

Budget Proposals 2014/15 and 2015/16: Equality Impact Assessment (EIA):

Business Unit:	Supporting People	Directorate:	Adults & Resources
Date Started :	30th July 2013	Date of current version:	6th February 2014

The council and its partners are facing a significant challenge in the savings it needs to make over the next couple of years. This Equality Impact Assessment (EIA) has been developed as a tool to enable business units to fully consider the impact of their proposals on the community. As a council we need to ensure that we are able to deliver the savings that we need to make while mitigating against any negative or adverse impacts on particular groups across our communities.

This EIA will evidence that the Council have fully considered the impact of the proposed changes and has carried out appropriate consultation on those changes with the key stakeholders. This EIA and the evidence provided within it will allow Councillors to make informed decisions as part of the decision-making process regarding the council's budget.

Executive Lead / Head Sign off:

Executive Lead(s)	Cllr Christine Scouler	Executive Head:	Fran Mason
Date:	6th February 2014	Date:	6th February 2014

Summary from Overall Budget Proposals:

Proposals – Outline	Savings for 2014/15 and 2015/16		Implementation Cost <i>Include brief outline + year incurred</i>	Delivery <i>When will this proposal realise income / savings</i>	Risks / impact of proposals <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Potential risks</i> • <i>Impact on community</i> • <i>Knock on impact to other agencies</i> • <i>If statutory service please state relevant legislation section and Act together with any statutory guidance issued.</i> 	Type of decision		
	Income £ 000's	Budget reduction £ 000's				Internal	Minor	Major
<p>Folks at home Outreach service to older people including resettlement support for people moving from residential care to extra care housing.</p> <p>Reduce by 48%</p>		Proposed saving £95,400		April 2014	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Current contract expires March 2014 • Potential impact on other public services such as adult social care, hospital and housing options. • Consultation and Equality Impact Assessment undertaken to assess the impact of the proposal. 			X

Section 1: Purpose of the proposal/strategy/decision

No	Question	Details
1.	Clearly set out the proposal and what is the intended outcome.	<p>Proposal - reduce the Folks @ Home Older People Outreach contract by 48% from March 18th 2014</p> <p>Reducing the contract value of this contract by 48% would reduce the effectiveness and reach of the service but achieve savings of close to £100k.</p>
2.	Who is intended to benefit / who will be affected?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Existing and future Clients - Reduction of Folks @ Home service could cause issues such as loss of independence and accommodation without the support received • Torbay and Southern Devon Care Trust – risk of increased need for Domiciliary Care as clients struggle to maintain their independence without the support offered by this service and people are unable to access preventative services in the future. • Torbay and Southern Devon Care Trust – As part of the developing Living Well @ Home service (which will deliver an integrated Care and Support service across Torbay), it has been proposed that funding currently earmarked for Older People services in Supporting People would be used from 2015 to enable the support element of this contract to be delivered. Reducing funding now would impact heavily on the preventative element of the Living Well @ Home service and limit the opportunities for integration. • Wider community – without these resources available, future clients could lose independence more quickly, and more pressure may be placed on informal support networks including family and neighbours. • Voluntary agencies – dedicated volunteers may have more opportunities to support people although this would put pressure on their limited resources as a result • Potential reduction in successful extra care placements from residential care since service provides resettlement support for those moving from residential care into extra care housing • Support Workers - Provider would need to reduce staff numbers significantly as a result of the reduction • If the reduction results in a significant change in service, it may be necessary to re-procure the service under procurement rules and undertake formal consultation.

Section 2: Equalities, Consultation and Engagement

Torbay Council has a moral obligation as well as a duty under the Equality Act 2010 to eliminate discrimination, promote good relations and advance equality of opportunity between people who share a protected characteristic and people who do not.

The **Equalities, Consultation and Engagement** section ensures that, as a council, we take into account the Public Sector Equality Duty at an early stage and provide evidence to ensure that we fully consider the impact of our decisions/proposals on the Torbay community.

