

Department/Service	Adult Services	<b>Equality Impact Assessment Form Template</b>		
Ref <b>See Appendix 1</b>	<b>ADU</b>	Officer responsible for the assessment	Alison McCudden	
Name of policy procedure function being assessed	<b>Adult Services Charging Policy</b>		Start date of assessment	04/02/11
Are there any other policies or procedures associated or linked with this one.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Financial Assessment Procedure</li> </ul>			
Briefly describe the aims, objectives and outcomes of the policy / procedure / function	<p>The proposed changes to charges involve making modifications to a number of areas. These can be summarised to include closing the gap between the standard charge set for services and the true, unsubsidised costs of the service. It also involves looking at new charges that could be introduced to offset administrative costs in a number of areas (e.g. Deferred Charge Agreements and Appointeeships).</p>			
Who is intended to benefit from this policy –procedure – function?	<p>Council Tax payers by increasing the size of the income that comes into the Council from charges. Provides equity between commissioned care service charges and personalised budget charging. Enables reinvestment of savings into front line services, contributing to maintaining service delivery able to meet growing demand.</p>			
What factors could contribute to or detract from the outcomes?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Problems in implementing the revised charging arrangements</li> <li>Rejection of the proposals by Council</li> <li>Miscalculation in the real income the changes generate (as factors at work are often complex)</li> </ul>			
Who are the main stakeholders in relation to the policy – procedure- function? (Please consider key equality groups)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Service Users and Carers</li> <li>External provider services.</li> <li>Care4CE</li> </ul>			
Who is responsible for the policy – procedure –	Alison McCudden			

Please indentify any impact (Positive / Negative) this policy, procedure, function or service will have on the following protected characteristics:								
Age - Is there an impact?	YES	<p>Comments/Actions:</p> <p>Cheshire East has a larger elderly population than both England and the North West. There are 68,400 people aged 65+ in Cheshire East or 18.9% in comparison to an average of 16.6% for the North West and 16.3% for the country. Correspondingly, Cheshire East has a small percentage of young people; 22.9% aged under 20, compared to 24.3% for the North West and 23.9% for England. Within Cheshire East in general the rural areas show the greatest proportion in both losses of young people and gains in older people. The Macclesfield area has the largest population and highest number of people aged 65+.</p> <p>Attendees at the Charging Events can be banded as following.</p> <table><tr><td>65+</td><td>10</td></tr><tr><td>44-64</td><td>26</td></tr><tr><td>18-44</td><td>11</td></tr></table> <p>No further age related issues were raised as a result of consultation except ability to pay. This is a significant problem for older people. According to the national Help the Aged Document 'Lifting Pensioners out of Poverty':</p> <p>"Almost one in four pensioners lives in poverty (2.5 million), with over half of poor pensioners living in severe poverty (56 per cent or 1.4 million). In addition, almost one in three pensioners lives in near poverty (3.8 million)." According to official statistics, in the last year alone an additional 300,000 pensioners were forced into poverty.</p>	65+	10	44-64	26	18-44	11
65+	10							
44-64	26							
18-44	11							

			<p>It is likely that the effect of the charging policy is to put pressure on those who can afford to pay, to pay more. However, service users are financially assessed according to ability to pay (under Government Fairer Charging Guidance) and so should not ever be asked to contribute more than they can afford to do.</p> <p>The Empower Card which has age related issues connected with it will be dealt with by a separate equality impact assessment.</p>
Carers – Is there an impact?		<b>No</b>	<p>Comments/Actions:</p> <p>The Office of National Statistics estimates that 10% of the population are likely to be carers i.e. 36,500 people in Cheshire East. There are 70,100 people over the age of 65 in Cheshire East and 8,016 of these may be carers. Of these approx 1,300 are likely to be in poor health themselves and 2,400 may be providing 50 or more hours of care per week. Only 740 carers are recorded as having had an assessment with Cheshire East Council of their needs as carers during the last year. (Cheshire East Carers Strategy 2010).</p> <p>One of the proposed changes was the implementation of a financial assessment on carers. This would affect carers currently using the free three hour home care service only. Many carers expressed the view in the consultation for this question that they were under enough financial and psychological pressure at the moment and that this proposal could only add further to it. However, it is now unlikely that this proposal will be implemented.</p> <p>The other aspects of the charging proposals have less effect on carers because this would involve increasing charges on the</p>

