & Design, although the RAE composition is equally proportioned, there is a greater ratio of female inventors compared to males.</p>
Disability	No suitable evidence collected

Part 1

Dependants	The proportion of inventors having dependents compared to those without was comparable to the ratios in the 2008 RAE composition.
------------	--

Part 1

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? (Please specify details for each of the Section 75 categories)

Section 75 category	Details of needs/experiences/priorities
Religious belief	None identified
Political opinion	None identified
Racial group	BME staff in Health Sciences and Art & Design may need more encouragement to apply to, and support in becoming inventors/innovators.
Age	Staff in the age group 25-34 may need more encouragement to apply to, and support in becoming inventors/innovators.
Marital status	None identified
Sexual orientation	None identified
Men and women generally	The data suggests that there may be a need to promote the recruitment of more females in the areas of Engineering, Computing & Maths and Built Environment and indeed female inventors. Likewise the promotion of more males in the area of Health Sciences may be valuable. The data from Art & Design would also suggest that there is a lack of male innovation in that area.
Disability	None identified
Dependants	None identified

Part 1

Consultation

Consultation with relevant groups, organisations or individuals about the policy can provide useful information about issues/opportunities which are specifically related to them (i.e. evidence to inform the policy). Please indicate whether you carried out (or intend to carry out²) any consultation exercises prior to equality screening?

We have now completed the consultation for the revised IP policy which lasted for six weeks. The consultation was both an open (all staff & students) and targeted (Heads of school upwards) where all individuals were asked to provide feedback on the draft policy. The revised IP Policy was presented to both the Innovation Ulster Ltd Board (14/05/10) and the Research Innovation Forum (01/06/10) for their views and input. I also met with the Research Degrees Committee on 14th January 2011 for their views and input. I have received very little feedback from the consultation and I would hope that this is a sign of unanimous approval of the revised IP Policy.

No equality issues were identified during this consultation.

² Please contact Equality and Diversity Services if you intend to carry out a consultation exercise prior to equality screening your policy. EDS will assist you to align some of the consultation questions with the screening pro-forma, so that you receive more meaningful responses.

Screening

Introduction

The answers to the following screening questions will assist the University in making a decision whether or not there is a need to carry out an equality impact assessment on the policy. The following information is provided to help you to identify and comment on the level of likely impact of the policy in questions 1-4:

Select 'major' impact if:

- a) The policy is significant in terms of its strategic importance;
- b) Potential equality impacts are unknown, because, for example, there are insufficient data upon which to make an assessment or because they are complex, and it would be appropriate to conduct an equality impact assessment in order to better assess them;
- c) Potential equality and/or good relations impacts are likely to be adverse or are likely to be experienced disproportionately by groups of people including those who are marginalised or disadvantaged;
- d) Further assessment offers a valuable way to examine the evidence and develop recommendations in respect of a policy about which there are concerns amongst affected individuals and representative groups, for example in respect of multiple identities;
- e) The policy is likely to be challenged by way of judicial review;
- f) The policy is significant in terms of expenditure.

Select 'minor' impact if:

- a) The policy is not unlawfully discriminatory and any residual potential impacts on people are judged to be negligible;
- b) The policy, or certain proposals within it, are potentially unlawfully discriminatory, but this possibility can readily and easily be eliminated by making appropriate changes to the policy or by adopting appropriate mitigating measures;
- c) Any asymmetrical equality impacts caused by the policy are intentional because they are specifically designed to promote equality of opportunity for particular groups of disadvantaged people;
- d) By amending the policy there are better opportunities to better promote equality of opportunity and/or good relations;
- e) Differential impact observed and opportunities exist to better promote equality of opportunity and/or good relations.

Part 2

Select 'none' if:

- a) The policy has no relevance to equality of opportunity or good relations.
- b) The policy is purely technical in nature and will have no bearing in terms of its likely impact on equality of opportunity or good relations for people within the equality and good relations categories.

Taking into account the evidence presented in Part 1, please complete the screening questions (Questions 1-4).

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? (Please provide details)		
Section 75 category	Details of policy impact	Level of impact? (minor/major/none)
Religious belief	No differential or adverse impact	None
Political opinion	No differential or adverse impact	None
Racial group	Differential impact	Minor
Age	Differential impact	Minor
Marital status	No differential or adverse impact	None
Sexual orientation	No differential or adverse impact	None
Men and women generally	Differential impact	Minor
Disability	No differential or adverse impact	None
Dependants	No differential or adverse impact	None

Part 2

2 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		The policy will offer equal opportunities for all individuals
Political opinion		
Racial group	We can provide more encouragement and support to BME staff in Health Sciences and Art & Design to apply to become inventors/innovators	
Age	We can encourage more innovation in the age group 25-34	
Marital status		The policy will offer equal opportunities for all individuals
Sexual orientation		The policy will offer equal opportunities for all individuals
Men and women generally	Encourage more females and female inventors in certain schools such as Engineering, Computing & Maths and Built Environment. Encourage more males to join Health Sciences and more male inventors in Art & Design. Positive action can be taken within Office of	

Part 2

	Innovation to redress the gender imbalance by giving talks to promote and encourage more males or females in a certain research sector to innovate and invent.	
Disability		The policy will offer equal opportunities for all individuals
Dependants		The policy will offer equal opportunities for all individuals

