



- Other Chief Officers  .....
- District Councils  .....
- Health Authority  .....
- Police  .....
- Other Bodies/Individuals  Janet Purcell, Cabinet Manager  
Michelle McHugh, O&S Manager

**FINAL DECISION NO**

**SUGGESTED NEXT STEPS:**

Details to be specified

- Further consideration by this Committee  .....
- To Council  .....
- To Cabinet  A verbal report from Overview & Scrutiny Committee will be presented along with Cabinet report on this matter on 14<sup>th</sup> October
- To an O & S Committee  .....
- To an Area Committee  .....
- Further Consultation  .....

**Adult Social Care and Health Overview and Scrutiny  
Committee -12<sup>th</sup> October 2010**

**Fairer Charges and Contributions**

**Report of the Interim Director of Adult Services**

**Recommendation**

That the Committee considers the final proposals on Fairer Charges and Contributions following the outcome of the consultation process and reports their views to Cabinet on 14<sup>th</sup> October 2010.

**1. Background**

- 1.1 The report attached as Appendix A consists of the final proposals to Cabinet following the three months' consultation with service users and the public, which commenced following the Cabinet meeting in June and ended on 17<sup>th</sup> September 2010.
- 1.2 The report seeks Cabinet approval to implement changes to the levels of charges within community care based on the original proposals as amended for the outcome of consultation. The Equality Impact Assessment is included as part of the Cabinet report. The full report on the outcome of the consultation process is also attached as Appendix B
- 1.3 This report is presented so that the views of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee can be presented to Cabinet on 14<sup>th</sup> October to be taken account of in their decision making.

**2. Scrutiny**

- 2.1 The report to Overview & Scrutiny is the same report as is being presented to Cabinet with the exception that the detailed results from the consultation are included in the Appendix to this report. The consultation report is produced by the Customer Engagement team within Adult Health & Community Services Directorate. A report is being drafted by the Warwickshire Observatory which will be available prior to the meeting and will also be placed on the Warwickshire website.
- 2.2 The Cabinet report in Appendix A summarises the findings from the consultation process and reviews the main points before arriving at the final recommended proposals

JOHN BOLTON  
Interim Director of Adult Services

Shire Hall  
Warwick

September 2010

## Cabinet – 14<sup>th</sup> October 2010

### Fairer Charges and Contributions Review

#### Report of the Interim Director of Adult Services

##### **Recommendation**

1. That Cabinet approve:
  - a) Changes to the charging levels for community care services as set out on Page 9 of this report in Table 1.
  - b) The change in the lower income threshold from Income Support + 40% to Income Support +25% to apply from December 2010;
  - d) That the maximum weekly charge (currently set at £387.13) be removed for all new service users from December 2010 and for all existing service users from April 2012;
  - e) That all charging levels continue to be subject to a report to Overview & Scrutiny on an annual basis in terms of review of full cost and inflation
2. That the Cabinet declare an intention to move towards one single contribution rate for personal budgets from April 2012 and that a further review should take place in due course
3. The changes outlined above as indicated for December 2010, April 2011, October 2011 and April 2012 should come into force on the following actual dates (being the first Monday in the month):
  - 6<sup>th</sup> December 2010
  - 4<sup>th</sup> April 2011
  - 3<sup>rd</sup> October 2011
  - 2<sup>nd</sup> April 2012
4. That the Cabinet notes that the estimated financial impact of the charging review based on the above recommendations exceeds the original target as set out in Paragraph 8.1

## **1. Background**

- 1.1 At its meeting on 17<sup>th</sup> June this year, Cabinet received a report on Fairer Charges and Contributions and approved the undertaking of a consultation

## Appendix A

process with the public on the following principles:

- a) That the Council will not subsidise the full cost of care so that the full cost is taken into account when people are assessed as to their contribution;
- b) That no one with weekly income less than income support plus 25% should be required to pay towards their services;
- c) That any new proposals will ensure that the financial targets set for income collection are met or exceeded;
- d) That officers investigate how insurance products might become available to assist people to reduce the future burden of care costs;
- e) That a report on the outcome of the consultation and firm proposals for change be brought to the Cabinet in October following review by Overview & Scrutiny Committee.

1.2 The three month consultation process ended on 17<sup>th</sup> September 2010. The results have been analysed and firm proposals are now being brought forward for consideration. A report has been taken to the Overview & Scrutiny Committee on 12<sup>th</sup> October and their report will be available for the meeting.

1.3 This report should be read in conjunction with the report to 17<sup>th</sup> June Cabinet which contained all the background information relevant to the proposals.

## 2. The Consultation Process

2.1 The consultation process consisted of:

- Letters and consultation pack sent to all service users and made available electronically for general use on the Warwickshire web;
- A further 1,765 consultation packs distributed to libraries, doctors surgeries, one-stop shops, parish councils, voluntary sector organisations & community groups
- A programme of 7 public meetings and 24 other meetings held for day centres, community groups, partnership boards and representatives from voluntary bodies run by the Customer Engagement team;
- A Helpline operated from 9.30 to 12.30 Mondays to Thursdays and from 9.00 to 5.00 on Fridays.

The public meetings which were held in the five main towns were all led by the Head of Service and in most cases jointly with the Cabinet member, Cllr Mrs Izzi Seccombe. There were 203 in attendance at the public meetings and over 400 at other meetings.

2.2 The framework of the questionnaire was a series of questions with a scaled response (strongly agree to strongly disagree) and room for comment on each question. A summary of the content was as follows :

- The removal of subsidy from all service costs (70% of total respondents disagreed or strongly disagreed)
- Charging people the full cost so that the Council can continue to offer as wide a range of services as possible (67% of total respondents disagreed or strongly disagreed)

## Appendix A

- The removal of the maximum weekly charge currently set at £387.13 (evenly spread but 53% of total respondents want it retained)
- Return to a policy of Income Support +25% in line with government guidance (evenly spread but around 40% of total respondents didn't know or didn't understand)
- The phasing of increases and the timescales (evenly spread on the phasing but around 56% of total respondents thought the timescales unreasonable)
- Should we increase charges to fund services, reduce services or find other ways (over 50% thought charges should go up but nearly 30% of total respondents thought other means should be found elsewhere in the Council)

2.3 The outcome of the consultation has been determined from:

- 829 hard copy returns
- 79 on-line returns
- Written submissions from groups
- Taped recordings and notes from each meeting held.

2.4 The full analysis of results from questionnaires and meetings has been made available to the Overview & Scrutiny Committee and a summary will be available on the Warwickshire website, published by the Warwickshire Observatory. A summary of results is given at Appendix 1. The percentages given in Para. 2.2 above include those who answered "don't know. (In the Warwickshire Observatory analyses, these are eliminated from the headline figures)

### **3. Major Themes from the Consultation**

3.1 General comments:

The majority of respondents generally understood the current economic situation facing the Council and the reasons for the changes. However, despite giving people assurances that those people on low incomes would not be affected, many found this difficult to relate back to the context of their own lives. There was a qualitative difference in response and understanding that customers showed between those who attended the meetings and could engage with the better understanding of the issues and those who completed the questionnaires with less opportunity to ask questions.