			cared for (only if they can afford to pay). It is likely that there will be some knock on effects on carers particularly where they must manage the budgets of those lacking in capacity. However, these are not deemed of extra significance compared to the main impact on the service users themselves.																											
Disability - Is there an impact?	Yes		<p>Comments/Actions:</p> <p>The majority of service users in Cheshire East Adult Services are those with a Physical Disability (55.3%). The next largest group is those with a Mental Health Disability which is almost half as much (23.9%). Learning Disability clients make up only 14.6% of community service users. 6.4% of customer's have a Visual Impairment [note older people are no longer taken to be a separate client group]</p> <table><tr><th>Client Type</th><th>Total Service Users</th><th>%</th></tr><tr><td>Physical Disability</td><td>3331</td><td>55.3</td></tr><tr><td>Mental Health</td><td>1441</td><td>23.9</td></tr><tr><td>Learning Disability</td><td>879</td><td>14.6</td></tr><tr><td>Other Vulnerable</td><td>206</td><td>3.4</td></tr><tr><td>Null</td><td>148</td><td>2.5</td></tr><tr><td>Substance Abuse</td><td>17</td><td>0.3</td></tr><tr><td>Visual Impairment</td><td>384</td><td>6.4</td></tr><tr><td>Total</td><td>6022</td><td>100.0</td></tr></table> <p>Note for table and graph: all categories are mutually exclusive except visual impairment. The data also shows the main client type so if a person also has other needs, these are not included in these statistics.</p> <p>Thus, the nature of social care as such (with the exception of substance abuse) is that all service users will have some form of</p>	Client Type	Total Service Users	%	Physical Disability	3331	55.3	Mental Health	1441	23.9	Learning Disability	879	14.6	Other Vulnerable	206	3.4	Null	148	2.5	Substance Abuse	17	0.3	Visual Impairment	384	6.4	Total	6022	100.0
Client Type	Total Service Users	%																												
Physical Disability	3331	55.3																												
Mental Health	1441	23.9																												
Learning Disability	879	14.6																												
Other Vulnerable	206	3.4																												
Null	148	2.5																												
Substance Abuse	17	0.3																												
Visual Impairment	384	6.4																												
Total	6022	100.0																												

		<p>disability even if this is a result of old age. Note: attendee disability was not one of the questions captured by the event feedback forms.</p> <p>Change in disposable income: Statistical analysis has shown that the effect of the move from 90% of disposable income to 95% or 100% is likely to be monetarily small with most people seeing a £1-5 increase on charges each week. However, as was stressed at the consultation events, this increase could nevertheless have a real impact on service users.</p> <p>Factors related to the extra expenditure required if someone has a disability are included in the essential income calculation. This might include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Excess Heating Costs</li> <li>• Gardening labour</li> <li>• Cleaners</li> <li>• Extra loads of laundry</li> <li>• Continence issues</li> <li>• Extra personal care</li> <li>• Community Alarm maintenance</li> <li>• Disability related equipment</li> </ul> <p>Individual Changes: The change which would bring administrative charges for appointeeships and brokerage is likely to impact on those lacking in mental capacity. The deferred payment charge on property will impact those who have to go into residential or nursing care. This is likely to happen because the person has suffered a loss of mental capacity or because of physical disability.</p> <p>The increase in transport charges is picked up by transport EIA.</p>
--	--	--

