

# EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT TEMPLATE

## 1. Topic of assessment

<b>EIA title:</b>	Surrey Local Welfare Provision Policy
-------------------	---------------------------------------

<b>EIA author:</b>	Rachel Yexley, Policy Manager, Adult Social Care
--------------------	--

## 2. Approval

	<b>Name</b>	<b>Date approved</b>
<b>Approved by<sup>1</sup></b>	Graham Wilkin	10/01/2013

## 3. Quality control

<b>Version number</b>	6	<b>EIA completed</b>	10/01/2013
<b>Date saved</b>		<b>EIA published</b>	

## 4. EIA team

<b>Name</b>	<b>Job title (if applicable)</b>	<b>Organisation</b>	<b>Role</b>
Graham Wilkin	Assistant to the Strategic Director	Surrey County Council	Project and EIA sponsor
Alex Green	Surrey Reuse Network Co-ordinator	Surrey Re-Use Network	Consulted
Alison Wilks	Strategic Housing Manager	Mole Valley District Council	Project group member – consulted
Andrew Evans	Strategy and Policy Development Assistant, Children, Schools and Families	Surrey County Council	Project group member – consulted
Andy Wickes	Senior Accountant, Finance	Surrey County Council	Project group member – consulted
Ginni Smedley	Strategy and Policy Development Manager, Children, Schools and Families	Surrey County Council	Project group member – consulted
Jane Bourgeois	Manager, Walton Citizens Advice Bureaux	Citizens Advice Bureaux	Consulted
Maria Zealy	Manager	Surrey Welfare Rights Unit	Project group member – consulted

<sup>1</sup> Refer to earlier guidance for details on getting approval for your EIA.

## EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT TEMPLATE

Nicola Sinnett	Category Specialist, Procurement	Surrey County Council	Project group member – consulted
Sophie Baker	Project Officer, Adult Social Care	Surrey County Council	Project group member – consulted
Stewart Taylor	Customer Interaction Lead, Shared Service Centre	Surrey County Council	Project group member - consulted
Rachel Yexley	Policy Manager, Adult Social Care	Surrey County Council	EIA co-ordinator

# EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT TEMPLATE

## 5. Explaining the matter being assessed

<b>What policy, function or service is being introduced or reviewed?</b>	<p>The Welfare Reform Act (2012) set out changes to the way in which the Social Fund is administered. The Social Fund is currently held by the Department for Work and Pensions and administered by Job Centre Plus to make discretionary payments, including: Community Care Grants and Crisis Loans for general living expenses*, for some of the most vulnerable people in society.</p> <p>From April 2013 the Social Fund will cease to exist. Provision for emergency cash and essential items (currently issued through Crisis Loans for general living expenses and Community Care Grants) will be replaced with 'local welfare provision; and devolved to upper tier local authorities who will be expected to use their discretion as to how to administer it.</p> <p>The funding is not ring fenced and Surrey County Council needs to agree its position with regards to protecting the money for the sole purpose of welfare provision. Whilst the total sum of money allocated to the organisation is relatively small, it will impact on the most vulnerable of people. Additional changes of Universal Credit and wider welfare reform are expected to increase demand on Local Welfare Provision.</p> <p>* <b>Crisis Loans</b> for general living expenses are interest free loans that are available to anyone who cannot meet their short-term needs in a disaster or emergency. They can be awarded to anybody regardless of their economic status. In the current system loans are repaid, generally as a direct deduction from state benefits. The majority of the loans are awarded to people on job seekers allowance who are single and under 35<sup>2</sup>.</p> <p><b>Community Care Grants</b> are non-repayable awards intended to support vulnerable people return to the community, remain in their community or to ease exceptional pressure on families. They can be awarded for a range of expenses and are commonly used to provide household equipment, particularly to those leaving institutional care, Prison etc. Community Care Grants have a much lower number of applications than crisis loans and higher awards<sup>3</sup>. The highest percentage of all client groups accessing this fund are people with disabilities<sup>4</sup>. The current stated purpose of this award is to help people to live as independently as possible in their community.</p>
--	--