Evidence, Consultation and Engagement

No	Question	Details
3.	Have you considered the available evidence?	Current population trends point to an increase in older people both nationally and locally, which will most likely lead to an increase in need for support and care services in the future.
4.	How have you consulted on the proposal?	<p>Providers of Supporting People funded services The consultation period ran from Thursday 21 November 2013 to 16 January 2014 On 21st November Providers were sent written details outlining the proposal(s) for their service(s) and given the Consultation Summary document detailing the overall proposals for the Supporting People (SP) programme, Equality Impact Assessments (EIAs) for their services and access to view the EIAs of other services online. Initial provider meetings/conversations were set up with SP Contract Managers in the week prior to the formal draft budget announcement. This was to explain the proposals and consultation process to providers and to allow the providers time to arrange meetings with their staff to take place on the day of the budget announcement (as for many services the proposals will affect staff) A client profile template was developed and sent to Providers to complete to identify clients in support services who were also in receipt of a statutory service. This information was used to inform the service EIAs and evidence where there might be an impact on the expenditure in other parts of the Authority. The Consultation Summary document and questionnaire were available on the Supporting People page of the Council's website. A follow up email was sent to Providers on 8th January asking if they were responding collectively, individually or both; and asking them to encourage referral agencies to respond to the consultation.</p> <p>Current and previous users of Supporting People funded services, and their carers, relatives and advocates. A standard letter outlining the specific proposals for each service was sent to the service provider to distribute</p>

No	Question	Details
		<p>to their service users. The letter outlined where service users could access and complete the client consultation questionnaire and explained the consultation process including the opportunity to attend focus groups or face to face interviews.</p> <p>Posters were sent to Providers to insert the details of the consultation events and promote these to service users.</p> <p>A number of focus groups proportionate to size of service were held for each of the affected services. Where services had more than 20 clients then 2 focus groups were offered, with the option for more if required, subject to the availability of resources to facilitate them. Focus groups used the same questions as the client questionnaire. However 1 focus group for clients in the supported employment service used different questions, chosen by by the external agency that facilitated this particular group.</p> <p>Focus groups were facilitated by representatives from Torbay Voice with a member of the SP team present to record comments. Where a focus group was organised but there were no attendees, the focus group has not been counted.</p> <p>Face to face interviews (with Torbay Voice representatives) or telephone interviews were offered to those choosing not to or unable to attend focus groups using the same questions.</p> <p>There may be a small duplication of respondents as some may have completed a questionnaire as well as attended a focus group</p> <p>Providers were encouraged to undertake their own consultations using the same questions, and some providers issued the questionnaires to their clients.</p> <p>The client questionnaire was available on the SP page of the Council's website and providers advised of this so that they could direct service users to it, or support service users to complete it themselves.</p> <p>Individual written submissions (email and letter) were received from service users, relatives, and family members.</p> <p>Stakeholders including statutory partners, referral agencies, local and national partner organisations</p>

No	Question	Details
		<p>An email was sent to all stakeholders attaching the SP Consultation Summary document and stakeholder questionnaire, a summary of SP services and a link to the EIAs for each service. Stakeholders were also encouraged to respond to the overall Council budget proposals and a link to the wider Council budget consultation was included in the email.</p> <p>Stakeholders included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Torbay and Southern Devon Health and Care NHS Trust • Devon Partnership Trust • Devon and Cornwall Probation Trust • South Devon Clinical Commissioning Group • Torbay Council Housing Services • Torbay Council Children’s Services • Police • Referral agencies such as: Community Mental Health Teams, Disability Information Service, Housing Options team, Torbay Hospital <p>Other local and national partners such as: British Association of Supported Employment, Shelter, The Alzheimers Society, MIND and Mencap</p> <p>See Appendix 1 for consultation results</p> <p>Other including members of the public/non service users</p> <p>A general questionnaire was placed on the Council’s website by the Council’s Policy and Performance Team asking about all of the Council budget proposals including a section on Supporting People. The SP section contained a link to the SP consultation documentation on the specific budget proposals for SP services.</p> <p>Further representations were made in writing (via letter, email and petition) by organisations and members of the public.</p> <p>A total of 285 representations were received, as well as 21 focus groups that were facilitated for clients and carers, where 160 people attended.</p>
5.	Outline the key findings	There were 80 responses received which referred to this proposal. There were no focus groups held as clients

