Screening/Scoping Pro Forma

Section	•	nood and Housing ent Services ⁄ Safety		r responsible reening/scop		David Bartlett and Steve Epsom					
Name of Polic be assessed		Date of Assessm					proposed new or existing ocedure/practice?	Existing			
1. Briefly deso of the policy/		Work in partnership with external agencies, improve internal understanding of community safety issues and engage with local community to deliver public reassurance and help reduce perception of fear of crime									
		ed or specific objectives of ctice? Please explain.	No			·	·				
3. Who is intended to benefit from this policy and in what way?				Residents of Guildford							
4. What outcomes are wanted from this policy/procedures/practice?				Reduction in public perception of fear of crime and ASB							
5. What factor the outcomes		Local and national media and need for referrals from other agencies									
6. Who are th stakeholders to the policy?	in relation	GBC Residents Other statutory and voluntar	y agenc	cies res	licy, and	no implements the y, and who is onsible for the y?		Implements Staff / volunteers and public Responsible Head of N and HMS Neighbourhood Manager Community Safety Officer	C		
differential im	pact on rac		Y	Please expl	ain						
What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this?			Low numbers and lack of information on individuals. Is there any indication that BME tenants are more likely to be the victims of hate crime?								

9. Are there concerns that the policy <u>could</u> have a differential impact due to gender?		Ν			
What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this?			male tenants, particularly those who are lone parents, more vulnerable than the ge tenant?		
10. Are there concerns that the policy <u>could</u> have a differential impact due to disability?		Ν			
What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this?			any positive steps been taken to ensure better the safety of disabled tenants in mmunity? Risk assessments always carried out		
11. Are there concerns that the policy <u>could</u> have a differential impact due to sexual orientation?		Ν			
What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this?	In the absence of data on the sexuality of tenants there is no basis for concluding that there is a differential impact but it is not unreasonable to suppose that such tenants could experience a negative impact arising out of homophobia.				
12. Are there concerns that the policy <u>could</u> have a differential impact due to their age?		Ν	Elderly tenants may feel more vulnerable to intimidation/threats and the activities of conmen.		
What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this?	init	iativ	sitive steps taken to reduce/eliminate these fears? Reporting hate crime to incidence of drug taking on housing estates higher amongst the er population?		
13. Are there concerns that the policy <u>could</u> have a differential impact due to their religious belief?	Ý		There is the potential for intimidation of people from minority religions.		
What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this?	Lack of knowledge and information				
14. Are there concerns that the policy <u>could</u> have a differential impact due to them having dependants/caring responsibilities?		Ν	In the case of lone parents, are they likely to be more vulnerable to domestic violence from absent fathers/mothers? Are there support mechanisms for these people?		

What existing evidence (either presun otherwise) do you have for this?	ned	or							
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?				Ро	Police checks carried out where necessary				
16. Are there concerns that the policy differential impact due to them being or transsexual?					N				
What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this?			In the absence of data on tenants who are transgender, there is no basis for concluding that there is a differential impact						
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	There is the potential for this to be the case.						
18. Can this adverse impact be justified on the grounds of promoting equality of opportunity for one group? Or any other reason?		N							
Business improvement 19. Is there any concern that there are unmet needs in relation to any of the above groups?		N	Probab	bly st	ubje	ct to the responses to the issues raised.			

20. Does differential impact or unmet need cut across the equality strands (e.g. elder BME groups)?	Ν	
21. If yes, should the full EIA be conducted jointly with another service area/contractor/partner/agency?	N	
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?		Need for more equality monitoring information on tenants. <i>Does the tenants survey addressed 'community safety' concerns?</i>

23. Should the policy proceed to a full equality impact assessment?	N	- Yes	Νο
24. If No, are there any changes required to the policy to improve it around the equality agenda?		Improve/extend equality monitoring of tenants Identify from specific groups of tenants whether they feel more vulnerable because of being from a particular equality strand.	

Signed (Completing officer)

Date March 2009 (final)

Signed (Head of Section)

Date.

Countersigned (Corporate Diversity/Diversity/Policy Team)

Date March 2009