

Equality Impact Assessment - Personalisation

A. Summary Details

1	Title of EIA:	Personalisation
2	Person responsible for the assessment:	Kaye Hadfield - Commissioning Officer Hannah Gillett – Commissioning Support Officer
3	Contact details:	Kaye.Hadfield@trafford.gov.uk Hannah.Gillett@trafford.gov.uk
4	Section & Directorate:	Integrated Commissioning Unit CYPS
5	Name and roles of other officers involved in the EIA, if applicable:	Jill Colbert, Head of Service, Commissioning

B. Policy or Function

1	Is this EIA for a policy or function?	Policy <input type="checkbox"/> Function <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
2	Is this EIA for a new or existing policy or function?	New <input type="checkbox"/> Existing <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Change to an existing policy or function <input type="checkbox"/>
3	What is the main purpose of the policy/function?	The main aim of this function is to review existing personalisation cases and how new cases are to be undertaken. The aim of personalisation was to make packages of care more flexible for young people whilst ensuring equitability across the cohort. However, many cases currently still have an allocated personal budget amount which has not been

reduced in line with young people's RAS scores.

Furthermore, within their personal budgets a number of service users are opting to use services that we already commission via contracts. As young people choose this as part of their personal budget, providers do not have to charge the price agreed in the block contract price and are charging more, due to the fact that they cannot ensure demand. This review will look at allowing young people to access such services as a commissioned service and take this amount off their allocated personal budget.

There are currently 111 young people accessing personal budgets, 13 of whom were excluded from personalisation due to exceptional circumstances.

Work is currently being undertaken with adult services to get an adult assessment in place earlier so that people's expectations of the plan are kept in line with transition and what they will be able to get with their budget in adult services.

There has been an EIA done on the impact of personalisation when it was introduced as a change in policy. This has been attached to the document for reference.



Final EIA
Personalisation.doc

4	Is the policy/function associated with any other policies of the Authority?	This function links to the Children Families and Wellbeing programme board and adult services review of care packages. The review of the function is to ensure that the process defined by the RAS, <u>Personalisation Policy</u> (Review Date: April 2015) and <u>Parent's Guide</u> (Review date: April 2015) is being followed properly and as cost effectively as possible.
5	Do any written procedures exist to enable delivery of this policy/function?	The Personalisation Policy and Social Care Personalisation Policy clearly state how the function is to be delivered; the review is to ensure this is being followed correctly.
6	Are there elements of common practice not clearly defined within the written procedures? If yes, please state.	The personalisation policy has been through full consultation and clearly defines all elements of common practice. No changes are being made to the policy.
7	Who are the main stakeholders of the policy? How are they expected to benefit?	<p>This is the same for the previous EIA, the function remains the same but needs to be applied more rigidly, involve better planning for transition and will be improved with implementation of the Care Act. The main stakeholders of the policy are the council and children and young people with complex and additional needs along with their families.</p> <p>Through proper implementation of this policy, a range of benefits are expected to be realised including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A value for money service • Equitable access to services through a transparent resource

		<p>allocation process.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Empowerment of children, young people and parents to shape packages of care that meet their needs. • More flexible use of resources and the development of innovative services, rather than traditional short break models, leading to improved outcomes • Greater ownership of resources by young people and families which has been shown to deliver significant efficiencies. Where families have choice of the use of funding there is evidence of a greater value placed on the support package they receive and awareness of the cost. • A smoother transition for children and young people into adult life where they may well continue to receive a personal budget from Adult Services.
8	How will the policy/function (or change/improvement), be implemented?	<p>The function is already operational; the purpose is to review cases where resource could be better used, or to change the use of the budget where there is a commissioned contract. The review will be undertaken with the Complex Additional Needs Operations Team.</p> <p>Some savings are expected to arise as a result of a step down approach in allocated funding; some of the most complex cases will see a step down later as they started the personalisation process later. Children and young people should be in receipt of a RAS based allocation only.</p> <p>It is recognised that there will be the need for exceptional cases, for example if a child requires residential/high allocation of overnight short break care due to parental capacity or the family have multiple siblings</p>

		with disabilities, and personalisation will not be appropriate for those families. Such exceptional cases will be managed in the same way they currently are: on a case by case basis outside of the personalisation model.
9	What factors could contribute or detract from achieving these outcomes for service users?	Managing complex historic cases will be difficult where there will be a reduction in packages. There are a number of children/young people going through the stepped down approach that will also make the existing policy more effective.
10	Is the responsibility for the proposed policy or function shared with another department or authority or organisation? If so, please state?	<p>The responsibility for the function is not shared with another department, authority or organisation however the Personalisation Policy is a direct result of current government policy.</p> <p>The publication of the Government's Green Paper 'Support and Aspirations: A New Approach to Special Educational Needs and Disability' (2011). This laid down a commitment to introduce the option of a personal budget by 2014 for all families with children with a statement of SEN or a new 'Education, Health and Care Plan' (EHC).</p>

C. Data Collection

1	What monitoring data do you have on the number of people (from different equality groups) who are using or are potentially impacted upon by your policy/ function?	<p>As per the 2011 census, the total number of children living in Trafford under the age of 19 was 56,500. Of this, 29,100 were male and 27,400 were female.</p> <p>As of December 2014, there were 244 children and young people</p>
---	--	---

receiving a package of support from the Complex and Additional Needs Service.