<sup>2</sup> DWP data for 2011/12 award by applicants in Surrey

<sup>3</sup> DWP Number and type of Community Care Grant applications by local authority between April 11 and September 2011

<sup>4</sup> DWP data for 2011/12 award by applicants in Surrey

# EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT TEMPLATE

<p><b>What proposals are you assessing?</b></p>	<p>The project group propose that in order to avoid a gap in support for some vulnerable people in certain situations, SCC should honour Social Fund arrangements via a Local Assistance Scheme by committing the non-ring fenced allocation from DWP. It is anticipated that Local Assistance Scheme payments will help meet some immediate needs as well as help prevent needs from escalating. They could also potentially limit the demand on other social care services.</p> <p>It is proposed that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• From 1 April 2013, Crisis Loans for general living expenses and Community Care Grants will be merged into one fund called Surrey Local Assistance Scheme.</li> <li>• The Council will provide payments rather than loans. Crisis Loans for living expenses have a high level of applications and low award value, leaving relatively high transactional costs. It seems unlikely that continuing to treat them as a loan would be financially advantageous, particularly as repayment could not be achieved through direct benefit deductions.</li> <li>• The Council will commission the Citizens Advice Bureaux to filter potential applicants, where possible signposting to other sources of support. Where a payment from the Local Assistance Scheme is felt to be required, the Citizens Advice Bureaux will assist with the application process.</li> <li>• Five new posts will be created within the council's Shared Service Centre to administer the scheme.</li> <li>• Applicants needing emergency support will be provided with support via payment cards which can be used to purchase goods.</li> <li>• Applicants requiring household items such as white goods or furniture will be provided with goods from the Surrey Re-Use Network. This will support the local economy and help SCC achieve its landfill reduction targets. The council's Environment and Infrastructure Directorate have agreed to contribute to the cost of commissioning Surrey Re-Use Network.</li> <li>• Targeted communications will take place to ensure that residents who are likely to benefit from the scheme are aware of the changes to the Social Fund and how to apply for the Surrey Local Assistance Scheme.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Who is affected by the proposals outlined above?</b></p>	<p><b>Residents</b></p> <p>Residents who use the service will be affected by the new proposals. The fund devolved to Local Authorities is less than was previously available when the fund was held centrally, so some people who would have previously been awarded a grant may now be unsuccessful. However, it is hoped that by working with local organisations such as the Citizens Advice Bureaux, potential applicants can be supported to find more sustainable support options for example debt advice or counselling services.</p> <p><b>Council Staff</b></p>

# EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT TEMPLATE

Five new Council posts will be created to administer the fund. The posts will be advertised in the first instance to the redeployment pool, therefore potentially offering employment to staff who are under notice of redundancy.

## **Citizens Advice Bureaux**

The Citizens Advice Bureaux will be commissioned to filter applicants and assist residents with making applications to the fund. The project will use some of the allocated administration funding to aid this process.

## **Surrey Re-use Network**

Surrey Re-Use network will be commissioned to provide furniture and white goods to successful applicants. This will support the local economy and help SCC achieve its landfill reduction targets.

## **Other voluntary organisations**

Where appropriate applicants will be signposted to suitable local voluntary organisations that may be able to provide support.

# EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT TEMPLATE

## 6. Sources of information

Engagement carried out
<p>From the outset Adult Social Care has recognised that this work could not be undertaken in isolation, so a project group was established with colleagues from the Children, Schools and Families directorate, Procurement, Finance, District and Borough Council representatives and the Citizen's Advice Bureaux. The group has also engaged and sought advice from a number of other Council services as part of the project including Information Management Technology (IMT), Legal and internal audit.</p> <p>At the beginning of the project a workshop was held with a variety of stakeholders to gather views on what the arrangements for delivering the social fund at a local level should look like. Invitees included colleagues from across Surrey County Council and District and Borough Councils, as well as a number of representatives from voluntary organisations who work directly with residents who may be likely to use the scheme. A follow up workshop was held in April 2012 with over 20 representatives from District and Borough Councils and Citizens Advice Bureaux to determine how to further progress the ideas generated.</p> <p>By their nature, crisis loans for general living expenses and community care grants are generally one-off payments, which suggests that meaningful consultation with service users as to how to best administer the scheme could prove difficult. Therefore, it is proposed to gather service user data and feedback as part of the scheme and monitor it at quarterly intervals. This information will then be used to inform decisions about whether any changes to the scheme are required.</p>
Data used
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Surrey i – Surrey Joint Strategic Needs Assessment</li><li>• 'Local welfare assistance to replace Social Fund Community Care Grants and Crisis Loans for general living expenses' Department for Work and Pensions Equality Impact Assessment, October 2011</li><li>• DWP data for 2011/12 awards by applicants in Surrey</li><li>• The Social Fund: Current role and future direction, Joseph Rowntree Foundation, 2006</li><li>• DWP website, 2012</li><li>• Families in Poverty Needs Assessment, 2011</li></ul>

## 7. Impact of the new/amended policy, service or function

# EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT TEMPLATE

## 7a. Impact of the proposals on residents and service users with protected characteristics

Protected characteristic <sup>5</sup>	Potential positive impacts	Potential negative impacts	Evidence
<p style="writing-mode: vertical-rl; transform: rotate(180deg);">Page 229</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>Age</b></p>	<p>In the current scheme applicants apply for funding through their local Job Centre, of which there are 5 across Surrey. In the proposed scheme, applicants will apply for the scheme via the 9 CABx. This may improve accessibility to the scheme to some older people who may have mobility issues or rely on public travel. More local access in this scheme, compared with the previous scheme, could have a positive impact on families with younger children as poverty disproportionately affects children under 10.</p>		<p><b>Local Data:</b> Compared with England, Surrey has a slightly larger proportion of people in the 35 years and over age group and fewer people in the 10-35 year age groups.</p> <p>The proportion of the population aged 85 years and over is projected to increase in England and Surrey until at least 2033. The current proportion aged 85 and over is slightly higher in Surrey than England. This reflects the longer life expectancies in Surrey compared with England.<sup>6</sup></p> <p><b>Local Research:</b> The majority of crisis loans are awarded to people on job seekers allowance who are single and under 35<sup>7</sup>.</p> <p>However, children and young people living in families where nobody works have a 58% risk of poverty nationally.<sup>8</sup> In Surrey, 16,595 children and young people live in families receiving either Income Support or Job Seekers Allowance (72% of all 0-19 year olds living in poverty and 6% of the total children and young people in the county).<sup>9</sup></p> <p>Additionally, poverty in Surrey disproportionately affects children under 10; this group make up 64% of 0-19s in poverty in Surrey.<sup>10</sup></p> <p><b>National Research:</b> In 2009/10 a small proportion of Crisis Loans final decisions were made in respect of customers under 18 (3%) and over 45 (13%). The largest proportion (37%) of final decisions were made in respect of customers between 18 to 24 years old. Customers 65 and</p>

<sup>6</sup> Surrey Joint Statagic Needs Assesment Chapter: Population Estimates and Projections.