3.2 Affordability:

Understandably, people's primary concerns were around affordability and the impact on the quality of their daily lives. The majority of respondents were not opposed to having to incur a slight increase for services, but felt that the level of increase for charges particularly, for day care, respite & transport was too steep. A significant percentage of people (13%) said that they may have to consider either cancelling or reducing their care services because they were concerned that they would not be able to afford to pay the increased charges, particularly when taking into account the affect on their financial ability to pay

## Appendix A

other household bills.

### 3.3 Timescales:

There was also a strong response regarding the timescales for implementing the increases which respondents felt were too tight and should be phased in over a longer period. People were concerned about not being able to financially manage with the proposed timescales but were generally in agreement with a staged implementation if more reasonable timescales could be agreed upon.

### 3.4 Categories of Respondent:

#### a) Client groups:

The main concerns voiced from older people were that they felt they were being penalised for having saved all their lives. Adults with a learning or physical disability and their carers recognised and acknowledged the importance of financially protecting people who cannot afford to pay, but there was a general consensus that where people could afford to pay that they should.

#### b) Ethnicity:

People from Black & Minority Ethnic groups were concerned that they would become socially isolated if service was removed due to eligibility criteria. This is not an effect of charging but more related to reviews of day services.

#### c) Carers:

Most concerns were raised by Family Carers on the impact on their caring role if the person they care for, decided to reduce or cancel their services because they felt they could not afford to pay the increased charges. This significant impact needs to be seriously considered to ensure that there is a balance of enabling carers to continue caring in the community without reaching crisis point which might put increased pressures on the need for additional services.

### 3.5 Other Significant Issues:

a) There was a strong response put forward at meetings regarding the quality of care services. People wanted a guarantee that the quality of care services would be closely monitored and would reflect the increased cost of the service charged to the customer. There was a consistent view expressed at public meetings that quality was inadequate and that something more needed to be done about it.

b) An issue frequently raised at the public meetings was that the Councils forecasts of increased income in its savings plans would need to be offset by the fact that:

- Many currently paying the full cost would see their savings depleted to a level at which they would then come within financial assessment;
- The likelihood that people would reduce their packages of home care or

## Appendix A

stop attending day centres. The Council would then have to reduce service availability even further to reduce its costs.

- c) The views expressed at some public meetings was that people should be charged the actual cost of their services not the average full cost i.e. the £16.45 proposed for home care. This would accord with the principles which should apply under personal budgets (see Para. 5.3)
- d) Of those who did not consider that charges should be increased (less than 50%), there was a significant view from respondents that the council should be exploring other options particularly in relation to non-essential services e.g. libraries, councillors expenses and including the council reviewing their current staffing structures and administration costs.

### **4. Review of Draft Proposals**

- 4.1 The responses to the consultation clearly demonstrate opposition to the Cabinet's proposals and the issues raised need to be understood and reflected upon in developing the final outcome. At the same time, the Cabinet minutes from the June meeting gave clear direction that the final proposals must ensure that financial targets are achieved or exceeded (see 1.1(c) above). The aim must therefore be to achieve this criteria whilst at the same time, easing the nature of the proposals for those using our services.
- 4.2 The Directorate has prepared savings plans which are currently under consideration within the Council and will be made public within the current budget cycle. As part of the consultation, the public have been engaged on the forecast need to reduce budgets across the Council by 25% and that adult social care is expected to develop proposals amounting to over £25m to do so. As stated earlier, there has been a good understanding from the public of the difficulties faced by the Council as a result of the economic climate and also that charges would have to rise to some extent. At present, there is little or no likelihood of increasing the level of savings from other means and therefore the specific targets around charging must still be achieved.
- 4.3 Understandably, affordability has been the main concern being raised during the consultation.

The issues here are partly governed by the overall level of the charges but particularly the very short timescales over which increases are currently proposed. The Cabinet could therefore partially address the issues raised through extension of these timescales. This is possible as there is scope for the Cabinet to still achieve the financial targets provided that other aspects of the change are introduced at the outset as follows:

- The change in the low income threshold from +40% to +25% is clearly in line with practice elsewhere and is significant in terms of additional income raised (over £1m). There is less opposition to change here and the impact is relatively more affordable. However, the change affects a large number of service users from the low to middle income groups. Although the concept was understood at public meetings, this was not so clear from

## Appendix A

results in the questionnaires. Taking all this into account, it seems most important to bring the treatment of low income into line with other councils from December and therefore this proposal is included in Section 5

- There was also relatively less opposition to removal of the maximum charge of £387.13. Its removal for new customers as soon as possible is important in terms of service users making the right choices going forward based on their own ability to pay. For existing customers who made choices based on the existence of the “cap”, it could have significant additional adverse effects. This is not the most significant aspect of changes in terms of the financial benefits to the Council but for a small number of service users, there would be a large impact. Implementation for new service users from December but protection for existing service users until April 2012 is therefore part of the proposal in Section 5.
- The £51.80 charge for respite should be introduced from the outset as this level of charge reflects the weekly residential rates (£387.13 internally but £363 in independent sector) and also that the impact will be offset to a varied extent by savings for service users on home care packages as these will no longer be charged for during respite periods. The proposal to move to a single charge for respite care of £51.80/day from December 2010 is included as part of the proposal in Section 5.

Implementation of the above elements at the earliest stage as described here does provide Cabinet with the ability to phase in the main increases in charges thus easing concerns about immediate affordability while enabling financial targets to be achieved. The phasing may also help prevent moves by service users to reduce service levels which is the main concern of carers.

4.4 Other main areas of concern were also raised where the Cabinet may feel that they are able to respond, again linked to rephrasing of the timescales:

- For some service users, the significant increases planned for day care and transport will have a particularly severe impact as they come as part of the overall package of care. It was accepted during the consultation that it would be inequitable to introduce a £9 charge per journey across the board irrespective of distance. A solution to this might be a charge based on mileage or a banded rate. At the same time, there will be difficulties in maintaining subsidised rates within day care as personal budgets become the norm. Further work is therefore necessary in these areas and therefore, it is recommended that further review takes place in both while the rates are incrementally increased.
- Concerns about the use of average rates can be addressed through the application of the actual costs in personal budgets. This will ensure that there is clearer accountability based on the choices made by service users.