			<p>The increase in charges for hot meals is likely to affect those who are physically disabled.</p> <p>It is likely that the effect of the charging policy is to put pressure on those who can afford to pay, to pay more. This is a particular problem for disabled people. The Leonard Cheshire Disability Review 2009 found disabled people were facing increasing levels of poverty, with 42% of respondents stating they were struggling to live on their income, up from 33% in 2007. However, service users are financially assessed according to ability to pay (under Government Fairer Charging Guidance) and so should not ever be asked to contribute more than they can afford to do. This means although there will be an impact on service user's particularly just about the Council threshold this should not be excessive.</p> <p>Nevertheless, the general principle of increasing charges on those with care needs will necessarily impact disproportionately on the vulnerable is the case as a result of the very principle of charging for care services. This is national issue to do with how the care system is currently set out by Government.</p>
Gender (Including pregnancy and Maternity, Marriage)?		<b>No</b>	<p>Comments/Actions:</p> <p>According to the Mid-2009 population estimates from the Office for National Statistics the current resident population of Cheshire East is circa 362,700. This is split between 184,500 females and 178,200 males (50.9% and 49.1%). This is approximately the same as the gender split in the North West and for England as a whole.</p> <p>There is a much larger ratio of females to male service users in Cheshire East. This can largely be explained by the differences</p>

			<p>in life expectancy between the sexes.</p> <p><b>Service Users by Sex</b></p> <table><tr><th>Sex</th><th>Total:</th><th>%</th></tr><tr><td>M</td><td>2206</td><td>36.6</td></tr><tr><td>F</td><td>3816</td><td>63.4</td></tr><tr><td><b>Total:</b></td><td><b>6022</b></td><td><b>100</b></td></tr></table> <p>19 men and 26 women indicated their gender on the consultation feedback forms. There were no gender related issues which were raised during these events.</p>	Sex	Total:	%	M	2206	36.6	F	3816	63.4	<b>Total:</b>	<b>6022</b>	<b>100</b>
Sex	Total:	%													
M	2206	36.6													
F	3816	63.4													
<b>Total:</b>	<b>6022</b>	<b>100</b>													
Gypsies & Travellers - Is there an impact?		No	<p>Comments/Actions:</p> <p>Cheshire East Caravans - July 2010 (source LILAC)</p> <table><tr><td>All Caravans</td><td>139</td></tr><tr><td>Authorised Sites</td><td>119</td></tr><tr><td>Unauthorised Sites</td><td>20</td></tr></table> <p>Due to the transient nature of the Gypsy and Traveller community it is difficult to ascertain the exact numbers of this section of the community within Cheshire. It is considered an important and significant minority group however.</p> <p>The impact of this policy on this protected characteristic is neutral. The plan to use empower card flexibly may have a beneficial impact.</p>	All Caravans	139	Authorised Sites	119	Unauthorised Sites	20						
All Caravans	139														
Authorised Sites	119														
Unauthorised Sites	20														
Race – Is there an impact?		No	<p>Comments/Actions:</p>												

