

## Appendix 4 Equality Impact Assessment Form

### 1. Document Control

#### 1. Control Details

Title:	Funding Model and Rates for Adult Residential and Nursing Care 2020/2021
Author (assigned to Pentana):	Jo Pettifor
Director:	Hugh White
Department:	Strategy & Resources
Service Area:	Contracting & Procurement
Contact details:	Jo.pettifor@nottinghamcitycouncil.gov.uk
Strategic Budget EIA: Y/N	N
Exempt from publication Y/N	N

#### 2. Document Amendment Record

Version	Author	Date	Approved
V2	Jo Pettifor	19.08.20	24.08.20

#### 3. Contributors/Reviewers

Name	Position	Date
Nasreen Miah	Equality & Employability Consultant	24.08.20
Sharon Ribeiro	Lead Contracts Performance Manager	06.08.20

#### 4. Glossary of Terms

Term	Description

## 2. Assessment

### 1. Brief description of proposal / policy / service being assessed

The Council is seeking to implement a new funding model for placements in non-standard/specialist adult residential and nursing care services, to take a more consistent, fair and streamlined approach to the fees paid for specialist care and support. A new proposed funding model has been developed which seeks to support a sustainable, efficient and effective market within the available resources. The key factors taken into consideration in developing the model are: financial modelling and the costs of service delivery; market considerations and strategic direction; and affordability. The model comprises 4 banding rates based on the number of direct hours of care delivery, and 3 size categories of home. A total of 12 fee rates are proposed based on the combination of home band and size. A consultation process was undertaken with all affected providers during March 2020 and responses were collated and considered in developing final recommendations.

### 2. Information used to analyse the effects on equality:

During March 2020, consultation was undertaken on the proposed funding model with all affected service providers (all those delivering specialist services), through an online questionnaire, an engagement event held on 6<sup>th</sup> March and meeting with the Care Homes Association. The online survey invited providers to comment on all aspects of the

proposals and to identify potential impacts and risks (to service delivery and to providers) and mitigating actions that could be taken. Responses were received from 10 providers providing residential care across all types of need in the City and County. The providers responding support all types of care need, with learning disability support being provided by most. Responses were collated and reviewed to identify risks highlighted, and the risks were analysed with reference to market knowledge to identify the impact of the proposal on services as a whole, citizens within those services, and on the provider market. Other factors taken into consideration in making recommendations were: costs of service delivery, the strategic intentions for residential and nursing care, and affordability.

### 3. Impacts and Actions:

	Could particularly benefit X	May adversely impact X
People from different ethnic groups.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Men	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Women	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Trans	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Disabled people or carers.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Pregnancy/ Maternity	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
People of different faiths/ beliefs and those with none.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Lesbian, gay or bisexual people.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Older	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Younger	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Other (e.g. marriage/ civil partnership, looked after children, cohesion/ good relations, vulnerable children/ adults).	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<b><i>Please underline the group(s) /issue more</i></b>		

*adversely affected or which benefits.*

<p><b>How different groups could be affected</b> (Summary of impacts)</p>	<p><b>Details of actions to reduce negative or increase positive impact</b> (or why action isn't possible)</p>
<p>Provide details for impacts / benefits on people in different protected groups.</p> <p><b>1. Summary of responses</b></p> <p>Responses were received from 10 providers providing residential care across all types of need in the City and County. In some sections providers felt that there was insufficient information to draw conclusions, as the impact will depend on factors such as which band homes fall under.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 7 respondents (70%) agreed or strongly agreed with the proposal to move to a more consistent funding model.</li> <li>• On the proposed number of care hours allocated to the bandings, responses were broadly split - 4 respondents (40%) agreed and 5 (50%) disagreed or strongly disagreed.</li> <li>• On the proposed funding levels for bands, responses ranged broadly from 'strongly agree' to 'strongly disagree'. 3 neither agreed nor disagreed</li> <li>• Responses on the rate for 1 to 1 hours varied in support and against. Some commented that the rate</li> </ul>	<p><b>1 Actions will need to be uploaded on Pentana.</b></p> <p>The risks identified have been considered in conjunction with wider knowledge of the market. Potential mitigating actions are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Implement appeals process for providers against banding decision – September to December 2020</li> <li>• Continue to engage with the market on future of service delivery. Explore options to provide support and advice for providers on sustaining their business. Providers to ensure services are modelled and delivered in a sustainable way</li> <li>• Providers to engage with NCC at early signs of services not being sustainable. Consider on a case by case basis where specific issues arise in relation to viability of individual packages - ongoing</li> <li>• Assess residents needs for additional 1:1 hours where necessary - eg high needs in band C homes - ongoing</li> <li>• Ensure payments are made in a timely manner explore options to reduce delays to approval processes - ongoing</li> <li>• Explore potential for citizens to be supported to move to Care, Support and Enablement/Supported accommodation – as needed</li> </ul>

is too low to meet all staffing costs

**2. Implications and risks**

6 providers (60%) identified a significant or very significant impact of the proposals

Risks to service viability:

- potential financial losses if funding doesn't cover the hours of care; services being financially unsustainable
- potential termination of packages
- potential service closures (in particular specialist homes)

Risks to service delivery – quality and levels of care:

- Difficulty delivering a quality / 'progressive' service; more task focused than enablement; Reduced activities
- Safeguarding risks if hours reduce and needs can't be met
- CQC ratings worsening
- Existing citizens' needs may not be met if hours reduce substantially; citizens with high needs could lose placements
- Potential reduction in complex/high needs referrals accepted – eg if band D rates/1 to 1 hours don't cover the cost of care needed

**4. Outcome(s) of equality impact assessment:**

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No major change needed	<input type="checkbox"/>	Adjust the policy/proposal
<input type="checkbox"/>	Adverse impact but continue	<input type="checkbox"/>	Stop and remove the policy/proposal

**5. Arrangements for future monitoring of equality impact of this proposal / policy / service:**

Review any issues and potential impacts raised by providers through the appeals process in relation to the banding of homes – September – December 2020.  
Review through ongoing engagement with providers and contract management and liaison with Adult Assessment colleagues.

**6. Approved by (manager signature) and Date sent to equality team for publishing:**

<p><b>Approving Manager:</b> The assessment must be approved by the manager responsible for the service/proposal. Include a contact tel &amp; email to allow citizen/stakeholder feedback on proposals.</p>	<p><b>Date sent for scrutiny:</b> Send document or Link to: <a href="mailto:equalityanddiversityteam@nottinghamcity.gov.uk">equalityanddiversityteam@nottinghamcity.gov.uk</a></p>
 <p><b>SRO Approval:</b></p>	<p><b>Date of final approval:</b> <b>24<sup>th</sup> August 2020</b></p>

**Before you send your EIA to the Equality and Community Relations Team for scrutiny, have you:**

1. Read the guidance and good practice EIA's  
<http://intranet.nottinghamcity.gov.uk/media/1924/simple-guide-to-eia.doc>
2. Clearly summarised your proposal/ policy/ service to be assessed.
3. Hyperlinked to the appropriate documents.
4. Written in clear user-friendly language, free from all jargon (spelling out acronyms).
5. Included appropriate data.

6. Consulted the relevant groups or citizens or stated clearly, when this is going to happen.
7. Clearly cross-referenced your impacts with SMART actions.