## 5. Revised Proposals

5.1 The final proposals following consultation are as follows:

- a) Revised Increases in the Maximum Charges:

Appendix A

Table 1

		<b>Current</b>	<b>Dec 2010</b>	<b>April 2011</b>	<b>Oct 2011</b>	<b>April 2012</b>
Home Care/Hr	Original	£9.66	£12.34	£16.45	£16.45	£16.45
	<b>Revised</b>	<b>£9.66</b>	<b>£11.36</b>	<b>£13.06</b>	<b>£14.75</b>	<b>£16.45</b>
Day Care/day	Original	£5.55	£20.00	£25.00	£25.00	£25.00
	<b>Revised</b>	<b>£5.55</b>	<b>£10.43</b>	<b>£15.32</b>	<b>Subject to review</b>	
Respite/day	Original	£4.13	£51.80	£51.80	£51.80	£51.80
	<b>Revised</b>	<b>£4.13</b>	<b>£51.80</b>	<b>£51.80</b>	<b>£51.80</b>	<b>£51.80</b>
Direct Payments/Hr	Original	£9.66	£10.00	£10.53	£10.53	£10.53
	<b>Revised</b>	<b>£9.66</b>	<b>£10.00</b>	<b>£10.53</b>	<b>£10.53</b>	<b>£10.53</b>
Telecare/wk	Original	£4.76	£4.76	£4.76	£4.76	£4.76
	<b>Revised</b>	<b>£4.76</b>	<b>£4.76</b>	<b>£4.76</b>	<b>£4.76</b>	<b>£4.76</b>
Transport/journey	Original	£1.33	£6.75	£9.00	£9.00	£9.00
	<b>Revised</b>	<b>£1.33</b>	<b>£3.25</b>	<b>£5.17</b>	<b>Subject to review</b>	
Other Chargeable Services		58.7%	75%	100%	100%	

NB:

1. The existing £4.13/day for respite is in addition to community care charges which continue during the period of respite.
2. The increased charge for direct payments removes the benefit given for the administration in relation to personal assistants.
3. There may be changes for inflation during the period to April 2012 and the actual charges will be set based on updated information at the time of each change – therefore the actual charge at a point in time could be slightly higher or lower than the figures above. However, after this point, charges would be subject to annual review for April each year.
4. The “other chargeable services” line in the table above is intended to allow for the increase to a 100% contribution rate for chargeable services under personal budgets. This contribution rate will supersede all other rates once the full review of transport and day care has been completed and results implemented.

b) Low Income Threshold :

The financial assessment procedures to be amended from Income Support +40% to +25% to be introduced from December 2010;

c) Maximum Weekly Charge:

The maximum weekly charge currently set at £387.13 to be removed for new customers from December 2010 but for existing customers from April 2012.

d) Moving from Planned to Actual:

A commitment has been given at the Cabinet meeting on 17<sup>th</sup> June to the introduction of charging based on actual service received rather than the planned package. This will be implemented from the date of the first increase in charges as approved by Cabinet (recommendation - December 2010).

## Appendix A

5.2 The changes outlined in Section 5.1 above as indicated for December 2010, April 2011, October 2011 and April 2012 should come into force on the following actual dates (being the first Monday in the month):

- 6<sup>th</sup> December 2010
- 4<sup>th</sup> April 2011
- 3<sup>rd</sup> October 2011
- 2<sup>nd</sup> April 2012

5.3 Personal Budgets:

All service users will be on personal budgets by April 2012 and there will be a mix in the intervening period of those on traditional services and people with personal budgets. The key principles of the Government's guidance on Fairer Contributions was that:

- that there must be equity between those charged for traditional services and those on personal budgets;
- a single contribution rate should apply;
- that changes are introduced at a pace that is fair to all

With different levels of subsidy between services (home care at 100% and day care 44%), the second of these principles cannot immediately be achieved. Where service users on personal budgets continue to receive day care services, complex calculations will be required. The Cabinet should therefore consider how to move its policy forward to achieve harmony of contribution rates. Longer-term, this could be achieved through raising further the day care rates on a per client group basis after April 2012.

## 6. Impact on Ability to Pay

6.1 The revised charges indicated above will be applied to each service user according to their ability to pay through the Fairer Charging & Contributions policy. The following is the estimated effect on numbers of service users paying charges:

Table 2

Service Users	Current		Effect of Proposals	
	No.	%	Estimated No.	%
Paying the full charge	2,372	36.0%	2,281	34.6%
Paying an assessed charge	1,938	29.4%	2,657	40.3%
Paying no charge	2,282	34.6%	1,654	25.1%

6.2 The 4 stage move towards the revised charging levels will have the following effects for the respective client groups by April 2012 based on current numbers of service users:

Table 3

<b>Client Groups</b>	<b>Estimated No. of service users</b>	<b>No increase</b>	<b>&lt; £500pa</b>	<b>£500 to £1,000pa</b>	<b>£1,001 to £2,000 pa</b>	<b>&gt;£2,001 pa</b>
Elderly & Phys Disability	5,771	32%	26%	22%	12%	8%
Learning Disability	765	48%	15%	28%	5%	4%
Mental Health	56	52%	13%	16%	9%	11%

A large proportion of the less than £500pa change results from the change in the low income threshold.

## 7. Areas for Further Review

### 7.1 Quality:

As discussed earlier, an area of considerable concern for respondents to the consultation was that if charges were to increase that more resources needed to be invested in improving quality of services. To varying extent, a view is held that there are too many examples of inadequate service delivery at present but with the pursuit of savings plans, the situation could deteriorate further. There is a need to reassure the public and others as to the way forward in this area and this is best picked up through the review and re-commissioning of the domiciliary care contracts during the next twelve months.

### 7.2 Potential Effects on Service Take-Up:

In Para. 3.2, the view from consultation meetings that significant increases in charges will lead to reduced take-up of services, was recorded. The Directorate will wish to avoid such effects if possible whilst acknowledging that service packages may also reduce for reasons which are appropriate i.e. due to the positive changes to the models of service delivery. Officers will therefore seek to identify in the monitoring arrangements, the patterns which emerge as a result off changes to charging levels.

### 7.3 Actual Costs:

Linked with the move to personal budgets is the concept that people should be charged the full cost of the service that they personally consume rather the average calculated on a county-wide basis. This is the only way to ensure true accountability for costs. Improvements in IT systems may be required before this change could be introduced.

## 8. Financial Impact on Savings Plans

- 8.1 Finance staff will have to re-assess charges for all service users for December 2010, April 2011, October 2011 and April 2012.

Table 4

	2010/11	2011/12	2012/13	2013/14
Original	769	2,776	3,100	3,100
Revised	667	3,011	3,907	3,917

The increase in income principally comes from not having included options around lowering the low income threshold as part of the original savings plan. Of the total, 85% of the increase relates to home care charges.

### Assumptions:

The increase in income is based on accurate work on the existing service user database for homecare, day care and transport only broader estimates of additional income from respite care charges. Allowance approximating to 10% have been made for:

- reductions in service demand at the same level.
- reductions in personal savings levels affecting full cost recovery;
- Charging for actuals replacing charging for planned care.

