

Screening/Scoping Pro Forma

Section	Housing Advice Service	Officer responsible for the screening/scoping	Melissa Samee		
Name of Policy to be assessed	HomeSTEP	Date of Assessment	26/11/08	Is this a proposed new or existing policy/procedure/practice?	Existing
1. Briefly describe the aims, objectives and purpose of the policy/procedure/practice?	To provide efficient and effective housing related support to couples, families and single people who need support in maintaining their tenancies. This is carried out by HomeSTEP (Supporting Tenants Empowering People). Service users are referred to the Service by the Housing Advice Service, in particular, Housing Options, Homes 4 U and Re-housing, when they are due to start a new tenancy in either private rented or Council rented accommodation.				
2. Are there any associated or specific objectives of the policy/procedure/practice? Please explain.	To meet the requirements of Surrey Supporting People, to ensure funding and the associated contract requirements held with them are maintained. Achieving 'value for money' in the provision of the service. Assist tenants to have positive outcomes in what they have chosen to achieve through the implementation of their actions plans.				
3. Who is intended to benefit from this policy and in what way?	Service users. Local Authorities, Housing Associations, Private Landlords. Social Care Workers, Social Workers, Mental Health Workers, Learning Disability Workers, Drug or Alcohol Workers and Probation Officers. With a multi-agency approach, the following can be avoided, repeat homelessness and/or housing need, evictions due to non payment of rent or anti-social behaviour and court proceedings.				
4. What outcomes are wanted from this policy/procedures/practice?	The sustainment of a tenancy which is generally an Assured Shorthold Tenancy. HomeSTEP service users should in time become more able to maintain their tenancies without support and be able to achieve the goal of permanent housing.				

5. What factors/forces could contribute/detract from the outcomes?	Service user non-engagement, level of locals rents, ability to apply for successful “Discretionary Housing Payments”, inability to get some LHA claims paid direct to landlords, evictions, resource limitations, and delays in other social benefits being processed.		
6. Who are the main stakeholders in relation to the policy?	Service users, private landlords, CAB, DWP, RSLs, Health Visitors, Social Services, Housing Benefit.	7. Who implements the policy, and who is responsible for the policy?	Head of Housing Advice Services and HomeSTEP Staff.
8. Are there concerns that the policy <u>could</u> have a differential impact on racial groups?	Y	N	Please explain
What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this?	Referrals are received via Housing Advice Services teams, no evidence to presume any racial groups are being excluded. Supporting People client record returns and outcome returns require ethnicity monitoring.		
9. Are there concerns that the policy <u>could</u> have a differential impact due to gender?	Y	N	
What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this?	The service is open to both males and females. However nature of client group is biased towards single parent mothers.		
10. Are there concerns that the policy <u>could</u> have a differential impact due to disability?	Y	N	
What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this?	Clients with low level learning disabilities are assisted however if the need is higher they would be referred to more appropriate services. Clients with a physical disability may be affected as there is a limited supply of adapted rented properties.		
11. Are there concerns that the policy <u>could</u> have a differential impact due to sexual orientation?	Y	N	

<p>What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this?</p>	<p>The service is open to clients of all sexual orientation and there is no evidence that people of different sexual orientation are deterred from using this service.</p>	
<p>12. Are there concerns that the policy <u>could</u> have a differential impact due to their age?</p>	<p>Y</p>	<p>N</p>
<p>What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this?</p>	<p>The service is not aged based; however the focus of the service is deliberately intended for younger families. The service is targeted at most vulnerable households, a higher proportion of which are younger.</p>	
<p>13. Are there concerns that the policy <u>could</u> have a differential impact due to their religious belief?</p>	<p>Y</p>	<p>N</p>
<p>What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this?</p>	<p>The service is open to clients irrespective of religious beliefs and there is no evidence that people of different religions or belief are deterred from using this service.</p>	
<p>14. Are there concerns that the policy <u>could</u> have a differential impact due to them having dependants/caring responsibilities?</p>	<p>Y</p>	<p>N</p>
<p>What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this?</p>	<p>The service has a large client base, many of whom have dependants/caring responsibilities, therefore appointments and contact is arranged to accommodate these responsibilities.</p>	
<p>15. Are there concerns that the policy <u>could</u> have a differential impact due to them have an offending past?</p>	<p>Y</p>	<p>N</p>
<p>What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this?</p>	<p>Risk assessments are carried out to ensure safety of both service users and support staff. The service is open to offenders and one of the objectives is to reduce the risk of reoffending.</p>	

16. Are there concerns that the policy <u>could</u> have a differential impact due to them being Transgender or transsexual?	Y	N	
What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this?	The service is open to clients of all sexual orientations.		
17. Could the differential impact identified in 8-16 amount to there being the potential for adverse impact in this policy/procedure/practice?	Y	N	Please explain No significant areas of exclusion.
18. Can this adverse impact be justified on the grounds of promoting equality of opportunity for one group? Or any other reason?	Y	N	Please explain for each heading (questions 8-16) on a separate piece of paper.
Business improvement 19. Is there any concern that there are unmet needs in relation to any of the above groups?	Y	N	Please explain No evidence to confirm this, as long as service users have an identified need for support and meet the Supporting People contract requirements, they will be considered to receive a service from us. However unmet need arises from limited resources.
20. Does differential impact or unmet need cut across the equality strands (e.g. elder BME groups)?	Y	N	Please explain No evidence to confirm this

21. If yes, should the full EIA be conducted jointly with another service area/contractor/partner/agency?	Y	N	Please explain		
22. Is there a missed opportunity to improve your business in relation to any of the policies, procedures or practices to promote racial, gender, disability, age, sexual orientation, religion or belief equality?			<p>Where possible the service should be promoted to encourage referrals from all the groups noted, however it is hoped that the service can be promoted to encourage referrals from other agencies in the future when resources allow.</p> <p>Equality monitoring of service users may help to identify if people from particular groups are deterred from using the service.</p>		
23. Should the policy proceed to a full equality impact assessment?	Y	N		Yes	No
			24. If No, are there any changes required to the policy to improve it around the equality agenda? None identified.		

Signed
(completing officer)

Date November 2008

Signed
(Head of Section)

Date

**Countersigned
(HR representative)**

Date December 2008