The ethnicity breakdown of children receiving a package of support from the CAN service via a social worker is as follows:

Ethnicity	Count of Case	Percentage:
A1 - White British	92	72.44%
C4 - Any other Asian background	9	7.09%
B3 - White and Asian	4	3.15%
B4 - Any other mixed background	3	2.36%
C2 - Pakistani	3	2.36%
D2 - African	3	2.36%
D3 - Any other Black background	3	2.36%
C1 - Indian	2	1.57%
E2 - Any other ethnic group	2	1.57%
A3 - Any other White background	1	0.79%
A4 - Traveller of Irish Heritage	1	0.79%
B1 - White and Black Caribbean	1	0.79%
B2 - White and Black African	1	0.79%
E1 - Chinese	1	0.79%
E4 - Information not yet obtained	1	0.79%
	Percentage:	100.00%

The gender breakdown of children receiving a package of support from the CAN service via a social worker is as follows:

Gender	Count of Case	Percentage:
Male	75	59.06%
Female	52	40.94%
	Percentage:	100.00%

The ethnicity breakdown of children receiving a package of support from the CAN service at a lower level of need via a Senior Family Support Worker is as follows:

Ethnicity	Count of Cases	Percentage:
A1 - White British	63	53.85%
Not Recorded	13	11.11%
C1 - Indian	9	7.69%
C2 - Pakistani	9	7.69%
D2 - African	5	4.27%
B3 - White and Asian	4	3.42%
B1 - White and Black Caribbean	3	2.56%
A3 - Any other White background	2	1.71%
B4 - Any other mixed background	2	1.71%
C4 - Any other Asian background	2	1.71%

D1 - Caribbean	2	1.71%
E2 - Any other ethnic group	2	1.71%
E1 - Chinese	1	0.85%
Percentage:		100.00%

The gender breakdown of children receiving a package of support from the CAN service at a lower level of need via a Senior Family Support Worker is as follows:

Gender	Count of Cases	Percentage:
Male	79	67.52%
Female	38	32.48%
Percentage:		100.00%

2	Please specify monitoring information you have available and attach relevant information*	The monitoring information available is detailed above. It is derived from data collected from the CAN Service. The data has been extracted from ICS and the eCAF system. Data is taken from those who access support through an allocated social worker and those that have lower level needs and access a Personal Budget through Senior Family Support Worker.
3	If monitoring has NOT been undertaken, will it be done in the future or do you have access to relevant monitoring data?	N/A

**Your monitoring information should be compared to the current available census data to see whether a proportionate number of people are taking up your service*

D. Consultation & Involvement

1	Are you using information from any previous consultations and/or local/national consultations, research or practical guidance that will assist you in completing this EIA?	The Personalisation Policy and the proposals for personal budgets were consulted on and have informed the policy. The proposals for personal budgets formed part of the budget consultation that took place between October 2012 and January 2013.
2	Please list any consultations planned, methods used and groups you plan to target. (If applicable)	Consultations took place for the policy, the policy went through a rigorous process including consultation with parents/carers, professionals and legal team before it was signed off. There will be no change to the policy; packages will be reviewed to their RAS score to ensure equitability of resources. Service users are able to feed back on the current procedure through contact with the social work team, brokers, parent forum, steering groups and through commissioning.
3	** What barriers, if any, exist to effective consultation with these groups and how will you overcome them?	The public consultation targeted key stakeholders, including those groups and organisations with a particular focus on the protected characteristics as defined by the equality duty, to make sure they were effectively able to participate in the consultation.

***It is important to consider all available information that could help determine whether the policy/ function could have any potential adverse impact. Please attach examples of available research and consultation reports*

E: The Impact – Identify the potential impact of the policy/function on different equality target groups

The potential impact could be negative, positive or neutral. If you have assessed negative potential impact for any of the target groups you will also need to assess whether that negative potential impact is high, medium or low

	Positive	Negative (please specify if High, Medium or Low)	Neutral	Reason
Gender – both men and women, and transgender;			X	Personalisation and personal budgets are focused on the individual concerned; therefore the individualised approach should meet the specific needs of a child/ young person irrespective of their gender.
Pregnant women & women on maternity leave			X	
Gender Reassignment			X	
Marriage & Civil Partnership			X	
Race- include race, nationality & ethnicity (NB: the experiences may be different for different groups)	X			Personal budgets focus on an individual's needs and the support they require. Current guidance and practice with regard to language, translation and interpretation will apply. Further, the nature of the personal budget process itself allows for families to design their support package around their particular cultural requirements. Any positive impact would be

