

EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT

The Council has a public sector equality duty under the Equalities Act (2010) to have due regard to:

- Eliminate discrimination, harassment and victimisation and any other conduct prohibited under the Act
- Advance equality of opportunity between people who share those protected characteristics and people who do not
- Foster good relations between people who share those characteristics and people who do not.

The three parts of the duty apply to the following protected characteristics: age, disability, gender reassignment, pregnancy/maternity, race, religion/faith, sex and sexual orientation. Marriage and civil partnership status applies to the first part of the duty.

In addition, the Council complies with the Marriage (same sex couples) Act 2013.

Stage 1 – Screening

Please complete the equalities screening form. If screening identifies that your proposal is likely to impact on protected characteristics, please proceed to stage 2 and complete a full Equality Impact Assessment (EqIA).

Stage 2 – Full Equality Impact Assessment

An EqIA provides evidence for meeting the Council’s commitment to equality and the responsibilities under the Public Sector Equality Duty.

When an EqIA has been undertaken, it should be submitted as an attachment/appendix to the final decision-making report. This is so the decision maker (e.g. Cabinet, Committee, senior leader) can use the EqIA to help inform their final decision. The EqIA once submitted will become a public document, published alongside the minutes and record of the decision.

Please read the Council’s Equality Impact Assessment Guidance before beginning the EqIA process.

1. Responsibility for the Equality Impact Assessment

Name of proposal	Charging for Managed Accounts
Service area	Commissioning
Officer completing assessment	Farzad Fazilat
Equalities/ HR Advisor	Louise Hopton Beatty
Cabinet meeting date (if applicable)	12 November 2019
Director/Assistant Director	Charlotte Pomery

2. Summary of the proposal

Please outline in no more than 3 paragraphs

- *The proposal which is being assessed*
- *The key stakeholders who may be affected by the policy or proposal*
- *The decision-making route being taken*

Introduce charging administration fees for Self-Funders

The MTFS for 2023/24 agreed the proposal to introduce administration fees for self-funders. This proposal is necessary in order to ensure the long-term sustainability of this service, for which currently no charges are made and which is expected to grow as the number of self-funders seeking arrangement of their care also increases.

A self-funder is someone who has assets and savings over £23,250 and is not eligible for LA support and should pay the full cost of their own care and support.

Self-funders receive help with information and advice on arranging care and support.

Currently some self-funders ask the Council to pay for the full cost of their care and they pay back the costs of the care only. There is currently no charge for the administration involved in setting up the care. There is, however, an administration cost to the Council related to fee negotiations, payments, billing and collection of funds.

It is proposed that where clients are self-funders, and where they have substantial funds and assets and require care and support, they are charged for the service they receive.

The proposal seeks to support additional income of £55K per year through raising this charge. It is proposed that the charges would be introduced in December 2019.

As the number of self-funding clients increase, the council recognises the administrative costs of managing self-funder payments, negotiations and recovery of payments is increasing and there is a need to off-set this increasing cost.

The proposed fees applicable from 1 December 2019 for self-funders clients is a flat fee of £650 per annum.

Where the self-funder service ends before the date the annual fees are due to be charged then pro rata fees will be calculated.

What will this mean:

The proposal will impact on current self-funder clients who do not pay an administration fee to the council for arranging their care.

3. What data will you use to inform your assessment of the impact of the proposal on protected groups of service users and/or staff?

Identify the main sources of evidence, both quantitative and qualitative, that supports your

analysis. Please include any gaps and how you will address these

This could include, for example, data on the Council's workforce, equalities profile of service users, recent surveys, research, results of relevant consultations, Haringey Borough Profile, Haringey Joint Strategic Needs Assessment and any other sources of relevant information, local, regional or national. For restructures, please complete the restructure EqIA which is available on the HR pages.

