

Policy Title: Decision to propose 450 FTE redundancies and as a consequence submit a HR1 notification and commence a 90-day consultation period

Decision: Screened Out

Contact: Damian McAlister, Chief People Officer.

Date of Completion: 17 April 2026

Part 1: Policy Scoping

Information about the policy

Name of the Policy

Decision to propose 450 FTE redundancies and as a consequence submit a HR1 notification and commence a 90-day consultation period

NOTE: This is the screening of the decision to propose 450 FTE redundancies. It is **not** intended to be the screening of any voluntary severance scheme that might be proposed, or selection criteria. If a voluntary severance scheme is developed, it will be subject to a separate screening exercise.

Is this an existing, revised, or new policy?

This is policy decision which has been approved by the University Council on the recommendation of the University's Senior Leadership Team.

What is it trying to achieve?

The current funding model for Higher Education in Northern Ireland is unsustainable due to inadequate funding from the Northern Ireland Government. Urgent action is required to return the University to a sustainable financial position.

The University has invested in additional staff in recent years and as such we are confident that we can operate, albeit with less enhancement activity, with a lower staff base. While we have taken action to reduce our cost base, yielding some £5m in savings, this has been insufficient in bridging the gap between our costs and income and therefore now believe that the proposed redundancies offer the most feasible route to financial sustainability within the required timeframe.

The University is required by law to provide advance notification to the Department for the Economy and NISRA of any proposal to make redundant 20 or more employees. This notification is via an online HR1 Form. The decision triggers a statutory 90-day consultation period on the intention to dismiss 450 FTE members of staff by way of redundancy.

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

Yes; Age. Anecdotally, voluntary redundancy schemes are particularly attractive to older staff with long service.

Who initiated or wrote the policy?

The Senior Leadership Team.

Who owns and implements the policy?

The Senior Leadership Team and University Council.

Implementation factors

Are there any factors which could contribute to or weaken the intended aim or outcome of the policy?

Yes

If yes, are they financial, legislative or other?

Financial: Funding from the Northern Ireland Government

Legislative: Compliance with relevant employment legislation

Other: Effective and timely consultation and development of a voluntary redundancy scheme. The University may not receive a sufficient number of applications for voluntary redundancy.

Main stakeholders affected

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

All staff.

Other policies with a bearing on this policy

What are they and who owns them?

Policy: The People, Place and Partnerships – Delivering Sustainable Futures for all Strategy

Policy owner: The Vice Chancellor

Policy: University Redundancy Policy

Policy owner: Chief People Officer

Available evidence

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

Note: Evidence can come from many sources. Examples include the University's management information systems, internal or external research, surveys or consultation exercises. The Equality Commission has produced a guide to [signpost to S75 data](#). Anecdotal evidence, such as feedback from service users may also be used.

Religious Belief

The University's EO data were reviewed. On 6 February 2026, our staff profile was 53.9% Catholic and 46.1% Protestant. Compared with 6 February 2021, this indicates a 3.9% increase in Catholic staff.

Political Opinion

The University does not collect information on Political Opinion or make assumptions regarding Political Opinion based on Community Background.

Racial Group

The University's EO data were reviewed. On 6 February 2026, our staff profile was 92.0% White and 8.0% Black and Minority Ethnic (BME). This indicates a 2% increase in BME staff compared with 2021.

Our BME profile suggests that we are twice as diverse as the local population, as the Northern Ireland Census 2021 suggests that 3.4% of the NI population is BME.

Age

The University's EO data were reviewed. On 6 February 2026, 29.7% of our staff were in the 46-55 age band and 26.0% of staff were in the 36-45 age band. 25.2% of staff were aged '56 and above', which represents a 0.8% increase in staff aged '56 and above' compared to 2021.

Marital Status

The University's EO data were reviewed. In February 2026, 55.1% of staff were 'Married or in a Civil Partnership', a decrease of 4.8% compared to 2021.

Sexual Orientation

The University's EO data were reviewed. In 2026, 75.5% of staff were 'Heterosexual'; 5.0% were 'Lesbian, Gay and Bisexual (LGB)' and 19.5% were 'Not Known'. This indicates a 2.3% increase in LGB staff compared with 2021.

Men and Women generally

The University's EO data were reviewed. In 2026, 58.0% of staff were 'Female'. This indicates a 2% increase in female staff compared with 2021.