No	Question	Details
		<p>preferred to make individual representations.</p> <p>People felt that Folks @ home is recognised as the service that ‘fills the gap’ for vulnerable elderly people who do not meet the criteria for statutory services. The service supports people to stay in their own homes or to move to more suitable accommodation to reflect their physical and health needs. Tasks range from help with bills and finances to installation of aids and other adaptive technology in their homes. They also provide emotional support to people.</p> <p>Without the service, there is a high risk that client’s health and safety would be compromised in unsuitable accommodation, that increased social isolation would lead to deteriorating mental health and that this would lead to clients relying on statutory services and moving into residential care.</p> <p>It is felt that the costs to health services, such as hospitals and ambulance service, and to the Adult Social Care budget through increased use of residential care and increased domiciliary care requirements would far exceed that spent on the current service.</p>
6.	<p>What amendments may be required as a result of the consultation?</p>	<p>Provider organisation and Police, probation and health services request a delay in implementation of the proposals so that alternative sources of funding can be investigated.</p>

Positive and Negative Equality Impacts

No	Question	Details		
7.	Identify the potential positive and negative impacts on specific groups			
		Positive Impact	Negative Impact	Neutral Impact
	Older or younger people	No positive impact	<p>Older people may be at greater risk of social isolation, falls and need for help from statutory services etc. Those living in the community may find it harder to maintain a tenancy</p> <p>As F@H is only available to older people (55+), they will be disproportionately affected. Client Record Data indicates that 62% of clients entering the service in 2012-13 were above the age of 65, with 17% over 85.</p>	
	People with caring responsibilities		<p>Potential for more pressure on carers to support older people with less opportunity for respite or other support for themselves</p> <p>There are negative health implications for older people who informally care for their partners/siblings and others.</p>	
	People with a disability			<p>Older People with a disability will be affected in the same way that older people without a disability are by this proposal. Client Record forms for 2012-13 indicate that 77% of clients entering the service had a disability.</p> <p>The following figures are the proportion of all clients entering the service in 2012-13, who had specific disabilities:</p> <p>Mobility - 46%</p> <p>Chronic (e.g. COPD/ Cancer etc) – 24%</p>

No	Question	Details	
			Visual – 17% Mental (e.g. Dementia) 17% Hearing - 8% Learning Disability – 4% Note: some clients present with multiple disabilities
	Women or men		54% of clients entering the service in 2012-13 were female. This is broadly in line with population trends with women living longer than men, but indicates that more women will be proportionately affected by this decision
	People who are black or from a minority ethnic background (BME)		No differential impact
	Religion or belief (including lack of belief)		No differential impact
	People who are lesbian, gay or bisexual		No differential impact
	People who are transgendered		No differential impact
	People who are in a marriage or civil partnership		Support given to bereaved partners may be lost, with the potential that this could lead to a decline in the health and wellbeing for the surviving partner
	Women who are pregnant / on maternity leave		Not applicable
	Socio-economic impacts (Including impact on child poverty issues and deprivation)		The loss of support for older people to live independently could lead to increased risk of homelessness, malnutrition and other health issues. Increased pressure on other council budgets are also likely, particularly the Adult Social Care budget as people are unable to cope in the wider community.