Part 2

3 To what extent is the policy likely to impact on good relations between people of different religious belief, political opinion or racial group? (Please provide details)		
Good relations category	Details of policy impact	Level of impact (minor/major/none)
Religious belief	No differential or adverse impact	None
Political opinion	No differential or adverse impact	None
Racial group	Possible differential impact	Minor

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 does not intend to implement any positive action in this area
Political opinion		The policy does not intend to implement any positive action in this area
Racial group	Provide more encouragement and support to BME staff in Health Sciences and Art & Design to apply to become inventors/innovators	

Part 2

Additional considerations

Multiple identity

<p>5 Generally speaking, people can fall into more than one Section 75 category. Taking this into consideration, please provide details of any potential impacts of the policy/decision on people with multiple identities? (<i>For example; disabled minority ethnic people; disabled women; young Protestant men; and young lesbians, gay and bisexual people</i>). Please include details of any data which you have used to determine/identify this impact</p>	
Section 75 categories (please specify)	Details of policy impact and details of data which describes the policy impact
BME women	Whilst Art and Design and Health Sciences have greater ratios of female inventors compared to males, neither of these schools have any BME female inventors.
Women aged 25-34	A small proportion of inventors is in the age group 25-34 and is approximately half the RAE proportion. This is surprising but may be down to higher workloads and domestic responsibilities (such as having children) associated with this age group.

Disability Duties

<p>6. Does the policy provide an opportunity to encourage disabled people to participate in University life?</p>	
If Yes , provide details	If No , provide reasons
Yes it is implicit within the policy e.g. all medical research carried out helps to encourage disabled people to participate better in University life.	

Part 2

7. Does the policy provide an opportunity to promote positive attitudes towards disabled people?	
If Yes , provide details	If No , provide reasons
Yes because it provides individuals with an opportunity to invent products and processes which will help the lives of disabled people.	

Part 3

Screening decision

Based on the evidence considered and outlined in Part 1 and the responses to the screening questions (Part 2), please indicate the screening decision for this policy:

Note: The University should take particular care not to screen out policies that have a procurement aspect if there is potential to promote equality of opportunity through the procurement of services.

Screen in the policy (subject the policy to an Equality Impact Assessment)
i.e. the likely impact is 'major' in respect of one, or more of the equality of opportunity and/or good relations categories

Screen out the policy without mitigation or an alternative policy proposed to be adopted (no Equality Impact Assessment)
i.e. the likely impact is 'none' in respect of all of the equality of opportunity and/or good relations categories

Screen out the policy and **mitigate the impacts on equality by amending or changing the policy, or by developing an alternative policy or action** (no Equality Impact Assessment)
i.e. the likely impact is 'minor' in respect of one, or more of the equality of opportunity and/or good relations categories

Part 3

If the decision is to subject the policy to an equality impact assessment (i.e. 'screen in' the policy), please provide details of the reasons.



If the decision is not to conduct an equality impact assessment (i.e. 'screen out' the policy), please provide details of the reasons.



Part 3

If the decision is not to conduct an equality impact assessment (i.e. 'screen out' the policy) and mitigate the impacts on equality by amending or changing the policy, or by developing an alternative policy or action, please provide reasons to support your decision, together with the proposed changes/amendments or alternative policy:

The likely impact is '**minor**' in respect of one, or more of the equality of opportunity and/or good relations categories.

Whilst the policy offers guidelines and protection on **all** (100%) intellectual property generated/created at the University (i.e. all IP is managed and/or developed under this policy), the screening process has indicated that action could be taken to encourage specific groups to become inventors/innovators in order to redress inequalities in uptake. Where it has been identified that there is differential participation, it has been agreed to better promote equality of opportunity through additional actions, for example:

- encourage and support BME staff in Health Sciences and Art & Design to avail of IP opportunities;
- encourage more innovation in the age group 25-34 (especially females in this age group);
- encourage more females in Engineering, Computing & Maths and Built Environment to avail of IP opportunities; and
- encourage more males in Art & Design to avail of IP opportunities;
- Office of Innovation to give talks to promote and encourage more males or females in a certain research sector to innovate and invent.

Part 3

Timetabling and prioritising

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

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.

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

Note: The Total Rating Score will 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 University in timetabling. Details of the University's Equality Impact Assessment Timetable will be included in its quarterly Screening Reports.

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

Yes

No

If yes, please provide details:

Part 4

Approval and authorisation

	Position/Job Title	Date
Screened by:	Director of Innovation	Feb 2011
Approved by:	Member of SMG	

Note: Following approval by Senior Management Group, the policy owner must inform the Head of Governance and Legal Services that the policy has been approved. Once the Council of the University has been informed of the policy (either directly or through an appropriate Committee), the policy owner can then promulgate the policy and develop appropriate training or awareness raising material in relation to the policy.

A copy of the screening pro-forma will be made available on the University's website and be made available on request.

Review

Note: Policies must be reviewed at least every two years, but sooner if changes in legislation or other variables require review.

This policy is due for review (in terms of its impact on equality of opportunity and good relations) by the policy owner on:

(Insert date)