Protected group	Haringey Population	Service users	Staff
Sex	GLA Projections (2017)	Mosaic data of service users	N/A
Gender Reassignment	N/A	Current data on service users does not breakdown by gender reassignment.	N/A
Age	GLA Projections (2017)	Mosaic data of service users	N/A
Disability	N/A	Mosaic data of service users	N/A
Race & Ethnicity	GLA Projections (2017)	Mosaic data of service users	N/A
Sexual Orientation	N/A	Current data on service users does not breakdown by sexual orientation.	N/A
Religion or Belief (or No Belief)	N/A	Current data on service users does not breakdown by religion or belief.	N/A
Pregnancy & Maternity	N/A	Current data on service users does not breakdown by pregnancy and maternity.	N/A
Marriage and Civil Partnership	N/A	Current data on service users does not breakdown by marriage and civil partnership.	N/A

Outline the key findings of your data analysis. Which groups are disproportionately affected by the proposal? How does this compare with the impact on wider service users and/or the borough's demographic profile? Have any inequalities been identified?

Explain how you will overcome this within the proposal.

Further information on how to do data analysis can be found in the guidance.

A. Sex

Table 1.1 - shows the overall Haringey data for gender

Gender	All Haringey	%
All		

people	222,075	
Males	112,270	51
Females	109,805	49

Table 1.2 - shows the gender of Adult Social Care users and of the 85 people who are self-funders and have savings over £23,250 as of 23.4.19.

	Total Adult Social Care Service Users	Total Adult Social Care Users (%)	Self - funders	Self funders %
Gender				
Male	1502	48	29	34
Female	1654	52	56	64

B. Age

Table 1.3 - shows the overall Haringey data for age.

Age	All Haringey	%
Total	222,075	
18-20	8,930	4
21-60	177,561	80
61+	35584	16

Table 1.4 - shows the age groups of the 3156 service users in receipt of social care and of the 85 people who are self-funders and have savings over £23,250 as of 23.4.19.

Age	Total Adult Social Care Service Users	Total Adult Social Care Users (%)	Self-funders (85)	Self-funders (%)
18-20	59	-	-	-
21-60	1278	40		1
61+	1819	60	84	
65+	-	-	-	99

C. Race and Ethnicity

Table 1.5 - shows the overall Haringey data for race and ethnicity.

	Haringey (2017 GLA Projections)
Race and Ethnicity	%
White	65%
Mixed / Multiple	5%
Asian / Asian British	10%
Black / African / Caribbean / Black British	16%
Other Ethnic Group	5%

Table 1.6 - shows the race and ethnicity of the 3156 service users in receipt of social care and of the 85 people who are self-funders and have savings over £23,250 as of 23.4.19.

Race and Ethnicity	Total Adult Social Care Service Users	Total Adult Social Care Users (%)	Self- funders (85)	Self-funders (%)
White	1466	46	50	59
Mixed / Multiple	66	2	1	1
Asian / Asian British	227	7	1	1
Black / African / Caribbean / Black British	1086	34	23	27
Other Ethnic Group	119	4	2	2
No data	195	6	8	10

D. Sexual orientation

3.2% of London identified as either Gay, Lesbian, Bisexual or Other (not heterosexual) in 2017.

Data on sexual orientation among appointees is not available, so it is therefore not possible to say whether this group is more likely to be appointees or not.

E. Gender reassignment

Gender Reassignment: No real data “Data on gender identity are still currently limited, though data collection methodology and question design are developing. Some work is being undertaken around gender identity and capturing trans or non-binary identities by other national statistics agencies for their respective censuses; work often involves a consideration or review of the sex question or response categories.”

Data on gender reassignment among appointees is not available, so it is therefore not possible to say whether this group is more likely to be appointees or not.

F. Religion or belief (or no belief)

Table 1.7 – shows the overall data for Haringey

Religion or belief (or no belief)	<u>Haringey</u> <u>(2017 GLA</u> <u>Projections)</u> <u>%</u>
Not Stated	8.9
Christian	45
Catholic	No breakdown
Hindu	1.80
Jewish	3.00
Muslim	14.20
Sikh	0.30
Buddhist	1.10
Greek Orthodox	No breakdown
Other	0.50
No Religion	25.20

4. a) How will consultation and/or engagement inform your assessment of the impact of the proposal on protected groups of residents, service users and/or staff?