<sup>7</sup> DWP data for 2011/12 award by applicants in Surrey

<sup>8</sup> Families in Poverty Needs Assessment, Surrey County Council, 2011

<sup>9</sup> Ibid

<sup>10</sup> Ibid

# EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT TEMPLATE

			<p>over also have lower success rates. Younger people are advantaged by the current system and older people are disadvantaged.<sup>11</sup></p> <p>Research by the Joseph Rowntree Foundation in 2006 looked in more detail at the factors associated with accessing the social fund. It found that Pensioners received a disproportionately small proportion of social fund expenditure compared to their presence in the eligible population. The report suggested that a lack of knowledge, the stigma of applying, communication difficulties and an antipathy to borrowing all hold pensioners back from applying.<sup>12</sup></p>
<p style="writing-mode: vertical-rl; transform: rotate(180deg);">Page 230</p> <p><b>Disability</b></p>	<p>In the current scheme applicants apply for funding through their local Job Centre, of which there are 5 across Surrey. In the proposed scheme, applicants will apply for the scheme via 9 CABx. This may improve accessibility to the scheme to people with disabilities or families where there is a disability.</p> <p>A locally delivered scheme may be better placed to identify people with disabilities who could</p>		<p><b>Local Research:</b> The highest percentage of all client groups accessing community care grants are people with disabilities<sup>13</sup>.</p> <p>There are approximately 8,500 children and young people aged 0-19 that may have a long-term illness, disability or a medical condition affecting their day-to-day activities.<sup>14</sup> Additionally, it is estimated that nationally 29% of families with disabled children are in poverty and 55% of families with children with disabilities are living in or at the margins of poverty.<sup>15</sup></p> <p>Caring for disabled children limits parents' capacity to work, reducing incomes and increasing the likelihood of poverty.<sup>16</sup></p> <p><b>National Research:</b> In 2009/10 31% of Crisis Loan final decisions were made in respect of disabled people. Overall success rates are very similar for disabled customers (76%) compared to non-disabled customers (77%).</p> <p>In 2009/10 33% of Community Care Grant final decisions were made in respect of disabled people. Overall success rates are higher for</p>

<sup>11</sup> 'Local welfare assistance to replace Social Fun Community Care Grants and Crisis Loans for general living expenses' Department for Work and Pensions Equality Impact Assessment, October 2011

<sup>12</sup> The Social Fund: Current role and future direction, Joseph Rowntree Foundation, 2006

<sup>13</sup> DWP data for 2011/12 award by applicants in Surrey

<sup>14</sup> JSNA Chapter: Children with disabilities

<sup>15</sup> Families in Poverty Needs Assessment, Surrey County Council, 2011

<sup>16</sup> Ibid

## EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT TEMPLATE

<p style="writing-mode: vertical-rl; transform: rotate(180deg);">Page 231</p>	<p>benefit from the scheme.</p> <p>This also applies to families with at least one disabled member and families with disabled children. They are more likely to report higher levels of material deprivation than families with no disabled members, meaning they are more likely to be apply to this scheme.</p> <p>However, this benefit will only be realised if the scheme is promoted with disability groups etc and that information is made available in accessible formats.</p> <p>By applying through CABx people and families with disabilities may also be positively impacted by being informed of support they did not previously know existed.</p>		<p>disabled customers (48%) than for non-disabled customers (43%).</p> <p>The number of disabled people accessing both Crisis Loans and Community Care grants has been rising in recent years.<sup>17</sup></p>
<p><b>Gender reassignment</b></p>	<p>The new scheme is not anticipated to have a</p>		<p><b>Local data:</b> There is currently no data on the number of people living in Surrey who have/ are undergoing gender reassignment.</p>

<sup>17</sup> 'Local welfare assistance to replace Social Fun Community Care Grants and Crisis Loans for general living expenses' Department for Work and Pensions Equality Impact Assessment, October 2011

# EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT TEMPLATE

	positive or negative impact on the basis of gender reassignment.		<b>National Research:</b> The DWP does not hold information on its administrative systems on transgender persons.
<b>Pregnancy and maternity</b>	The new scheme is not anticipated to have a positive or negative impact on the basis of pregnancy and maternity.		<b>National Research:</b> The DWP only holds information on pregnancy and maternity on its administrative systems where it is the primary reason for the incapacity. It cannot therefore be used to accurately assess the equality impacts.
<b>Race</b>	<p>The new scheme is not anticipated to have a positive or negative impact on the basis of race.</p> <p>However, the group is aware that according to a DWP Equalities Impact Assessment, overall success rates for Crisis Loan awards were 'slightly higher for white customers than other groups'.<sup>18</sup></p> <p>The Council will need to monitor equalities data carefully to ensure that this is not replicated in the local scheme.</p>		<p><b>Local Data:</b> 16.99% of Surrey's population are from BME groups. This is compared to 17.21% across England and 14.28% in the South East. Epsom &amp; Ewell and Woking have the highest percentage of non-White residents while Waverley has the lowest. The largest ethnic minority group in Surrey is Indian (2.3% of the population)<sup>19</sup></p> <p>All ethnic minority groups in Surrey have a higher proportions of poverty compared to the majority white population. Poverty differs among ethnic groups. These differences are often due to labour market disadvantage among some groups, for example the high risk of low pay among Pakistani and Bangladeshi groups.<sup>20</sup></p> <p>Most 0-19s in poverty are White British because the majority of Surrey's population is White British, however, Pakistani, Bangladeshi, Black African and Gypsy / Roma or Traveller children and young people in Surrey are more likely to experience poverty as it disproportionately affects these groups.<sup>21</sup></p> <p><b>National Research:</b> According to the DWP, "in 2009/10 79% of Crisis Loan final decisions were made in respect of white customers with some ethnic groups receiving less than 1 % of the final awards. Overall</p>

<sup>18</sup> 'Local welfare assistance to replace Social Fun Community Care Grants and Crisis Loans for general living expenses' Department for Work and Pensions Equality Impact Assessment, October 2011

<sup>19</sup> Surrey Joint Statagic Needs Assesment Chapter: Ethnicity

<sup>20</sup> Surrey Joint Statagic Needs Assesment Chapter: Ethnicity

<sup>21</sup> Families in Poverty Needs Assessment, Surrey County Council

## EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT TEMPLATE

			<p>success rates are slightly higher for white customers than other groups”.</p> <p>“In 2009/10 65% Community Care Grant final decisions were made in respect of white customers with some ethnic groups receiving less than 1% of the final decisions. Overall, success rates are slightly higher for all ethnic minority customers (average of 46%) than white customers (average of 44%).”<sup>22</sup></p>
<b>Religion and belief</b>	The new scheme is not anticipated to have a positive or negative impact on the basis of religion and belief.		<p><b>Local Data:</b> The 2001 census revealed that 74.6% of the Surrey population were Christian; 1.3% Muslim; 0.3% Buddhist; 0.7% Hindu; 0.3% Jewish; 0.2% Sikh; 0.3% Other; and, 15.2% had no religion.</p> <p><b>National Research:</b> The DWP does not hold information on its administrative systems on the religion or beliefs of claimants.</p>
<b>Sex</b>	<p>The new scheme is not anticipated to have a positive or negative impact on the basis of sex.</p> <p>Those fleeing domestic abuse, and women in general are at greater risk of becoming victims of domestic abuse than men, may be positively impacted by having a grant than a loan. This is particularly where there</p>		<p><b>National Research:</b> In the current system there are no differences between male and female success rates for crisis loans. However, single females who are more likely to be caring for children are advantaged by the current system for awarding Community Care Grants. This is because during the assessment stage higher number of women than men are seen as having sufficient needs to be awarded a Community Care Grant.</p> <p>In 2009/10 58% of final awards for Crisis Loans were made in respect to single males, 34% in respect to single females and 8% made in respect to couples. The success rates were the same for single males and females (76%) and 74% for a couple. The majority of applications are made by unemployed recipients and the award rate is a reflection</p>

<sup>22</sup> ‘Local welfare assistance to replace Social Fun Community Care Grants and Crisis Loans for general living expenses’ Department for Work and Pensions Equality Impact Assessment, October 2011

## EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT TEMPLATE

	<p>has been no opportunity to pre-plan their flight.</p>		<p>of the profile of customers who currently claim Job Seekers Allowance (JSA) as 28% of the JSA caseload are female without children.</p> <p>In 2008/10 49% of Community Care Grant final decisions made in respect to single females, 36% made in respect to single males and 15% made in respect to couples. The success rates for single females were higher (49%) than single males (42%) but lower than couples (53%).<sup>23</sup></p> <p>Women in general are at greater risk of becoming victims of domestic abuse than men. 88% of those that contact Surrey's outreach services are female.<sup>24</sup></p>
<p style="writing-mode: vertical-rl; transform: rotate(180deg);">Page 234</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>Sexual orientation</b></p>	<p>The new scheme is not anticipated to have a positive or negative impact on the basis of sexual orientation.</p>		<p><b>Local Data:</b> The 2001 census showed that there was a smaller percentage of people living in a same sex couple in Surrey than in England and the South East.</p> <p>Although there is no definitive data, if we take the national estimate of 5-6% then approx. 55 000 - 66 000 people in Surrey would identify as lesbian, gay or bisexual.<sup>25</sup></p> <p><b>National Research:</b> The DWP does not hold information on its administrative systems on the sexual orientation of claimants.</p>
<p><b>Marriage and civil partnerships</b></p>	<p>The scheme will need to consider that lone parent families are more likely to be in poverty and therefore lone parents are more likely to apply to this scheme. Having better access than</p>		<p><b>Local Data:</b> Compared to England as a whole and the South East, Surrey has high rates of marriage (47.2% for Surrey compared with 43.5% for England and 44.7% for South East).</p> <p>Surrey rates of separated or divorced individuals are also low compared to England and the South East (Surrey County Council, no date).</p> <p>Most children and young people in poverty live in a lone parent</p>

<sup>23</sup> Local welfare assistance to replace Social Fund Community Care Grants and Crisis Loans for general living expenses, Equality Impact Assessment, October 2011

<sup>24</sup> JSNA Chapter: Domestic Abuse

<sup>25</sup> Surrey Joint Strategic Needs Assessment Chapter: Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual and Transgender

## EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT TEMPLATE

	<p>previously, through more local access points, should result in a positive impact. Additionally a further positive impact will be any potential extra support or signposting identified for them by CABx.</p>		<p>household. In Surrey this equates to 72% of all 0-19 year olds in poverty, around 16,000 children and young people.<sup>26</sup></p> <p><b>National Research:</b> The DWP does not hold information on the civil partnership status of claimants.</p>
--	---	--	--

### 7b. Impact of the proposals on staff with protected characteristics

Protected characteristic	Potential positive impacts	Potential negative impacts	Evidence
<p>Page 235</p> <p><b>Age</b></p>	<p>Five new posts will be created as a result of the Council taking on this new responsibility. The posts will be recruited in line with the Council's Equality and Diversity policy, therefore it is not anticipated that there will be any negative impact.</p>		
<b>Disability</b>	As above		
<b>Gender reassignment</b>	As above		
<b>Pregnancy and maternity</b>	As above		
<b>Race</b>	As above		

<sup>26</sup> Families in Poverty Needs Assessment, Surrey County Council

## EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT TEMPLATE

<b>Religion and belief</b>	As above		
<b>Sex</b>	As above		
<b>Sexual orientation</b>	As above		
<b>Marriage and civil partnerships</b>	As above		

# EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT TEMPLATE

## 8. Amendments to the proposals

Change	Reason for change
No changes are proposed as a result of this EIA.	

