

Screening/Scoping Pro Forma

Section	Housing Advice Services		Officer responsible for the screening/scoping	Melissa Samee		
Name of Policy to be assessed	Supported Housing (Guildford) and Floating Support Service (Guildford, Runnymede and Woking)		Date of Assessment	05/11/08	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 help to some couples and single people who need support in managing their homes or maintaining their tenancies. This can either be provided through a GBC supported housing tenancy or direct to a tenant living in the community in the form of Floating Support. Service users are referred to the Service and once assessments are carried out, a decision is reached on whether they meet the criteria to receive the service.					
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 support 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, homelessness, evictions due to non payment of rent or anti-social behaviour, court proceedings and possible stays in hospital.					
4. What outcomes are wanted from this policy/procedures/practice?	The successful maintenance of a housing tenancy. Floating Support service users should in time become more independent be able to maintain their tenancies without support and Supported Housing service users should have the opportunity to move on to independent general needs tenancies with a time limited amount of floating support, if required.					

5. What factors/forces could contribute/detract from the outcomes?	Service user non-engagement, evictions, and unplanned deaths. Resource limitations.		
6. Who are the main stakeholders in relation to the policy?	Service users, Cross tenure landlords, Statutory Care Providers, Probation, Drug and Alcohol Services, CAB, DWP Housing Advice Centre and other housing support agencies.	7. Who implements the policy, and who is responsible for the policy?	Head of Housing Advice Services and Supported Housing 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 from stakeholders, 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.		
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 learning disabilities are assisted, however clients with a physical disability may be affected as some of our supported housing stock is not adapted for disabled use.		
11. Are there concerns that the policy <u>could</u> have a differential impact due to sexual orientation?	Y	N	
What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this?	However, no clear evidence available to confirm this.		

12. Are there concerns that the policy <u>could</u> have a differential impact due to their age?	Y	N	
What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this?	Service is targeted at people aged, between 16 to 65. People outside this age range do not qualify/ meet the criteria to receive the service.		
13. Are there concerns that the policy <u>could</u> have a differential impact due to their religious belief?	Y	N	
What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this?	No clear evidence available to confirm this.		
14. Are there concerns that the policy <u>could</u> have a differential impact due to them having dependants/caring responsibilities?	Y	N	
What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this?	Service offered is flexible enough to work around this issue.		
15. Are there concerns that the policy <u>could</u> have a differential impact due to them have an offending past?	Y	N	
What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this?	Risk assessments are carried out to ensure safety of both service users and support staff.		
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?			No clear evidence available to confirm this.
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. Age limit is a restriction of Supporting People contract and it would be difficult to undertake the adaptations required to make the affected supported housing suitable for disabled use.
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 Surrey CC for supporting people in general? Partners involved in the floating support?

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 groups.</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	<table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <tr> <td data-bbox="768 512 1800 563"></td> <td data-bbox="1800 512 1917 563" style="text-align: center;">Yes</td> <td data-bbox="1917 512 2058 563" style="text-align: center;">No</td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="3" data-bbox="768 563 2058 764"> 24. If No, are there any changes required to the policy to improve it around the equality agenda? None identified. </td> </tr> </table>		Yes	No	24. If No, are there any changes required to the policy to improve it around the equality agenda? None identified.		
	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 November 2008