Please outline which groups you may target and how you will have targeted them

Further information on consultation is contained within accompanying EqIA guidance

A public consultation was open from 22 July 2019 to 8 September 2019 and comprised: a dedicated webpage explaining the consultation and access to an online version of the survey and a separate questionnaire. The questionnaire was sent to 3150 service users with free post return envelope. A direct number for service users to call and ask questions or help to complete the questionnaires.

In addition, three drop-in sessions for service users to complete the questionnaire and ask questions about the two proposals were convened. The drop-in sessions were held at Marcus Garvey Library, Wood Green Library and Hornsey Library to ascertain the views of current service users, their carers of the adults who receive service in Haringey.

4. b) Outline the key findings of your consultation / engagement activities once completed, particularly in terms of how this relates to groups that share the protected characteristics

Explain how will the consultation's findings will shape and inform your proposal and the decision-making process, and any modifications made?

The consultation resulted in 342 responses.

General feedback from consultation:

The proposal to introduce administration fee was not supported by 69%. Two thirds of the 312 people who responded - 55% strongly disagreed and 14% disagreed).

Age

259 people indicated their age. 63% of the respondents were aged over 60. This is slightly lower than those likely to be impacted. Of the 85 service users who are impacted 99% are over 60 years of age. This response should have been expected as this age group is also over-represented in the wider cohort of all Adults Social users.

(See table 1.4 above for supporting information).

All age groups had over 50% either disagree or strongly disagree with the proposal, with the exception of 21-24 which only had 30% (however 60% replied 'don't know' in this age category). The highest level of disagreement came in 85+ respondents with 87% of those disagreeing with the proposal.

Sex

259 people supplied this information. Of the 259, 39% were female, 37% were male and 24% did not supply this information. The 39% response from females is a slightly lower representation compared to the overall all Adult Social Care users of which 52% were females see table 1.2 above for details).

There was minimal difference between male and female responses, with 63% of males disagreeing with the change and 65% of females.

Disability

272 people supplied this information.

80% of respondents considered themselves to have a disability. This was expected as care and support are provided to vulnerable adults all of whom are disabled in some way in order to meet Care Act eligibility.

Notably people without a disability disagreed more with the change, with 79% disagreeing (73% strongly disagree) compared to 65% for those with a disability, although both disagree overall.

Race and Ethnicity

The people who supplied this information were predominately from the following: 38% white and 27% Black / African / Caribbean This ratio of responses should be expected as these groups reflect the profile of people who are self-funders and receive adult social care. This also supported by the overall Haringey data from the Haringey (2017 Greater London Authority) projections.

All ethnicities disagreed with the change with more than 50% either disagreeing or strongly disagreeing, with the exception of Mixed (however similar to the age breakdown, 40% of responses were 'don't know'). Mixed ethnicities disagreed the least with only 45% disagreeing (18% strongly disagreeing) however this was only 11 responses. White, Black and Asian all had similar levels of disagreement, with 62%, 67% and 67% disagreeing (and 46%, 52%, 53% strongly disagreeing).

5. What is the likely impact of the proposal on groups of service users and/or staff that share the protected characteristics?

Please explain the likely differential impact on each of the 9 equality strands, whether positive or negative. Where it is anticipated there will be no impact from the proposal, please outline the evidence that supports this conclusion.

Further information on assessing impact on different groups is contained within accompanying EqIA guidance

Those affected will be either current or future service users of Adult Social care and where the council provides a free administration for care provisions.

1. Sex

As of 23 April 2019, there are 85 service users who are self-funders whose assets and saving is above £23,500. There were 56 (66%) female and 29 (34%) male users. This proposal will therefore impact a larger proportion of females. This is higher than the wider population receiving adult social care, where females are over-represented. 1654 Adult Social Care Service Users were female (54%) and 1502 were male (46%).