No	Question	Details	
	Public Health impacts (How will your proposal impact on the general health of the population of Torbay)		There may also be an impact on CCG budgets due to an increase in hospital admissions.
			The effect of the withdrawal of this service may impact on the healthy life expectancy of older people.
8a.	Cumulative Impacts – Council wide (proposed changes elsewhere which might worsen the impacts identified above)	The proposal to reduce SP floating support services (community based support) will mean that there is a further negative cumulative impact as the proposal states a 100% reduction to floating support so older people will not be able to access any other generic service for support.	
8b.	Cumulative Impacts – Other public services (proposed changes elsewhere which might worsen the impacts identified above)	Cumulative impact of proposed reductions across services and increasing reliance on voluntary sector will impact on voluntary sector capacity.	

Section 3: Mitigating action

No	Action	Details
9.	Summarise any negative impacts and how these will be managed?	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Older people may be at greater risk of social isolation, falls and need for help from statutory services etc. Those living in the community may find it harder to maintain a tenancy. 2. Potential for more pressure on carers to support older people with less opportunity for respite or other support for themselves 3. There are negative health implications for older people who informally care for their partners/siblings and others. 4. Support given to bereaved partners may be lost, with the potential that this could lead to a decline in the health and wellbeing for the surviving partner.

		<p>5. The loss of support for older people to live independently could lead to increased risk of homelessness, malnutrition and other health issues.</p> <p>6. Increased pressure on other council budgets are also likely, particularly the Adult Social Care budget as people are unable to cope in the wider community. There may also be an impact on CCG budgets due to an increase in hospital admissions.</p> <p>7. The effect of the withdrawal of this service may impact on the healthy life expectancy of older people.</p> <p>Whilst increased engagement with voluntary agencies will offer some level of service to offset the loss, the greater the reduction in contract value will impact on how much assistance these agencies will be able to provide in the short term.</p> <p>The implementation of a financial assessment to determine ability to pay could be considered, although new administrative procedures would need to be set up to accommodate this.</p> <p>The proposed overall reduction in Supporting People services will cumulatively affect the extent to which risks can be mitigated as there will be no other services to refer people to.</p>
--	--	---

Section 4: Monitoring

No	Action	Details
10.	Outline plans to monitor the actual impact of your proposals	<p>The following impacts will be monitored and reported to Commissioning for Independence Board, Chaired by the Director of Adult Services</p> <p>The following will be monitored:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increase in delayed discharges from hospital • Increase in respite visits • Increase in number of people requiring Residential Care • Acute rises in the number Social Care packages • Increased waiting times for outreach service <p>As well as showing any impact of the reduction in service capacity, this data will inform any future</p>

commissioning strategies produced by Torbay Council, Adult Social Care and/or the Clinical Commissioning Group

Section 5: Recommended course of action –

No	Action	Outcome	Tick ✓	Reasons/justification for recommended action
11.	<p>State a recommended course of action Clearly identify an option and justify reasons for this decision. The following four outcomes are possible from an assessment (and more than one may apply to a single proposal). Please select from the 4 outcomes and justify the reasons for your decision</p>	<p>Outcome 1: No major change required - EIA <i>has not identified any potential for adverse impact in relation to equalities and all opportunities to promote equality have been taken</i></p>		
		<p>Outcome 2: Adjustments to remove barriers – <i>Action to remove the barriers identified in relation to equalities have been taken or actions identified to better promote equality</i></p>		
		<p>Outcome 3: Continue with proposal - Despite having identified some <u>potential</u> for adverse impact / missed opportunities in relation to equalities or to promote equality. Full justification required, especially in relation to equalities, in line with the duty to have 'due regard'.</p>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<p>The purpose of this proposal is not to discriminate directly or indirectly, and does not amount to unlawful discrimination. The Council has to deliver significant savings, and in doing so has to prioritise its statutory responsibilities. Whilst the consultation has highlighted the benefits derived from the service together with the impact upon those who currently receive the service, this service is not statutory. The Council will endeavour, with its partners and the community, to mitigate against any adverse impacts. If any individual affected by the decision meets the FACS criteria, they will receive a service to meet their needs from Torbay & Southern Devon Health & Care Trust.</p>
		<p>Outcome 4: Stop and rethink – EIA has identified actual or potential unlawful discrimination in relation to equalities or adverse impact has been identified</p>		

Appendix 1

Consultation Results: Folks @ Home - Reduce by 50%

There were 80 responses received which referred to this proposal. There were no focus groups held as clients preferred to make individual representations. The service is provided by Folks@Home.