- 8.2 A number of changes will be required in order to introduce effective systems for charging on actual service rather than planned by December 2010. These involve upgrades to ICT, revisions to invoicing procedures for providers etc. Interim arrangements will be made whilst these changes take place but there may be temporary cost implications which will offset against the forecast savings in the table.

## 9. Charging Policy

- 9.1 Following Cabinet decision, a revised Charging and Contributions Policy will be drawn up based on the following:

- The services to be included/excluded;
- Service user exclusions;
- How charging applies to traditional services and personal budgets;
- What constitutes service [actual now as opposed to planned and rules around how this applies];
- The procedures applicable to fairer charging/contributions within Warwickshire including what constitutes disability related expenditure.

- 9.2 The draft policy will be reported back to the Overview & Scrutiny Committee. It will then be publicised on the Warwickshire website and made available in leaflet form to new and existing service users.

## **10. Equality Impact Assessment**

10.1 The full Equality Impact Assessment is included at Appendix 2.

This EIA has looked separately at the effects on:

- Different Client group
- People with disabilities
- Different age groups
- Ethnicity
- Religious affiliation
- Income groups

Comments are included within the Assessment on any adverse impacts and their significance. The recommendations are designed to address impacts as far as possible at this stage and the areas in paragraph 5.1 which are subject to further review allow scope for further development.

JOHN BOLTON  
Interim Director of Adult Services

Shire Hall  
Warwick

September 2010

## Summary Consultation Results per Question

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Don't know
Question 1.1: It is proposed that subsidies would be reduced or removed and charges for home, day and respite care services, including direct payments would rise to reflect the full cost. This will include reviewing transport charges to reflect real journey costs. Do you agree with this proposal?	2%	16%	23%	47%	11%
Question 1.2: Do you think it is fair that we change for the full cost of services, so that we can then offer as wide a range of services for as many people as possible?	2%	20%	31%	36%	11%
Question 2.1: Do you think the council should retain its maximum weekly charge currently set at £387.13	23%	30%	15%	11%	21%
Question 2.2: Or, do you think that this limit of £387.13 a week should be removed, so that it is fair and equitable for all?	7%	22%	24%	24%	22%
Question 3.1: In line with government guidance, the council is proposing to return to a policy of Income Support +25%. Do you agree with this proposal?	3%	25%	15%	18%	40%

Appendix A

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Don't know
Question 4.1: We must make sure we have an equitable way of providing services, to do this the council needs to move to full costs. In view of the outlined two stage proposal, is doing this in a staged way fair for all?	3%	26%	21%	35%	19%
Question 4.2: Do you think the timescales are reasonable?	2%	23%	21%	35%	19%

	Increase charges through a fair assessment of someone's ability to pay for those charges (as we are now proposing)	Provide services to fewer people by restricting our services only to those in greatest need	Neither of these
Question 5: The Cabinet is considering increasing charges as it needs to balance its books as it no longer gets sufficient money from Government or Council Tax collections to fund all the costs of adult social care in Warwickshire. If it were your choice, would you:	51%	19%	30%

## Warwickshire County Council

### Equality Impact Assessment for Cabinet Proposals on Fairer Charging & Contributions

<b>Directorate</b>	<b>AHCS</b>
<b>Service Area</b>	<b>Adult Social Care</b>
<b>Policy/Service being affected</b>	<b>Community Care Charging</b>
<b>Is this an investment or proposed saving?</b>	A saving – by increasing income
<b>Is this proposed saving or investment directly linked to another i.e that an investment in a new or existing service relates to a saving in another area? If so please name the linked proposal.</b>	No.
<b>Who is undertaking this assessment?</b>	Chris Norton
<b>Date of this assessment</b>	27 September 2010
<b>Signature of completing officer (to be signed after the EIA has been completed)</b>	
<b>Name and signature of Head of Service (to be signed after the EIA has been completed)</b>	Ron Williamson 
<b>Signature of DLT Equalities Champion (to be signed after the EIA is completed and signed by the completing officer)</b>	Kim Harlock
<b>Is your proposal likely to result in complaints from existing services users and/or members of the public? YES</b>	
<b>If yes please flag this with your Head of Service and the Customer Relations Team as soon as possible</b>	

A copy of the Equality Impact Assessment Report including relevant data and information to be forwarded to the Directorate Equalities Champion and the Corporate Equalities & Diversity Team

## Form A1

### INITIAL SCREENING FOR BUDGET DECISIONS – DO THEY HAVE ANY RELEVANCE OR POSE ANY RISK TO ANY OF THE EQUALITIES GROUPS?



High relevance/priority



Medium relevance/priority



Low or no relevance/ priority

**Note:**

1. Tick coloured boxes appropriately, and depending on degree of relevance to each of the equality strands
2. Summaries of the legislation/guidance should be used to assist this screening process

DEPARTMENT:	Relevance/Risk to Equalities																							
State the service or proposal being assessed:	Gender inc transgender			Race			Disability			Sexual Orientation			Religion/Belief			Age			Priority status For EIA					
	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Reducing subsidies in charges	✓			✓			✓					✓	✓			✓			✓			✓		
Reducing income protection floor	✓			✓			✓					✓	✓			✓			✓			✓		
Removing charging limit for new customers	✓			✓			✓					✓	✓			✓			✓			✓		
Are your proposals likely to impact on social inequalities e.g. child poverty for example or our most geographically disadvantaged communities																						✓		

For saving proposals complete form A2a below

For investment proposals complete form A2b below

**Form A2a – proposed savings**

**Equality Impact Assessment**

**Please Explain**

<b><u>Stage 1 – Scoping and Defining</u></b>			
(1) What are the aims and objectives of service where savings are to be made?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• To reduce/ remove subsidies from charges to customers for community care services.</li> <li>• To reduce the income protection floor to the Department of Health recommended level of income support plus 25%</li> <li>• To charge residential respite care under CRAG.</li> <li>• To remove the charging cap for new service users immediately but at a later stage for existing service users.</li> </ul>		
(2) How does the service fit with the council's wider objectives?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Contribution towards savings targets</li> <li>• Promote a fairer charging policy - current subsidies to customers who have the means to pay higher charges means less resources are available to meet the cost of service provision</li> </ul>		
(3) What would have been the expected outcomes of the service?  Who would have benefited from the service and in what way?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Increases in charging income.</li> <li>• Reduction in demand from full paying customers.</li> <li>• Potentially a change in the shape of demand as perverse financial incentives to choose particular services are reduced.</li> </ul>		
(4) Does this proposed saving have the potential to directly or indirectly discriminate against any particular group or to compound issues of social inequality?  Please identify all groups that are affected	<p>RACE Yes</p>	<p>AGE Yes</p>	<p>GENDER inc Transgender Yes</p>
	<p>RELIGION/BELIEF Yes</p>	<p>DISABILITY Yes</p>	<p>SEXUAL ORIENTATION No</p>