Positive		Negative	X	Neutral impact		Unknown Impact	
----------	--	----------	---	----------------	--	----------------	--

2. Gender reassignment

Data on gender reassignment among self-funders is not available, so it is therefore not possible to say whether this group is more likely to be self-funders or not. While there is not data to suggest that transgender people are more likely to be recipients of adult social care, according to the charity Stonewall this group is more likely to lack support from their families, and therefore could be self-funders.

Positive		Negative		Neutral impact		Unknown Impact	X
----------	--	----------	--	----------------	--	----------------	---

3. Age

As of 23 April 2019, there are 85 service users who are self-funders whose assets and savings are above £23,500. Age group of 65+ are 99% of this group. The implementation of the arrangement fee is expected to have a greater impact for older people.

It should be noted that this age group is also over-represented in the wider cohort of Adult Social Care users - of the 3156 Adult Social Care Users, 60% are 61+.

Positive		Negative	X	Neutral impact		Unknown Impact	
----------	--	----------	---	----------------	--	----------------	--

4. Disability

Care and support are provided to vulnerable adults all of whom have a disability. Adults who receive this service and where they have asked the council to make payments to providers of care on their behalf will be affected by this proposal.

Positive		Negative	X	Neutral		Unknown	
----------	--	----------	---	---------	--	---------	--

				impact		Impact	
--	--	--	--	--------	--	--------	--

5. Race and ethnicity

As of 23 April 2019, there are 85 service users who are self-funders whose assets and saving is above £23,500.

The impact of this proposed change will impact across all ethnicity groups, however, there is likely to be a greater impact for the following groups: White (47%). This is expected as these groups are predominant in the people being provided Adult Social Care.

Positive		Negative	X	Neutral impact		Unknown Impact	
----------	--	----------	---	----------------	--	----------------	--

6. Sexual orientation

Data on sexual orientation among self-funders is not available, so it is therefore not possible to say whether this group is more likely to be self-funders or not. There is no data to suggest that LGBT people are more likely to be self-funders, and therefore this group is not expected to be disproportionately impacted by the proposal.

Positive		Negative		Neutral impact		Unknown Impact	X
----------	--	----------	--	----------------	--	----------------	---

7. Religion or belief (or no belief)

Data on religion or belief among self-funders is not available, so it is therefore not possible to say whether this group is more likely to be self-funders or not. There is no data to suggest that people of certain faiths are more likely to be self-funders, and therefore the proposal is not expected to have a disproportionate impact on this area.

Positive		Negative		Neutral impact		Unknown Impact	X
----------	--	----------	--	----------------	--	----------------	---

8. Pregnancy and maternity

Data on pregnancy and maternity among self-funders is not available, so it is therefore not possible to say whether this group is more likely to be self-funders or not. However, given that the majority of self-funders are aged 61+, there is not an expectation that this group is more likely to be self-funders, and therefore the proposal is not expected to have a disproportionate impact on this area.

Positive		Negative		Neutral impact		Unknown Impact	X
----------	--	----------	--	----------------	--	----------------	---

9. Marriage and Civil Partnership

Data on marriage and civil partnership status among self-funders is not available, so it is therefore not possible to say whether one group is more or less likely to be self-funders. There is not data to suggest that those in a marriage or civil partnership are more likely to be self-funders, and therefore this group is not expected to be disproportionately impacted by the proposal.

Positive		Negative		Neutral impact		Unknown Impact	X
----------	--	----------	--	----------------	--	----------------	---

10. Groups that cross two or more equality strands e.g. young black women

Older people with a disability are more likely to be impacted by the proposed changes, therefore during the consultation we will try to capture information from people from this group, to minimise any disproportionate impact the proposed changes could have on them.

Outline the overall impact of the policy for the Public Sector Equality Duty:

- Could the proposal result in any direct/indirect discrimination for any group that shares the relevant protected characteristics?
- Will the proposal help to advance equality of opportunity between groups who share a relevant protected characteristic and those who do not?

