

Screening/Scoping Pro Forma

| | | | | | |
|---|---|--|--|---|----------|
| Section | Democratic Services Civic Support | Officer responsible for the screening/scoping | Kate Walton | | |
| Name of Policy to be assessed | Mayor's Distress Fund and Arundel House Charity – Distribution Policies | Date of Assessment | 07/10/08 | Is this a proposed new or existing policy? | Existing |
| 1. Briefly describe the aims, objectives and purpose of the policy/procedure/practice? | To provide financial assistance to applicants who by reason of poverty, disability, age or other similar circumstances are in need of assistance, whether in money or kind. | | | | |
| 2. Are there any associated or specific objectives of the policy/procedure/practice? Please explain. | Grants are paid to residents of Guildford for the welfare (whether to relieve poverty or otherwise) and the general benefit of the applicant. In the case of Arundel House the person must also be under the age of 21. | | | | |
| 3. Who is intended to benefit from this policy and in what way? | Residents of Guildford borough who meet the criteria and can demonstrate a genuine need for assistance will receive a grant (maximum £150) | | | | |
| 4. What outcomes are wanted from this policy/procedures/practice? | To provide financial assistance to meet the needs of local residents experiencing hardship | | | | |
| 5. What factors/forces could contribute/detract from the outcomes? | Economic climate – Both charities rely on income from investments and donations, both of which are affected by the current economic climate. Increase in level of applications. | | | | |
| 6. Who are the main stakeholders in relation to the policy? | The Trustees (CE, Mayor, Deputy Mayor, S151 Officer) Residents of Guildford Borough | 7. Who implements the policy, and who is responsible for the policy? | The Civic Secretary Head of Legal & Democratic Services | | |
| 8. Are there concerns that the policy <u>could</u> have a differential impact on racial groups? | N | Please explain: The only criteria are that the applicant must be a resident of Guildford Borough, or being aided by an organisation operating within the borough and existing evidence of a genuine need. | | | |
| What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? | The criteria set out within the Distribution Policy. Currently, beneficiaries of the Fund etc. are not monitored | | | | |

| | | |
|---|--|---|
| 9. Are there concerns that the policy <u>could</u> have a differential impact due to gender? | N | |
| What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? | Currently, beneficiaries of the Fund are not monitored although historic records identify whether they are male or female. | |
| 10. Are there concerns that the policy <u>could</u> have a differential impact due to disability? | N | |
| What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? | As Q8 | |
| 11. Are there concerns that the policy <u>could</u> have a differential impact due to sexual orientation? | N | |
| What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? | As Q8 | |
| 12. Are there concerns that the policy <u>could</u> have a differential impact due to their age? | N | Only in the case of Arundel House, where the applicant must be under the age of 21, but in such cases the application would be reassigned to the Mayor's Distress Fund. |
| What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? | As Q8 | |
| 13. Are there concerns that the policy <u>could</u> have a differential impact due to their religious belief? | N | |
| What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? | As Q8 | |

| | | | |
|--|-------|---|--|
| 14. Are there concerns that the policy <u>could</u> have a differential impact due to them having dependants/caring responsibilities? | | N | |
| What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? | As Q8 | | |
| 15. Are there concerns that the policy <u>could</u> have a differential impact due to them have an offending past? | | N | |
| What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? | As Q8 | | |
| 16. Are there concerns that the policy <u>could</u> have a differential impact due to them being Transgender or transsexual? | | N | |
| What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? | As Q8 | | |
| 17. Could the differential impact identified in 8-16 amount to there being the potential for adverse impact in this policy/procedure/practice? | | N | It is not considered that there is likely to be a differential impact although, without monitoring the beneficiaries, this could not be confirmed. |

| | | |
|---|-----------------|--|
| <p>18. Can this adverse impact be justified on the grounds of promoting equality of opportunity for one group? Or any other reason?</p> | | <p>Emphasis may be given to disabled persons who may be more likely to have welfare needs than non-disabled people. Were that to be the case, it is felt that could be justified on the grounds of promoting equality of opportunity. Please explain for each heading (questions 8-16) on a separate piece of paper.</p> <p>N/A</p> |
| <p>Business improvement</p> <p>19. Is there any concern that there are unmet needs in relation to any of the above groups?</p> | <p>N</p> | <p>Please explain The introduction of the equality monitoring of beneficiaries may identify this to be the case but no concern is anticipated.</p> |
| <p>20. Does differential impact or unmet need cut across the equality strands (e.g. elder BME groups)?</p> | <p>Y</p> | <p>Please explain The introduction of equality monitoring of beneficiaries may identify this to be the case. Subjectively, it is not improbable that (say) older disabled persons are more likely to have welfare needs</p> |
| <p>21. If yes, should the full EIA be conducted jointly with another service area/contractor/partner/agency?</p> | | <p>Please explain</p> |
| <p>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> | <p>Y</p> | <p>The introduction of the equality monitoring of beneficiaries could help to identify where this activity could help to promote equality of opportunity.</p> |

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|----------------|-----|
| 23. Should the policy proceed to a full equality impact assessment? | N | | Yes | No |
| | | 24. If No, are there any changes required to the policy to improve it around the equality agenda? To consider the introduction of equality monitoring of beneficiaries | | Yes |

Signed
(completing officer)

Date October 2008

Signed
(Head of Section) Date

Countersigned
(HE representative)

Date November 2008