			<p>White people are the overwhelming racial group within Cheshire East. Nevertheless there is a significant proportion of people who are neither white British or Irish. This amounts to a total of 20,800 people or (6.1%), with 13,000 (3.8%) being non white.</p> <p>Ethnic Minorities (estimated for 2009 ONS)</p> <table><tr><td></td><td>Cheshire East</td><td>England</td><td>Cheshire East %</td><td>North West %</td><td>England %</td></tr><tr><td></td><td>Unitary Authority</td><td>Country</td><td>Unitary Authority</td><td>Region</td><td>Country</td></tr><tr><td>All Ethnic Groups</td><td>360,700</td><td>51,092,000</td><td>100.0</td><td>100.0</td><td>100.0</td></tr><tr><td>White</td><td>347,600</td><td>45,082,900</td><td>96.4</td><td>92.1</td><td>88.2</td></tr><tr><td>Mixed</td><td>3,300</td><td>870,000</td><td>0.9</td><td>1.2</td><td>1.7</td></tr><tr><td>Asian or Asian British</td><td>5,000</td><td>2,914,900</td><td>1.4</td><td>4.4</td><td>5.7</td></tr><tr><td>Black or Black British</td><td>2,000</td><td>1,447,900</td><td>0.6</td><td>1.1</td><td>2.8</td></tr><tr><td>Chinese or Other Ethnic Group</td><td>2,700</td><td>776,400</td><td>0.7</td><td>1.1</td><td>1.5</td></tr></table> <p>The impact of this policy on this protected characteristic is neutral.</p>		Cheshire East	England	Cheshire East %	North West %	England %		Unitary Authority	Country	Unitary Authority	Region	Country	All Ethnic Groups	360,700	51,092,000	100.0	100.0	100.0	White	347,600	45,082,900	96.4	92.1	88.2	Mixed	3,300	870,000	0.9	1.2	1.7	Asian or Asian British	5,000	2,914,900	1.4	4.4	5.7	Black or Black British	2,000	1,447,900	0.6	1.1	2.8	Chinese or Other Ethnic Group	2,700	776,400	0.7	1.1	1.5
	Cheshire East	England	Cheshire East %	North West %	England %																																														
	Unitary Authority	Country	Unitary Authority	Region	Country																																														
All Ethnic Groups	360,700	51,092,000	100.0	100.0	100.0																																														
White	347,600	45,082,900	96.4	92.1	88.2																																														
Mixed	3,300	870,000	0.9	1.2	1.7																																														
Asian or Asian British	5,000	2,914,900	1.4	4.4	5.7																																														
Black or Black British	2,000	1,447,900	0.6	1.1	2.8																																														
Chinese or Other Ethnic Group	2,700	776,400	0.7	1.1	1.5																																														
Religion & Belief- Is there an Impact?		No	<p>Comments/Actions:</p> <p>Cheshire East as a whole has a far greater percentage of people who stated that they were Christian in the census than in England as a whole. This is a pattern which is a feature of much of the North West of England. Perhaps, the main reason for this is the lack of racial diversity apparent in the general population.</p>																																																



			<p>Cheshire East has an equal amount of Buddhists to the North West average, half as many Hindu's and Jewish people and significantly less Muslims.</p> <table><tr><td></td><td>Cheshire East</td><td>England</td><td>Cheshire East</td><td>England</td></tr><tr><td></td><td>Unitary Authority</td><td>Country</td><td>Unitary Authority%</td><td>%</td></tr><tr><td>All People</td><td>351,817</td><td>49,138,831</td><td>100.0</td><td>100.0</td></tr><tr><td>Christian</td><td>282,432</td><td>35,251,244</td><td>80.3</td><td>71.7</td></tr><tr><td>Buddhist</td><td>551</td><td>139,046</td><td>0.2</td><td>0.3</td></tr><tr><td>Hindu</td><td>617</td><td>546,982</td><td>0.2</td><td>1.1</td></tr><tr><td>Jewish</td><td>562</td><td>257,671</td><td>0.2</td><td>0.5</td></tr><tr><td>Muslim</td><td>1,375</td><td>1,524,887</td><td>0.4</td><td>3.1</td></tr><tr><td>Sikh</td><td>170</td><td>327,343</td><td>0.0</td><td>0.7</td></tr><tr><td>Any other religion</td><td>593</td><td>143,811</td><td>0.2</td><td>0.3</td></tr><tr><td>No religion</td><td>42,757</td><td>7,171,332</td><td>12.2</td><td>14.6</td></tr><tr><td>Religion not stated</td><td>22,760</td><td>3,776,515</td><td>6.5</td><td>7.7</td></tr></table> <p>The impact of this policy on this protected characteristic is neutral.</p>		Cheshire East	England	Cheshire East	England		Unitary Authority	Country	Unitary Authority%	%	All People	351,817	49,138,831	100.0	100.0	Christian	282,432	35,251,244	80.3	71.7	Buddhist	551	139,046	0.2	0.3	Hindu	617	546,982	0.2	1.1	Jewish	562	257,671	0.2	0.5	Muslim	1,375	1,524,887	0.4	3.1	Sikh	170	327,343	0.0	0.7	Any other religion	593	143,811	0.2	0.3	No religion	42,757	7,171,332	12.2	14.6	Religion not stated	22,760	3,776,515	6.5	7.7
	Cheshire East	England	Cheshire East	England																																																											
	Unitary Authority	Country	Unitary Authority%	%																																																											
All People	351,817	49,138,831	100.0	100.0																																																											
Christian	282,432	35,251,244	80.3	71.7																																																											
Buddhist	551	139,046	0.2	0.3																																																											
Hindu	617	546,982	0.2	1.1																																																											
Jewish	562	257,671	0.2	0.5																																																											
Muslim	1,375	1,524,887	0.4	3.1																																																											
Sikh	170	327,343	0.0	0.7																																																											
Any other religion	593	143,811	0.2	0.3																																																											
No religion	42,757	7,171,332	12.2	14.6																																																											
Religion not stated	22,760	3,776,515	6.5	7.7																																																											
Sexual Orientation -Is there an impact?		No	<p>Comments/Actions:</p> <p>In the NWDA's Report (North West Development Agency) "Improving the Region's Knowledge Base on the LGB&amp;T population in the North West" it was estimated that 34,500 LGB's were living in the County of Cheshire. When adjusted for predicted population growth and split proportionately for the Cheshire East area, the number can be stated as being 12,311</p>																																																												