This includes:

- a) Remove or minimise disadvantage suffered by persons protected under the Equality Act
 - b) Take steps to meet the needs of persons protected under the Equality Act that are different from the needs of other groups
 - c) Encourage persons protected under the Equality Act to participate in public life or in any other activity in which participation by such persons is disproportionately low
- Will the proposal help to foster good relations between groups who share a relevant protected characteristic and those who do not?

Implementation of this proposal would affect current and future adult social care service users aged 18 and over and who request the council arrange their care and have savings over £23,250.

Currently self-funders who arrange their own care (or their own families) do not benefit from the reductions that are achieved as a result of the purchase at scale in which the Council becomes involved.

Analysis indicates that the introduction of administration fees will impact on the protected characteristics of disability, age and ethnicity.

6. a) What changes if any do you plan to make to your proposal as a result of the Equality Impact Assessment?

Further information on responding to identified impacts is contained within accompanying EqlA guidance

Outcome	Y/N
No major change to the proposal: the EqlA demonstrates the proposal is robust and there is no potential for discrimination or adverse impact. All opportunities to promote equality have been taken. <u>If you have found any inequalities or negative impacts that you are unable to mitigate, please provide a compelling reason below why you are unable to mitigate them.</u>	N
Adjust the proposal: the EqlA identifies potential problems or missed opportunities. Adjust the proposal to remove barriers or better promote equality. Clearly <u>set out below</u> the key adjustments you plan to make to the policy. If there are any adverse impacts you cannot mitigate, please provide a compelling reason below	Y
Stop and remove the proposal: the proposal shows actual or potential avoidable adverse impacts on different protected characteristics. The decision maker must not make this decision.	N

6 b) Summarise the specific actions you plan to take to remove or mitigate any

actual or potential negative impact and to further the aims of the Equality Duty

Impact and which relevant protected characteristics are impacted?	Action	Lead officer	Timescale
Implementation of this proposal would affect current and future adult social care service users aged 18 and over and who request the council arrange their care and have savings over £23,250.	Record of appeals will be kept.	Farzad Fazilat	From date of implementation and ongoing.

Please outline any areas you have identified where negative impacts will happen as a result of the proposal, but it is not possible to mitigate them. Please provide a complete and honest justification on why it is not possible to mitigate them.

The council recognises that this proposal will disproportionately impact on people with protected characteristics based on age, gender, disability, race and ethnicity but only in so far as these are the users of adult social care in the borough who are more likely to be older, female, disabled and from certain backgrounds.

The arrangement fee will only be applied to people with savings who have capital above the upper charging limit for care, currently over £23,250. People with savings below this figure will not be required to pay the administration fee. This means that people in lower income groups who also may have protected characteristics will not be required to pay the proposed fee.

The administration fee will only be applied following a financial assessment and after it has been explained to the individual that they are liable to pay an arrangement fee in addition to the costs of meeting their care needs. This approach will ensure that people are aware of the fee before it is applied and it is done in a transparent and fair manner. This also allows the individual to make a choice.

The self-funders fee is proposed to be collected annually however the consultation strongly supported that the arrangement fee is paid 4-weekly rather than yearly. If the fee is collected in instalments then there are extra administration costs associated with this, however, factoring in consultation feedback people will be advised that our preferred option is annual but individuals can choose to pay it in instalments. This will be communicated during the financial assessment process.

People who pay the fee will no longer be liable to pay should their savings fall below £23,250. Financial assessment reviews will ensure that people who are self-funders but are approaching the £23,250 threshold for savings, will be closely monitored to ensure the fee is not charged at the point their savings fall below £23,250.

People will have the right to make a complaint if they believe that the fee has been applied incorrectly or unfairly.

6 c) Summarise the measures you intend to put in place to monitor the equalities

impact of the proposal as it is implemented:

Keep a record of all appeals.

7. Authorisation

EqlA approved by Date 1st November 2019



.....
(Assistant Director/ Director)

8. Publication

Please ensure the completed EqlA is published in accordance with the Council's policy.

Please contact the Policy & Strategy Team for any feedback on the EqlA process.