



Equality Impact Assessment (EqIA)

Introduction

This EqIA is for:	Charge for money management service		
Details are set out:	C06 Option for Change		
Officers undertaking the assessment:	Bridgette Shilton, Team Manager, Adult Care Financial Services Karen Ashcroft, Senior Practitioner, Adult Care Financial Services		
Assessment approved by:	Caroline Baria, Service Director	Date: Sept 2015	Updated: Feb 2016

The Public Sector Equality Duty which is set out in the Equality Act 2010 requires public authorities to have due regard to the need to: Eliminate unlawful discrimination, harassment and victimisation; Advance equality of opportunity between people who share a protected characteristic and those who do not; Foster good relations between people who share a protected characteristic and those who do not.

The purpose of carrying out an Equality Impact Assessment is to assess the impact of a change to services or policy on people with protected characteristics and to demonstrate that the Council has considered the aims of the Equality Duty.

Part A: Impact, consultation and proposed mitigation

1 What are the potential impacts of proposal? *Has any initial consultation informed the identification of impacts?*

Adult Care Financial Services currently acts as appointee for 643 service users. It is proposed to introduce a charge of £6 per week in 2016/17 and £12 per week from 2017/18 for all service users who have savings in excess of £1,000. Service users will become liable for a charge for a service which was previously offered for free.

In the main this service is provided to older adults who lack the capacity to manage their own finances and people with a disability.

Previous enquiries with outside agencies and solicitors have shown that in all cases a charge is payable for this service. Introducing a charge would cover the costs to the Council of providing this service and bring the Council into line with emerging practice in other local authorities.

2 Protected Characteristics: Is there a potential positive or negative impact based on:

Age	<input type="checkbox"/> Positive	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Negative	<input type="checkbox"/> Neutral Impact
Disability	<input type="checkbox"/> Positive	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Negative	<input type="checkbox"/> Neutral Impact
Gender reassignment	<input type="checkbox"/> Positive	<input type="checkbox"/> Negative	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Neutral Impact

Pregnancy & maternity	<input type="checkbox"/> Positive	<input type="checkbox"/> Negative	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Neutral Impact
Race <small>including origin, colour or nationality</small>	<input type="checkbox"/> Positive	<input type="checkbox"/> Negative	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Neutral Impact
Religion	<input type="checkbox"/> Positive	<input type="checkbox"/> Negative	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Neutral Impact
Gender	<input type="checkbox"/> Positive	<input type="checkbox"/> Negative	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Neutral Impact
Sexual orientation <small>including gay, lesbian or bisexual</small>	<input type="checkbox"/> Positive	<input type="checkbox"/> Negative	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Neutral Impact

3 Where there are potential negative impacts for protected characteristics these should be detailed including consideration of the equality duty, proposals for how they could be mitigated (where possible) and meaningfully consulted on:

How do the potential impacts affect people with protected characteristics <i>What is the scale of the impact?</i>	How might negative impact be mitigated or explain why it is not possible	How will we consult
Age – the majority of clients currently receiving this service are of retirement age and above, and would be charged for this service. This proposal would apply to all service users, including those with a disability. Therefore, any service user with a disability who does not have the capacity to manage their own financial affairs would be charged for this service	We cannot mitigate this but the service users could choose to arrange their own service, with support from the Council. We cannot mitigate this but the service users could choose to arrange their own service, with support from the Council.	Public consultation on the website with direct communication to providers, charities and voluntary organisations. Consulting with service users with the use of advocates.

Part B: Feedback and further mitigation

4 Summary of consultation feedback and further amendments to proposal / mitigation

<p>There were 1002 responses to the public consultation, with 43% agreeing to the proposal and 36% disagreeing.</p> <p>2 questions were posed following feedback from the Learning Disability and Autism Partnership Board meeting on 13 January 2016:</p> <p>Would the charge be the same if someone had £1,500 or £2,500? The proposal is that the charge would be applied to all service users who receive the service and have savings over £1,000.</p> <p>Have the charges been looked at as being fair? Charges are consistent with charges applied by other Councils, and will mean the service is able to cover its costs.</p> <p>On review of the specific comments made during public consultation, there were five showing a strong view in favour of the charge being implemented, and five stating it was not a good idea. Of those that feel it is not a good idea, two queried whether there was a conflict of interest in the Corporate Director being the appointee, and whether the charge would be applied to personal allowance.</p>
--

Although the Corporate Director will be the appointee, it is the Department for Work & Pensions that decides whether it is in a service user's best interests for the Council to be appointed, and therefore there is no conflict of interest. The charge would not be applied to personal allowance, but to savings in excess of £1,000.

Completed EqlAs should be sent to equalities@nottscc.gov.uk and will be published on the Council's website.