			<p>for 2009. This equates to circa 3.4%. If this ratio is also adopted for Cheshire East service users (which is currently 6022 - 30 September 2010), this would be 205.</p> <p>The impact of this policy on this protected characteristic is neutral.</p>									
Transgender - Is there an impact?		No	<p>Comments/Actions:</p> <p>The North West Development Agency has estimated that the number of transsexual people in the North West in 2009 as between 600-700. Using this proportion for Cheshire East means that there would be circa 32-37 transsexual people. Although the NWDA does note that this is a, “conservative estimate because it covers only those who are seeking, those who intend to seek and those who have undergone gender re-assignment and gender recognition (i.e. transsexuals), and does not include those not seeking recognition”. There are no current service users who are known to be transgender.</p> <p>The impact of this policy on this protected characteristic is neutral.</p>									
Other socio-economic disadvantaged groups (including white individuals, families and communities) Is there an impact?		No	<p>Comments/Actions:</p> <p>The areas with the lowest average household income, Cheshire East, 2007</p> <table><tr><td>Region (Lower Super Output Area)</td><td>Ward</td><td>Paycheck – Average Income</td></tr><tr><td>Central &amp; ValleyL1</td><td>Delamere</td><td>£21,900</td></tr><tr><td>East CoppenhallL3</td><td>Maw Green</td><td>£22,200</td></tr></table>	Region (Lower Super Output Area)	Ward	Paycheck – Average Income	Central & ValleyL1	Delamere	£21,900	East CoppenhallL3	Maw Green	£22,200
Region (Lower Super Output Area)	Ward	Paycheck – Average Income										
Central & ValleyL1	Delamere	£21,900										
East CoppenhallL3	Maw Green	£22,200										

			West Coppenhall & GrosvenorL4	Grosvenor	£23,100
			Macclesfield Town EastL5	Macclesfield Hurdsfield	£23,600
			AlexandraL1	Alexandra	£23,700
			West NantwichL1	Barony Weaver	£23,800
			Wilmslow Town Dean Row & HandforthL4	Handforth	£23,900
			Congleton EastL3	Congleton North	£24,200
			St BarnabasL4	St Barnabas	£24,300
			East CoppenhallL2	Maw Green	£24,400
			<p>Service users are financially assessed according to ability to pay (under Government Fairer Charging Guidance) and so should not ever be asked to contribute more than they can afford to do. This means although there will be an impact on service user's particularly just about the Council threshold this should not be excessive.</p>		
Please give details of any other potential impacts of this policy (i.e. Poverty & deprivation, community cohesion, environmental)	<b>Yes</b>		<p>Comments/Actions: This policy is likely to decrease disposable income for social care service users although within a designated limit.</p>		
Could the impact constitute unlawful discrimination in relation to any of the Equality Duties		<b>No</b>	<p>Comments: Although impacts have been detected these concern the general principle of social care charging and do not introduce any new emphasis on current policy.</p>		
Does this policy – procedure – function have any effect on good relations between the council and the	<b>Yes</b>		<p>Comments: Charging is always likely to be a contentious area and the consultation events showed the strength of peoples feeling</p>		