<p>(5) Are there any negative impacts on social inequality issues? This includes impacts on child poverty for example or our most geographically disadvantaged communities</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This proposal will impact most on those who have the means to pay more and least on those who have the means to pay less, therefore reducing social inequality in the long term.</li> <li>• Those who are most financially disadvantaged pay no charges now and will pay no charges in the future because they will still be protected by the means testing process which will ensure no-customer's income is reduced below the equivalent of income support plus 25% as a result of charges for personal care services, therefore preventing the creation or aggravation of poverty. There are no other changes to the Fairer Charging &amp; Contributions</li> </ul>
<p><b><u>Stage 2 - Information Gathering</u></b></p>	
<p>(1) What type and range of evidence or information have you used to help you make a judgement about the cut to this particular service?</p>	<p>The following type and range of evidence information have been used which includes both local and national information –</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Department of Health – Fairer Charging policies for home care and other non residential social services, government guidance - 2003</li> <li>• Department of Health – Fairer Contributions Guidance: Calculating an individual's contribution to their personal budget</li> <li>• Warwickshire's Personalisation and Transformation of Adult Social Care programme</li> <li>• Warwickshire's existing charging policies</li> <li>• Data collection and statistical analysis of current and projected service usage, current and future demographics, costs of services and charges to customers, identifying potential financial impact of increased charges on new/existing customers.</li> <li>• Comparable information on community care charges gathered from other neighbouring local authorities.</li> </ul>

(2) Have you been able to use any consultation data to help make this decision, if so what?

A three month public consultation has been conducted resulting from a Cabinet decision on 17<sup>th</sup> June 2010.

A comprehensive and detailed engagement and consultation plan was developed and set out the Directorate's approach to full engagement with:

- People who use services, their families and carers
- Providers of services
- Potential future customers – eg: members of the general public
- Councillors and MPs

Given the range and complexities of the Fairer Charging Review, a number of methods of consultation/engagement were used. This enabled each audience group to fully participate in the process.

These methods included the following –

- 6500 letters to all existing customers
- Information fact sheet (including questionnaire)
- Leaflet – included fictitious scenarios and frequently asked questions
- Dedicated phone line – for customers, family carers/relatives
- Web pages – consisting of information from fact sheet, on line survey, pod cast, links to other websites providing information on Fairer Charging guidance and Personal Budgets
- 21 Visits to a number of Day Services for adults with a Learning Disability, Physical Disability & older people. As well as a number of community groups, eg. Older People Forums, Black & Minority Ethnic groups across Warwickshire and 3 strategic partnership groups for older people, Carers and adults with a Learning Disability.
- Public meetings – in each district & borough across Warwickshire.
- Dedicated email, fax line and postal address
- Voluntary sector organisations briefing session
- people who have expressed an interest in putting forward their views.

All existing customers (6500) in receipt of home care, day care, respite, transport (to and from Day Care) and Direct Payments were sent a letter and factsheet (which included a questionnaire) so that they were informed of the consultation process and were given the opportunity to put forward their views.

	<p>For those adults with Learning Disabilities who may have complex and/or profound needs may find it difficult to comprehend and feel able to respond to the proposals within the consultation. New Ideas Advocacy have been involved offering specialist support and guidance to those</p> <p>Easy read and picture supported information has been produced, so that the proposals within the consultation are in a format which are available to a wider audience and with people with varying needs.</p> <p>A dedicated helpline was developed for customers and their carers/relatives to respond to any queries or concerns around the consultation and to offer a service whereby an estimate could be given as to how/if the person would be affected by any increases in charges, should the proposals be implemented.</p>
--	---

<b><u>Stage 3 – Making a Judgement</u></b>	
1) From the evidence above is there any adverse or negative impact identified for any particular group?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Information systems hold information about gender and client type (i.e. disability or need type).</li> <li>▪ For younger adults the changes impact on people with disabilities and do not impact on people without disabilities.</li> <li>▪ In older people it will impact more on women simply because more customers are women, but it does not appear to impact disproportionately for women.</li> <li>▪ It impacts more upon older people with disabilities than it impacts upon younger adults with disabilities. This is because this group has the higher level of resources.</li> <li>▪ Those with more severe needs and the means to pay charges will be more impacted upon as their chargeable services will be higher in the first place.</li> <li>▪ Removing the charging cap will result in very significant increases for a small number of people.</li> </ul>

<p>(1) From the evidence above is there any adverse or negative impact identified for any particular group? (Continued)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ People on moderate income including those on benefits will be affected by the reduction in the low income threshold whereas those whose resources exceed the upper threshold for financial assessment will not. This occurs where their assessable income is less than the service cost.</li> <li>▪ A higher proportion of people with younger adults with disabilities will be affected by the change to the lower income threshold. This is primarily because there are more people on low/moderate incomes in this group with benefits which bring them above the threshold</li> <li>▪ There is no evidence of a negative impact by race simply because charging information systems do not hold this information, but there is no feedback from the consultation of any concerns about any adverse impact in this respect.</li> <li>▪ People in certain religious/cultural groups are more likely to choose day care within their own communities rather than domiciliary care. There is no however no adverse effect on these groups as a result of the proposals to Cabinet as day care charges continue to be subsidised while domiciliary care is moving towards full cost.</li> </ul>
<p>(2) If there is an adverse impact, can this be justified?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ The fact that this impacts on people with disabilities and does not impact on people without disabilities is simply because people with disabilities are the customer base of adult social services and people without disabilities are not. This therefore is a justifiable impact.</li> <li>▪ The fact that this impacts more upon older people is because the majority of the client base are older people and because older people tend to have higher resources (from retirement income, pensions, etc) than younger adults with disabilities. This is justifiable because it impacts on older people more because of their income and wealth, not because of their age. Also, where older people do not have the means to pay they will not have to pay, in exactly the same way as for younger adults without the means to pay.</li> </ul>

(2) If there is an adverse impact, can this be justified? (Continued)

- People with more significant disabilities plus more significant savings and income will be more affected but this is because higher needs equates to higher services which equates to higher cost and therefore higher charges. This is justifiable on the grounds that to not charge the same rates for people with higher needs would be to the detriment of those with lower needs who would then be subsidising higher need customers. However, the assessment process does take account of disability related expenditure which would not be offset for those who cannot justify such costs.
- Removing the charging cap immediately for new service users is justified on the grounds that at that stage, people are encouraged to make choices based on the cost to themselves. Where people are already in receipt of service packages, there is protection until April 2012 to allow time for adjustment to be made.
- The negative impact on people with moderate incomes is a justifiable effect of the reduction in low income threshold to a level used by other councils and which is in line with Government guidance.
- The effect of the change on low income thresholds for people with disabilities will be looked at along with a review of the disability related expenditure guidance
- Keeping a subsidy in place for Day Care but not for any other services is justified on the grounds that the level of increase would be too great within the time period and in depth work will be undertaken prior to a further review.

(3) if there is an adverse impact on social inequalities can these be justified?