Category	Examples of comments
Impact on the Health, Wellbeing and Quality of Life of Existing and Potential Clients	<p>“Folks @ home is recognised as the service that ‘fills the gap’ for vulnerable elderly people who do not meet the criteria for statutory services.”</p> <p>“Many older people find that as they age, their housing situation no longer meets their needs due to their physical health and abilities. Without Folks@home, these vulnerable individuals would be unable to move home and therefore risk their safety and their health by remaining in unsuitable housing. This will lead to crisis situations, hospital admissions and place an increased burden on the emergency services”</p> <p>“If Folks at Home had been unavailable to the clients I have referred, their well being and health would have been negatively affected.”</p> <p>“Folks @ home work with clients to successfully reduce their alcohol intake.”</p> <p>“I suffer from severe anxiety and depression and I thought socialising was beyond my capability but my support worker has shown me otherwise which has given me a new lease of life.”</p> <p>“We were in emergency accommodation when I met my support worker. She re-housed us, set us up with our utility companies, liaised with the council and our landlord when the welfare reform came in to place. She</p>

Category	Examples of comments
	<p>successfully applied to charities to get us a fridge, and cooker. She referred us for an OT assessment to get a shower chair as I am a frequent faller.”</p>
<p>Impact on Statutory Services and National Priorities</p>	<p>“Inappropriate 999 calls will increase as vulnerable older people do not know who to turn to.”</p> <p>A number of client responses highlighted the need for other services should the Folks at Home service no longer be available to them. These mainly focused around hospitals and residential care.</p> <p>“I think I would have carried on falling over and having to be admitted to hospital.”</p> <p>“Without this I will end up in Residential Care.”</p> <p>“I will find it more difficult to discharge some patients safely, meaning acute hospital beds are being used inappropriately for people who are not unwell, but who “fall through the net” because there is no service to support them.”</p>
<p>Financial Impact of the Proposals</p>	<p>m. ... Without the service, bed blocking would increase and hospital discharges would be delayed.”</p> <p>“Folks@home successfully reduce existing care packages funded by Torbay Care Trust and through enabling life skills, often eliminate the need for care packages to be put in place for many clients. Withdrawal of support to clients will generate a significant increase in care packages.”</p> <p>“Folks@home reduces the burden on residential care and care packages significantly. The cost of those accessing residential care and the</p>

Category	Examples of comments
	increase in care packages would outweigh the cost of Folks@home's service significantly."
Impact on the Service / Provider	<p>"Folks@home faces closure with this level of funding cut, as it would not be viable to continue the service in its present form."</p> <p>"Six staff would be made redundant if the service is forced to close. Their specialist skills and knowledge built over many years of training and experience would be lost."</p>
Quality of Service Provision	<p>"Folks@home are housing experts, specialists in working with older people, older people's benefit experts, housing re-locators, enablers and skilled professionals in all aspects of issues faced by older people."</p> <p>"I like that my support worker has a clear understanding of my support needs and the best way to help me keep my independence and reduce my stress."</p> <p>"I am paralysed from the chest down so have had input from lots of people, my support worker from folks at home has achieved more than any of the other agencies and in far less time".</p>
Opportunities to Discuss Alternative Options / Source Other Funding	<p>"If councillors were aware of the incredible work that this service provides to the community and the desperate individuals it helps, a reduction in funding would not be considered."</p>