community			concerning the measures.
Do you require further data/information/intelligence to support decision making?		<b>No</b>	Comments:  (please note if you answer yes or no you will still be required to complete the Data Methods/Collection to Support Decision Making Section)
Please specify any question(s)/issues/concerns/actions identified as a result the assessment. What needs to be done?			Comments <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Communication, information and support for vulnerable people and their carers.</li> </ul>

<b>Data Methods/Collection to Support Decision Making</b>		
Please indicate what methods of research, information and intelligence will be/have been used e.g. consultation, reports, comparisons with similar organisations	Internally  Activity data has been analysed to determine how much extra income each measure is likely to generate in comparison to the potential impact on service users.	Externally  Comparisons with Other Local Authorities have been made to determine where charging policies are set and currently subject to consultation and change.
Please state who will be/who was involved/engaged/consulted	Internal (Staff/Members/Service/Dept)  Members Social Care staff	External (stakeholders/service users/partners)  All stakeholders, service users, carers and community support groups
Please indicate any significant expected costs & resource requirements for completing the		

data collection		
-----------------	--	--

### Equalities Impact Assessment (EIA) Action Plan: Making Changes

REF	Action	Responsible Person/s	Action Deadline	Tasks	Progress
	Notify customers of charge impact and ensure no-one is left not able to afford care.	Client Finance	By end of April 2011		
	Review Extra Care Housing charging structure	Lynn Glendenning	By September 2011		
	Review Hot Meals contract as will become unviable due to low volume	Alison McCudden	By September 2011		
	Monitor income against targets	Patrick Rhoden	On-going through year		
Please state the date the policy/procedure/function will be reassessed? (generally 1-3 yrs)			Comments/Date:		

Signed (Service Manager) .....

Date.....

Signed (Head of Section) .....

Date.....

Once you have completed this section please email it to the Equality and Inclusion Team. The Equality and Inclusion Team will convene a quarterly meeting of the Fairness and Inclusion Group (FIG) who will quality check our EIA's to ensure we have considered everyone. We plan to send approximately 2-5% of our completed EIAs Forms to the (FIG).

#### Quarterly Progress and monitoring

REF	Action	Progress	Completed

Once you have completed your progress report, please email it to the Equality and Inclusion Team. Make a copy of the progress report template so you can present an update in three months time.

Once you have completed your quarterly progress report, please email it to the Equality and Inclusion Team

#### Measuring Impact & Reporting

Ref	Action	Impact	Outcome	Review Date
	The changes that you have made to remove the gaps you have Identified (simply cut and paste these from the action plan).	What has been the overall impact of making the particular changes?  (could include wider community involvement in policy development or greater use of service by diverse communities).	What are the concrete results of having changed your policy or service? Could include improved service use, reductions in complaints or increased satisfaction. These will be based on detailed data and should outline how the changes have brought about improvements for different communities and groups	

Once you have completed your impact report, please email it to the Equality and Inclusion Team. The Equality and Inclusion Team will prepare an annual report for Corporate Management Team and Cabinet on our progress.

## Appendix 1

### Service Reference Index

<b>Service Reference Index</b>			
Safer & Stronger – <b>SSC</b>	Regeneration – <b>REG</b>	Planning & Policy – <b>PAH</b>	Legal & Democratic Services – <b>LAD</b>
Children & Families – <b>CHI</b>	Adults – <b>ADU</b>	Health & Wellbeing – <b>HWB</b>	Human Resources & Organisational Development – <b>HROD</b>
Policy & Performance – <b>PAP</b>	Corporate Improvement - <b>CI</b>	Environmental – <b>ENV</b>	Borough Treasurer & Head of Assets – <b>BTA</b>