				<p>limited as the current market is not well developed with regards to culturally sensitive services however commissioners monitor the provision of such services in the market.</p>
<p>Disability – physical, sensory & mental impairments</p>	X	X	X	<p>Personal budgets enable children/ young people and their families to have increased choice and control over the services they receive to meet their needs.</p> <p>Personalisation and personal budgets provide an individualised approach to meet needs.</p> <p>The resource allocation system used to determine the amount of a personal budget is weighted according to increasing need; those children with the most complex needs receive the highest weighting.</p> <p>It has been evident that through the implementation of the</p>

				<p>personalisation policy, some children and young people are offered a personal budget that did not equate to their previous cost of the care package they currently receive. Those that are affected do this on a stepped approach across three years so that the change is managed carefully. The policy therefore has the potential to impact on individuals positively, negatively or in a neutral way. Although, as a consequence of the policy, some negative impacts may be reported, the amount offered to children/ young people and their families will always be proportionate to the needs presented.</p>
<p>Age Group - specify eg; older, younger etc)</p>	X	X	X	<p>The resource allocation system is age related and separates children/ young people in to four age bands.</p>
<p>Sexual Orientation – Heterosexual, Lesbian, Gay Men, Bisexual people</p>	X			<p>The individualised approach to meeting needs should account for the specific needs of a child/</p>

				<p>young person including their sexual orientation. The increased level of choice and control given by personal budgets will allow children/young people and their families to develop their care support plan in accordance with their needs which can include the above. Commissioners will monitor the level of access to and availability of services which promote positive sexual identity whilst also influencing improved practice around monitoring sexual orientation.</p>
<p>Religious/Faith groups (specify)</p>	X			<p>The individualised approach to meeting needs should account for the specific needs of a child/young person irrespective of their religion/ faith. However, the increased level of choice and control introduced by personal budgets will allow children/young people and their families to develop their care support plan in accordance with their</p>

				needs which can include the above.
--	--	--	--	------------------------------------

As a result of completing the above what is the potential negative impact of your policy?

There is already a policy in place of which an EIA has been completed. The policy will be reviewed in April 2015. This is not a change to policy.

High **Medium** **Low**

F. Could you minimise or remove any negative potential impact? If yes, explain how.	
Race:	No impact identified
Gender, including pregnancy & maternity, gender reassignment, marriage & civil partnership	No impact identified
Disability:	The policy and process is dependent on the assessed needs of the child/young person with disability.
Age:	Earlier assessment with adults services will make the transition process easier.
Sexual Orientation:	See previous EIA-The policy will have a positive impact in enabling children and young people to choose services and providers who recognise and celebrate their sexual identity.
Religious/Faith groups:	See previous EIA -The policy will have a positive impact in enabling children and young people to choose services and providers who recognise and celebrate their religion/ faith.

Also consider the following:		
1	If there is an adverse impact, can it be justified on the grounds of promoting equality of opportunity for a particular equality group or for another legitimate reason?	Personalisation promotes the equitable use of resources through a transparent assessment and allocation process in which children and their families are fully engaged and involved. The distribution of resources is based on need, with assessment underpinning all allocation decisions.
2	Could the policy have an adverse impact on relations between different groups?	No, there is no change to the policy; the policy is already in operation.
3	If there is no evidence that the policy <i>promotes</i> equal opportunity, could it be adapted so that it does? If yes, how?	

G. EIA Action Plan

Recommendation	Key activity	When	Officer Responsible	Links to other Plans eg; Sustainable Community Strategy, Corporate Plan, Business Plan,	Progress milestones	Progress
To audit the cases that have not met their RAS allocation.	To outline the number of cases and to identify why e.g. time to be allocated PB.	February 2015	Richard Johnson/Hannah Gillett	Personalisation policy CFW Programme	For more cases to be at their RAS allocation.	

To calculate savings for those currently going through stepped down approach to their true RAS figure.	Identify the cases that have not reached their Y3 transitional RAS allocation but are currently in Y1 and Y2. To calculate amount saving through the current process.	January/February 2015	Richard Johnson	Personalisation policy CFW Programme	Cost saving to be identified by current process.	
To look at the current number of young people accessing commissioned services.	Calculate the number accessing commissioned services and the cost.	January 2015	Hannah Gillett	Personalisation policy CFW Programme	Cost saving to be identified.	
To promote the use of commissioned services to families accessing Personal Budgets.	To brief the commissioned providers about change in process with using personal budgets for commissioned services.	January/February 2015	Hannah Gillett	Personalisation policy CFW Programme	Increased number of PB allocation using commissioned services.	

Please ensure that all actions identified are included in the attached action plan and in your service plan.

Signed *Kaye Hadfield*
Lead Officer Kaye Hadfield
Date 8/1/15

Jill Colbert
Signed
Service Head Jill Colbert
Date 8/1/15