There is a positive impact on social equalities in that the poorest are the least affected and those with the most means are the most affected.

<p>(4) What actions could be taken or have been taken to reduce or eliminate negative or adverse impact?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Maintaining a charging floor that protects customers to the level of income support plus 25%</li> <li>▪ Increasing the level of charges gradually to full cost, and making this process more gradual than was originally proposed.</li> <li>▪ Not going to full cost charging for day care because the cost of day care, particularly for adults with disabilities is very high.</li> <li>▪ Maintaining protection for two years by retaining the maximum cap for existing service users.</li> </ul>
<p>(5) Is there any positive impact?</p> <p>Does it promote equality of opportunity between different groups and actively address discrimination?</p>	<p>The main positive impact is meeting savings targets in a way that impacts on the income and wealth of those customers who have the means to pay more charges which is a far better impact than the alternative which would be to raise criteria for services and therefore increase unmet need.</p>

**Stage 4 – Action Planning, Review & Monitoring**

If No Further Action is required then go to – Review & Monitoring

(1) Action Planning – Specify any action which could be taken to mitigate or eradicate negative or adverse impact on specific groups, including resource implications.

**EIA Action Plan**

<b>Action</b>	<b>Lead Officer</b>	<b>Date for completion</b>	<b>Resource requirements</b>	<b>Comments</b>
Further work to review day care and transport charges	Paul Walsh	September 2011	Fairer Charging Review team in place	
Development of a Charging Policy with the heading outlined in the Cabinet report Paragraph 9	Paul Walsh	November 2010	“ “	

**(2) Review and Monitoring**

State how and when you will monitor the impact of this proposed saving

- Monitoring of the impact across client groups
  - Monitoring of the impact of charges in relation to potential withdrawal from service
  - Monitoring of the impact on carers groups
- Through annual review to Overview & Scrutiny Committee

Please annotate your proposed saving with the following statement:

‘An Equality Impact Assessment on this proposed saving was undertaken on (date of assessment) and will be reviewed on date (one years from the date it was assessed)’.

## Fairer Charging Consultation – Final Report

### Summary

A cabinet report, presented on 17 June 2010, outlined proposals to formally consult with people in Warwickshire who approved a 3 month public consultation period.

### Recommendation

For the Directorate Leadership Team to note the outcomes of the consultation exercise in their recommendations to Cabinet.

## 1. Context

- 1.1 Adult Health & Community Services Directorate are undertaking a review of the contributions customers pay towards packages of care for its community care services, in line with the transformation of adult social care, personalisation of services and that the fact that Warwickshire can no longer afford to subsidise services.
- 1.2 The Cabinet report presented on 17 June 2010, outlined proposals to formally consult with people in Warwickshire.

1. Cabinet approved a process of consultation with people in Warwickshire on charging for adult social care community based (non-residential) services based on a number of principles:

- a) That the County Council will not subsidise the costs of care. (It may be necessary to phase the move towards the ending of the current subsidies). That when people are assessed to make their contribution towards the costs to their personal budgets that the full costs of the services which they are using is taken into account.
- b) That no one who is on Income Support or who receives an income less than a sum of money which is equivalent to income support plus 25% should be required to pay for the costs of their services. I.E. These people continue to receive free services.
- c) That any new proposals will ensure that the financial targets set for income collection by the council are met or exceeded.
- d) That officers investigate how insurance based products might become available to assist people who may choose this option as a way of reducing the longer term burden of the costs of care.

- 1.3 This report is in response to the above and sets out the findings from the consultation, which ran from Friday 25 June to Friday 17 September 2010.
- 1.4 The focus of the public consultation was to:

## APPENDIX B

- 1) Provide an opportunity for individuals to consider the proposals as outlined in the Cabinet report and respond accordingly.
- 2) Consider whether they agreed with the proposals and then put forward comments as to how these proposals may personally impact on their lives.

## 2. Methodology & Response Rates

2.1 Overall, approximately **1500** people either responded to, or were involved in the consultation and the following methods were used, as agreed by Cabinet.

Method of Consultation	Numbers
Consultation Packs	1765 packs distributed <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 25 libraries</li> <li>• 75 doctor surgeries</li> <li>• 11 One-Stop-Shops</li> <li>• 160 Parish Councils</li> <li>• 100 voluntary sector organisations &amp; community groups</li> </ul>
Customer letters	5000 existing customers 470 new customers
Dedicated phone line	162 calls received
Questionnaire – Paper copies & on line survey (see appendix 1 – attached)	Total = 875 829 – paper copies received 79 – completed on line survey

## 2.2 Public meetings

In total, **203** people attended the **7** public meetings and included members of the general public, Councillors, customers of adult social care services, family/parent carers, voluntary sector organisations & service providers.

Venue	Date	Numbers of attendees
<b>Warwick District</b>		
St Peter's Conference Centre, Dormer Place, Leamington	Mon 28 June Mon 16 August	11 64
<b>Nuneaton &amp; Bedworth Borough</b>		
Hatters Space Community Centre, Upper Abbey Street, Nuneaton	Wed 30 June Wed 18 August	7 39
<b>Rugby Borough</b>		
Benn Hall, Newbold Road, Rugby	Monday 5 July	40
<b>Stratford District</b>		
Methodist Church Hall, Stratford-Upon-Avon	Thurs 8 July	25
<b>North Warwickshire Borough</b>		
Trinity Church, Coleshill Road, Atherstone.	Tues 13 July	17

2.3

### Visits

Approximately **400** people attended the **20** visits which were undertaken across Warwickshire.

These visits were arranged to a number of Day Services for adults with a Learning

## APPENDIX B

Disability, Physical Disability & older people. As well as a number of community groups, e.g. Older People Forums, Black & Minority Ethnic groups across Warwickshire and 3 strategic partnership groups for older people, Carers and adults with a Learning Disability. Specialist support for those with a Learning Disability was provided by New Ideas Advocacy, who used a variety of communication methods to support this client group.

Date & Time	Organisation	Number of attendees
Mon 28 June	Rugby Disability Forum	35
Thurs 8 July	Alcester SCAN (Senior Citizens Action Network)	20
Mon 26 July	Satkaar (Asian Elders Day service)	21
Wed 28 July	Emscote Centre, Warwick (LD Day service)	11
Wed 28 July	Sesame Centre, Rugby (PD day service)	26
Mon 2 Aug	North Warks Older People Forum	40
Mon 2 Aug	Saltway Centre, Stratford (PD & LD day service)	12
Fri 30 July	Warwickshire Older People's Partnership	20
Fri 6 Aug	Newbold Centre, L/Spa (LD day service)	11
Mon 9 Aug	Shortwoods, Dordon (LD Day service)	15
Wed 11 Aug	Bridgeway Centre, Bedworth (LD day centre)	19
Thurs 12 Aug	Ramsden Centre, Nuneaton (PD day service)	29
Friday 13 Aug	Bloxham Centre, Rugby (LD day service)	15
Tues 17 Aug	Nuneaton & Bedworth OP Forum	30
Wed 1 <sup>st</sup> Sept	Learning Disability Partnership Board	24
Thurs 2 Sept	Rugby CORE (Counsel of Older Residents)	16
Friday 10 Sept	Abbotsbury Day Care	8
Mon 13 Sept	WISE (West Indian Senior Endeavour) group, L/Spa	12
Tues 14 Sept	Warwickshire Carers Partnership	17
Thurs 16 Sept	Orchard Blythe Day Care	To follow

2.4

### Voluntary Sector Briefing Session

A Voluntary sector briefing session was arranged and **22** people attended the session. Positive feedback was received from voluntary organisations who said they would feel more confident when being asked to support and respond to individuals who had contacted them for advice and guidance.