Disability

The University's EO data were reviewed. In 2026, 7.2% of staff declared a disability, an increase of 2.3% compared with 2021.

Our disability declaration rate is lower than expected, compared with the local population. The NI Census (2021) found that 24% of the NI population stated that their day-to-day activities were limited because of a long-standing health problem or disability.

Dependants

The University's EO data were reviewed. In 2026, 43.4% of staff had dependants. This indicates an increase of 5% compared with 2021.

Needs, experience 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 or decision? (Please specify for each of the Section 75 categories below the needs, experiences and priorities)

Religious Belief

None identified.

Political Opinion

None identified.

Racial Group

None identified.

Age

Anecdotally voluntary redundancy schemes are particularly attractive to older staff with long service. This is a positive impact for the affected staff.

The Labour Relations Agency (LRA) redundancy calculator (which is incorporated in the University's Redundancy Policy) calculates redundancy compensation based on age and length of service.

Marital Status

None identified.

Sexual Orientation

None identified.

Men and Women generally

None identified.

Disability

None identified.

Dependants

None identified.

Consultation

Consultation with relevant groups, organisations or individuals about the policy can provide useful information about issues or opportunities which are specifically related to them (that is evidence to inform the policy).

Please indicate whether you carried out or intend to carry out any consultation exercises prior to equality screening?

Yes there has been some initial consultation and engagement on the issue as set out below.

The University's financial operating context has been deteriorating over the last couple of financial years. As such it has often formed part of the agenda for formal Trade Union meetings and staff communication events. The following serves to exemplify those formal engagements, over the last 12 months only, during which key stakeholders and staff were briefed on the University's finances.

- 7 February 2025 – JUCNC attended by the Vice-Chancellor who provided a strategic update which included briefing on finances
- 4 March 2025 – VC Townhall Event for staff
- 11 March 2025 – Union Finances Briefing with Chief Strategy and Finance Officer (CSFO) and Chief People Officer (CPO)
- 9 May 2025 – JUCNC including discussion on finances. The Vice-Chancellor was unable to attend but the Deputy Vice-Chancellor (DVC), CSFO and CPO led the discussion for management
- 7 October 2025 – Union Finance Briefing with DVC and CSFO
- 19 November 2025 – JUCNC including discussion on finances. The Vice-Chancellor was unable to attend but the Deputy Vice-Chancellor, CSFO and CPO led the discussion for management
- 27 November 2025 – VC Townhall Event for staff
- 10 December 2025 – Union Finance Briefing with DVC, CSFO and CPO
- 18 February 2026 – JUCNC attended by the Vice-Chancellor who provided a strategic update which included briefing on finances
- 25 March 2026 – Union Finance Briefing with DVC, CSFO and CPO

The HR1 submission triggers a statutory consultation process (minimum of 90 days) during which time we will formally consult with our University Trade Unions on the need for redundancy, measures which may help avoid or limit redundancies and any proposals around the resultant redundancy scheme.

Part 2: Screening questions

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 question 1 to 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 opportunities 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.

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.

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

Screening questions

1. What is the likely impact on equality of opportunity for those affected by this policy, for each of the Section 75 categories?

Details of the likely policy impacts on **Religious Belief**

The decision is unlikely to impact on equality of opportunity for this group as it bears no relevance to religious belief.

What is the level of impact?

None.

Details of the likely policy impacts on **Political Opinion**

The decision is unlikely to impact on equality of opportunity for this group as it bears no relevance to political opinion.

Level of impact

None

Details of the likely policy impacts on **Racial Group**

The decision is unlikely to impact on equality of opportunity for this group as it bears no relevance to racial group.

Level of impact

None

Details of the likely policy impacts on **Age**

The decision is likely to impact on equality of opportunity for this group. Depending on the outcome of the 90-day consultation, it is possible that the voluntary exit scheme could be based on The Labour Relations Agency (LRA) redundancy calculator (which is incorporated in the University's Redundancy Policy). This calculates redundancy compensation based on age and length of service.

Level of impact

Minor +

Details of the likely policy impacts on **Marital Status**

The decision is unlikely to impact on equality of opportunity for this group as it bears no relevance to marital status

Level of impact
None

Details of the likely policy impacts on **Sexual Orientation**

The decision is unlikely to impact on equality of opportunity for this group as it bears no relevance to sexual orientation.

Level of impact
None

Details of the likely policy impacts on **Men and Women generally**

The decision is unlikely to impact on equality of opportunity for this group as it bears no relevance to men and women generally.