## 9. Action plan

Potential impact (positive or negative)	Action needed to maximise positive impact or mitigate negative impact	By when	Owner
<p>A locally delivered system may be better placed to identify people with protected characteristics who may benefit from the scheme.</p>	<p>In order to realise this potential positive impact it is important that service users with protected characteristics (as well as front line workers and volunteers who work with service users who have protected characteristics) are aware of the scheme, who may benefit and how to apply.</p> <p>A communications plan has been developed and service user feedback will be gathered to ensure that the scheme is meeting the needs of the people for whom it is intended.</p>		
<p>People with protected characteristics will not be negatively impacted by the changes.</p>	<p>By ensuring that eligibility for the Surrey Local Assistance Scheme is closely aligned to existing Social Fund criteria set by the DWP, it is anticipated that people with protected characteristics will not be negatively impacted by the changes.</p> <p>The Council will seek to collect appropriate equalities and diversities information from all those who apply for the payment. This information will be monitored on a quarterly basis.</p> <p>It is proposed that this EIA should be reviewed when there is local information available regarding the use of the</p>		

# EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT TEMPLATE

	scheme.		
--	---------	--	--

## 10. Potential negative impacts that cannot be mitigated

Potential negative impact	Protected characteristic(s) that could be affected
<p>It is acknowledged that there will be less funding available for Surrey Local Assistance Scheme than had previously been available through the Social Fund. Therefore, there may be some applicants who would have been successful in being awarded a crisis loan or community care grant who may not be granted support from the Local Welfare Provision scheme. If this is the case, there could be a potential negative impact on people from protected characteristics who are more likely to benefit from the scheme.</p> <p>Surrey has tried to mitigate this potential negative impact by commissioning CAB to signpost applicants to other, more sustainable sources of support where possible.</p>	Age; Disability; Sex

## 11. Summary of key impacts and actions

<p><b>Information and engagement underpinning equalities analysis</b></p>	<p><b>Key data:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Surrey i – Surrey Joint Strategic Needs Assessment</li> <li>'Local welfare assistance to replace Social Fund Community Care Grants and Crisis Loans for general living expenses' Department for Work and Pensions Equality Impact Assessment, October 2011</li> <li>DWP data for 2011/12 awards by applicants in Surrey</li> </ul> <p><b>Key engagement:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Local Assistance Scheme Project Group meetings</li> <li>Workshop with large variety of stakeholders including organisations who work directly with people likely to benefit from the scheme.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Key impacts (positive and/or negative) on people with protected characteristics</b></p>	<p>A locally delivered system may be better placed to identify people with protected characteristics who may benefit from the scheme.</p> <p>In order to realise this potential positive impact it is important that service users with protected characteristics (as well as front line workers and volunteers who work with service users who have protected characteristics) are aware of the scheme, who may benefit and how to apply.</p>

## EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT TEMPLATE

	<p>A communications plan has been developed and service user feedback will be gathered to ensure that the scheme is meeting the needs of the people for whom it is intended.</p>
<p><b>Changes you have made to the proposal as a result of the EIA</b></p>	<p>No changes have been made as a result of this EIA.</p>
<p><b>Key mitigating actions planned to address any outstanding negative impacts</b></p>	<p>By ensuring that eligibility for the Surrey Local Assistance Scheme is closely aligned to existing Social Fund criteria set by the DWP, it is anticipated that people with protected characteristics will not be negatively impacted by the changes.</p> <p>The Council will seek to collect appropriate equalities and diversities information from all those who apply for the payment. This information will be monitored on a quarterly basis.</p> <p>It is proposed that this EIA should be reviewed when there is local information available regarding the use of the scheme.</p>
<p><b>Potential negative impacts that cannot be mitigated</b></p>	<p>It is acknowledged that there will be less funding available for the Surrey Local Assistance Scheme than had previously been available through the Social Fund. Therefore, there may be some applicants who would have been successful in being awarded a crisis loan or community care grant who may not be granted support from the Surrey Local Assistance scheme. If this is the case, there could be a potential negative impact on people from protected characteristics who are more likely to benefit from the scheme.</p>

This page is intentionally left blank