### 3. Emerging Key themes

From the comments, responses and views received through the various methods of engagement, (including the results of the on line questionnaire attached as Appendix 1) there are a number of emerging key themes.

3.1 The majority of respondents generally understood the current economic situation facing the council and the reasons for the changes. Although, despite, giving people assurances that those people on low incomes would not be affected, most found this difficult to relate back to the context of their own lives.

### 3.2 **Affordability**

Overall, people's primary concerns were around affordability and the impact on the quality of their daily lives. The majority of respondents were not opposed to having to incur a slight increase for services, but felt that the level of increase for charges particularly, for day care, respite & transport were too steep. A large number of people said that they may have to consider either cancelling or reducing their care services because they were concerned that they would not be able to afford to pay the increased charges, particularly when taking into account the affect on their financial ability to pay other household bills.

People from Black & Minority Ethnic groups were concerned that they would become socially isolated, if they could no longer afford to attend their day centre. The main concerns voiced from older people were that they felt they were being penalised for having saved all their lives. Adults with a learning or physical disability and their carers recognised and acknowledged the importance of financially protecting people who cannot afford to pay, but there was a general consensus that if people could afford to pay, they should.

There was an overwhelmingly response from respondents who felt that the council should be exploring other options particularly in relation to non-essential services e.g libraries, councillors expenses and including the council reviewing their current staffing structures and administration costs.

### 3.3 **Timescales**

There was also a strong response regarding the timescales for implementing the increases which respondents felt were too tight and should be phased in over a longer period. People were concerned about not being able to financially manage with the proposed timescales but were generally in agreement to a staged implementation if more reasonable timescales could be agreed upon.

### 3.4 **Impact on Family Carers**

Most concerns were raised by Family Carers on the emotional impact of their caring role if the person they care for, decided to reduce or cancel their services because they felt they could not afford to pay the increased charges. This significant impact needs to be seriously considered to ensure that there is a balance of enabling carers to continue caring in the community without reaching crisis point which might put increased pressures on the needs of additional services.

### 3.5 **Quality of Services**

There was a strong opinion put forward regarding the quality of care services. People were generally not opposed to increases in charges but did want a guarantee that the quality of care services would be closely monitored and would reflect the increased cost of the service charged to the customer.

Appendix 1

**It is proposed that subsidies would be reduced or removed and charges for home, day and respite care services, including Direct Payments would rise to reflect the full cost. This will include reviewing transport charges to reflect real journey costs.**

**Do you agree with this proposal?**

		Are you / do you? (tick all that apply)				Total
		Service User	Family Carer	Member of the public	Part of an organisation	
Do you agree with this proposal?	Strongly Agree	1%	2%	5%	3%	2%
	Agree	16%	16%	19%	22%	16%
	Disagree	24%	19%	25%	22%	23%
	Strongly Disagree	49%	55%	44%	41%	47%
	Don't know	10%	8%	8%	11%	11%
Total		100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

**Responses regarding impact of proposal on an individual:**

Emotional impact on Family carers – (if cared for person reduces or cancels their day care/respite/transport.)	6.1%
Worry of affordability to pay higher costs	38.5%
Will have to cancel or reduce service	12.9%
Will reduce household income to pay other bills	3.6%
Impact on my quality of life	4.1%
Unclear of how will be affected	21.8%
Lower my standard of living	2.3%
Don't understand	1.6%
Using personal savings to pay for services	9.1%

## APPENDIX B

Do you think it is fair that we charge people for the full cost of services, so that we can then offer as wide a range of services for as many people as possible?

		Are you / do you? (tick all that apply)				Total
		Service User	Family Carer	Member of the public	Part of an organisation	
Do you think it is fair that we charge people for the full cost of services, so that we can then offer as wide a range of services for as many people as possible?	Strongly Agree	1%	2%	3%	2%	2%
	Agree	20%	24%	17%	27%	20%
	Disagree	32%	24%	39%	35%	31%
	Strongly Disagree	36%	43%	33%	25%	36%
	Don't know	11%	7%	8%	11%	11%
Total		100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

### Responses regarding impact of proposal on an individual:

Affect my quality of life	6.2%
Affordability of paying higher costs	45.5%
Affect financial ability to pay other household bills	3.4%
Reduce care service – now at greater risk	4.5%
Would not have enough money to buy personal hygiene items – pads, pants etc	0.3%
Additional responsibility for family carer	6.5%
If care costs increase will quality of services improve	10.6%
Will deter needy people asking for help	1.4%
The cost of my care is more than my pension	3.4%
Should help the most vulnerable	15.8%
Would have to use savings	2.4%

**APPENDIX B**

**Do you think the council should retain its maximum weekly charge currently set at £387.13?**

		Are you / do you? (tick all that apply)				Total
		Service User	Family Carer	Member of the public	Part of an organisation	
Do you think the council should retain its maximum weekly charge currently set at £387.13?	Strongly Agree	22%	28%	27%	11%	23%
	Agree	32%	26%	27%	30%	30%
	Disagree	14%	13%	14%	18%	15%
	Strongly Disagree	10%	11%	14%	14%	11%
	Don't know	22%	22%	17%	28%	21%
Total		100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

## APPENDIX B

Or, do you think that this limit of £387.13 a week should be removed, so that it is fair and equitable for all?

		Are you / do you? (tick all that apply)				Total
		Service User	Family Carer	Member of the public	Part of an organisation	
Or, do you think that this limit of £387.13 a week should be removed, so that it is fair and equitable for all?	Strongly Agree	7%	6%	14%	11%	7%
	Agree	22%	17%	16%	32%	22%
	Disagree	26%	22%	25%	21%	24%
	Strongly Disagree	24%	30%	29%	14%	24%
	Don't know	21%	24%	16%	21%	22%
Total		100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

### Responses regarding impact of proposal on an individual:

Financial impact on Family carer and cared for person	3.2%
Pensions & benefits will not cover increased cost.	11.8%
People would need to look at prioritising care costs against household or food bills	1.6%
People that can afford to pay should pay.	9.1%
Affects future affordability	35.5%
Reduce or cancel services	7.5%
Increased Charges will most adversely affect the most vulnerable	19.9%
Questions value for money	8.6%
should be equal for everyone	2.7%

## APPENDIX B

In line with government guidance, the council is proposing to return to a policy of Income Support +25%.