Level of impact
None

Details of the likely policy impacts on **Disability**

The decision is unlikely to impact on equality of opportunity for this group as it bears no relevance to disability.

Level of impact
None

Details of the likely policy impacts on **Dependants**

The decision is unlikely to impact on equality of opportunity for this group as it bears no relevance to persons with or without dependants.

Level of impact
None

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

Religious Belief

No. The decision bears no relevance to religious belief.

Political Opinion

No. The decision bears no relevance to political opinion.

Racial Group

No. The decision bears no relevance to racial group.

Age

No. The decision could be underpinned by the Labour Relations Agency (LRA) redundancy calculator, which is incorporated in the University's Redundancy Policy, and calculates redundancy compensation based on age and length of service.

Marital Status

No. The decision bears no relevance to marital status.

Sexual Orientation

No. The decision bears no relevance to sexual orientation.

Men and Women generally

No. The decision bears no relevance to men and women generally.

Disability

No. The decision bears no relevance to disability.

Dependants

No. The decision bears no relevance to people with or without dependants.

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

Religious Belief

Details of the likely policy impacts on **Religious Belief**

The decision is unlikely to impact on good relations for this group; it has no relevance to good relations.

Level of impact

None

Political Opinion

Details of the likely policy impacts on **Political Opinion**

The decision is unlikely to impact on good relations for this group; it has no relevance to good relations.

Level of impact

None

Racial Group

Details of the likely policy impacts on **Racial Group**

The decision is unlikely to impact on good relations for this group; it has no relevance to good relations.

Level of impact

None

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

Religious Belief

No, the decision has no relevance to good relations.

Political Opinion

No, the decision has no relevance to good relations.

Racial Group

No, the decision has no relevance to good relations.

Additional considerations**Multiple identity**

5. Generally speaking, people can fall into more than one Section 75 category. Taking this into consideration, are there any potential impacts of the policy or decision on people with multiple identities? (For example, disabled minority ethnic people; disabled women; young Protestant men, and young lesbians, gay and bisexual people).

Yes

Please specify the relevant Section 75 categories concerned below.
Provide details of the policy impact and data which describes the policy impact.

All those impacted by this decision hold multiple and intersecting identities related to Age, however it is envisaged that redundancy will be more attractive to older staff with long service.

Disability Duties

6. Does the policy provide an opportunity to encourage disabled people to participate in University life?

No. The decision bears no relevance to disability.

7. Does the policy provide an opportunity to promote positive attitudes towards disabled people?

No. The decision bears no relevance to disability.

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 (that is, subject to an Equality Impact Assessment). The likely impact is **major** in respect of one, or more of the equality of opportunity or good relations categories.
- Screen out** the policy without mitigation or an alternative policy proposed to be adopted (that is, **no** Equality Impact Assessment). The likely impact is **none** in respect of all of equality of opportunity 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** (that is, **no** Equality Impact Assessment). The likely impact is **minor** in respect of one or more of the equality of opportunity or good relations categories.

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

Not applicable

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

Not applicable

If the decision is not to conduct an equality impact assessment (that is, 'screen out' the policy), and mitigate the impacts on equality of opportunity 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 of the equality of opportunity categories (Age), however, the impact is likely to be positive.

This decision to dismiss 450 FTE members of staff by way of redundancy has triggered the submission of an HR1 notification and a statutory 90-day consultation period. It is **not** intended to be the screening of any voluntary severance scheme that might be proposed, or selection criteria. If a voluntary severance scheme is developed, it will be subject to a separate screening exercise.

Timetabling and prioritising

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

On a scale of 1 to 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 rating for timetabling the equality impact assessment in terms of effect on equality of opportunity and good relations:

Not applicable

Priority rating for timetabling the equality impact assessment in terms of social need

Not applicable

Priority rating for timetabling the equality impact assessment in terms of effect on people's daily lives

Not applicable

Priority rating for timetabling the equality impact assessment in terms of relevance to the University's functions

Not applicable

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?

Not applicable

Approval and authorisation



Screened by

Position or Job Title: Director of People and Culture

Date screened: 17 April 2026

Approved by:



Position or Job Title: Chief People Officer

Date approved: 17 April 2026

Review

Not applicable. In line with the HR1 process, the University will open a formal 90-day consultation. If a voluntary severance scheme is developed, it will be subject to a separate screening exercise.