Do you agree with this proposal?

		Are you / do you? (tick all that apply)				Total
		Service User	Family Carer	Member of the public	Part of an organisation	
Do you agree with this proposal?	Strongly Agree	2%	3%	7%	3%	3%
	Agree	23%	24%	26%	36%	25%
	Disagree	16%	13%	13%	16%	15%
	Strongly Disagree	19%	22%	13%	12%	18%
	Don't know	40%	37%	41%	33%	40%
Total		100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

### Responses regarding impact of proposal on an individual:

Too complicated to understand	29.5%
Affordability to pay for care	30.1%
I don't know what Income Support +25% is.	8.0%
I do not receive Income Support	13.6%
This sounds fair	4.0%
Should look after the vulnerable (older people)	14.8%

## APPENDIX B

In view of this proposal, is doing this in a staged way fair for all?

		Are you / do you? (tick all that apply)				Total
		Service User	Family Carer	Member of the public	Part of an organisation	
In view of this proposal, is doing this in a staged way fair for all?	Strongly Agree	2%	3%	2%	2%	3%
	Agree	28%	25%	20%	33%	26%
	Disagree	21%	18%	23%	18%	21%
	Strongly Disagree	32%	41%	36%	26%	32%
	Don't know	17%	13%	19%	21%	18%
Total		100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

### Responses regarding impact of proposal on an individual:

Timescale too quick	7.7%
Phase in over longer period	14.9%
Not able to afford increases	32.8%
Will have less money to spend	8.7%
Cancel care package	6.7%
Reduce services	3.1%
Staging proposal acceptable	5.6%
Should introduce 25%, & 50% increase first than 75% & 100%	4.6%
It is not fair to make the vulnerable pay	15.9%

## APPENDIX B

### Do you think the timescales are reasonable?

		Are you / do you? (tick all that apply)				Total
		Service User	Family Carer	Member of the public	Part of an organisation	
Do you think the timescales are reasonable?	Strongly Agree	1%	3%	2%	0%	2%
	Agree	25%	22%	15%	29%	23%
	Disagree	23%	13%	19%	24%	21%
	Strongly Disagree	34%	46%	47%	25%	35%
	Don't know	18%	16%	18%	22%	19%
Total		100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

### Responses regarding impact of proposal on an individual:

December (Christmas)& January not good time to implement increases	5.8%
Not able to afford increases	46.8%
Timescale unreasonable	47.4%

## APPENDIX B

The Cabinet is considering increasing charges as it needs to balance its books as it no longer gets sufficient money from Government or Council Tax collections to fund all the costs of adult social care in Warwickshire. If it were your choice would you:

		Are you / do you? (tick all that apply)				Total
		Service User	Family Carer	Member of the public	Part of an organisation	
The Cabinet is considering increasing charges as it needs to balance its books as it no longer gets sufficient money from Government or Council Tax collections to fund all the costs of adult social care in Warwickshire. If it were your choice would you:	Increase charges through a fair assessment of someone's ability to pay for those charges (as we are now proposing)	55%	44%	38%	62%	51%
	Neither of these	26%	45%	39%	18%	30%
	Provide services to fewer people by restricting our services only to those in greatest need	19%	12%	23%	20%	19%
Total		100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

### Responses regarding impact of proposal on an individual:

Explore other cost cutting options within local authority. (jobs, administration costs)	69.2%
Reduce non-essential services eg: library services, sports centres,	24.2%
Reduce an individual's care hours	2.2%
What is council tax paid for?	4.4%

## APPENDIX B

Is there one key message about these proposals that you would like to give to councillors?

Don't make life harder for vulnerable people	62.4%
Can't afford increases	4.1%
The system is unfair	16.7%
Too bigger cuts too quickly	3.2%
Minimise cost impact	8.6%
If I am forced to receive less support from the council, this will increase the stress on my full time carer and the support he needs from the council	5.0%

**APPENDIX B**

**Are You?**

		Are you / do you? (tick all that apply)				Total
		Service User	Family Carer	Member of the public	Part of an organisation	
Are You?	Female	66.1%	70.0%	54.5%	62.5%	65.6%
	Male	33.9%	30.0%	45.5%	37.5%	34.4%
Total		100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

**How old are you?**

		Are you / do you? (tick all that apply)				Total
		Service User	Family Carer	Member of the public	Part of an organisation	
How old are you?	18 - 29	1.4%		1.8%	3.1%	1.3%
	30 - 44	4.4%	4.6%	12.5%	15.6%	5.5%
	45 - 59	8.0%	31.0%	21.4%	34.4%	12.7%
	60 or over	86.2%	64.4%	62.5%	46.9%	80.3%
	Under 18			1.8%		.1%
Total		100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

**APPENDIX B**

**Which of these groups do you consider you belong to?**

		Are you / do you? (tick all that apply)				Total
		Service User	Family Carer	Member of the public	Part of an organisation	
Which of these groups do you consider you belong to?	Any other Ethnic Group	.4%			3.1%	.4%
	Asian or Asian British - Any other Asian Background	.5%				.4%
	Asian or Asian British - Indian	3.4%	3.8%	11.5%	3.1%	4.0%
	Asian or Asian British - Pakistani	.2%		1.9%		.3%
	Black or Black British - Caribbean	.2%				.1%
	Chinese or other ethnic group - Chinese			1.9%		.1%
	White - Any other white background	.7%	2.6%			.8%
	White - British	93.2%	92.3%	82.7%	90.6%	92.2%
	White - Irish	1.4%	1.3%	1.9%	3.1%	1.5%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	

## APPENDIX B

Do you have any long-term illness, health problem or disability which limits your activities or the work you can do?

		Are you / do you? (tick all that apply)				Total
		Service User	Family Carer	Member of the public	Part of an organisation	
Do you have any long-term illness, health problem or disability which limits your activities or the work you can do?	No	4.6%	50.7%	44.2%	48.3%	14.2%
	Yes	95.4%	49.3%	55.8%	51.7%	85.8%
Total		100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Which District / Borough area do you live in?

		Are you / do you? (tick all that apply)				Total
		Service User	Family Carer	Member of the public	Part of an organisation	
Which District / Borough area do you live in?	None of the above	.3%	3.6%	3.7%	3.1%	1.1%
	North Warwickshire	13.2%	7.2%	9.3%	6.3%	12.0%
	Nuneaton & Bedworth	18.1%	21.7%	22.2%	21.9%	19.0%
	Rugby	19.9%	20.5%	16.7%	21.9%	19.8%
	Stratford-on-Avon	23.0%	24.1%	24.1%	31.3%	23.6%
	Warwick	25.4%	22.9%	24.1%	15.6%	24.6%
Total		100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%