

Appendix 1 Summary of Recommendations and Impact Assessments

*includes strongly agree or disagree

Proposal	Consultation response*	Recommended	If recommendation agreed		If recommendation not agreed	
			Fairness & Equality	Financial & Legal	Fairness & Equality	Financial & Legal
1. A single policy for all services where the Council has discretion to charge	62% agree 23% disagree	Yes – adopt policy framework set out in appx 2	Yes – would treat all services users the same	£ 3.5m - £5m per year increased income	No – the current policies do not treat people the same	£ 3.5m - £5m per year loss of additional income
2. Adopt a standard amount for disability related expenses (DRE)	51% agree 35% disagree	No – retain current policy to use actual expenses	Yes – would continue to recognise the actual outgoings of people with disabilities	No financial impact	No – would not take into account the actual cost of outgoings	£ 1.5m - £3.3m per year loss of income
3. Remove Max Weekly Charge of £440	40% agree 48% disagree	Yes	Yes – all services users would contribute based on their financial means	£27k - £560k per year increased income (small service user numbers make this volatile)	No – would disproportionately advantage people with higher incomes	£27k - £560k per year loss of additional income
4. Increase Maximum Weekly Contribution to 100% of net income	12% agree 81% disagree	No – retain current policy to use 95% of net income	Yes – would protect 5% of net income of all service users	£ 125k per year loss of additional income	No – would disproportionately disadvantage people on low incomes	£ 125k per year additional income
5. Include short term residential care in policy	40% agree 31% disagree	Yes – subject to review of national guidance	Delegated to Executive Member to review in the light of new national statutory guidance			
6. Regard Personal Injury Awards as income and capital, where legally permissible.	58% agree 23% disagree	Yes	Yes – people with income and capital from whatever source, would be treated the same.	The Council would have a policy on this matter. Potential income, subject to approval of proposal 3	No – some people with income and capital would be treated differently.	The Council would not have policy on this matter. Potential future loss of income
7. Charging for carers services	13% agree 75% disagree	No – retain current policy not to charge	Yes – would recognise the role of carers and support their health and wellbeing	No financial impact	No – would not recognise role of carers or their health and wellbeing	Would need to be financially assessed
8. Charging for intermediate care/ reablement services	25% agree 65% disagree	No	Yes – reduces cost to tax payer of long term care or hospital admission.	No financial impact Not a local discretionary matter	No – increases long term cost to taxpayer.	£ no impact Not a local discretionary matter
Total	-	-	Yes – a fairer policy	£3.9m - £5.4m max additional income	No - an inequitable policy	Loss of 4m - £5.5m additional income
9. Review planned implementation date	Concerns expressed	Cabinet to advise	Yes – would recognise impact of increased costs to service users	Loss of some additional income in 2011/12.	No – would not recognise impact to service users	No loss of additional income in 2011/12

Hampshire County Council Contributions Policy Survey: Summary

The statistics:

Executive Summary

The survey:

In late 2010, Hampshire County Council conducted a survey to ask residents for their views on plans to change the way they contribute towards the costs of the care they and others they care for receive.

Currently most, but not all, adult social care services are charged for, with service users contributing towards the cost of the services they use based on their financial circumstances. The plans for a revised contributions-based policy would bring services under one umbrella and ensure that people choosing from the range of non residential and short term residential services would contribute based on their ability to pay not the services they choose.

The survey ran from 5th October 2010 to 14 January 2011 and was produced in a number of versions, both a standard and a large print version. A number of the respondents to the standard version of the survey said they did not understand the questions. The whole survey would have been better in Plain English along the lines of the Easy Read version.

The financial assessment process (appendix 4), which was included with the survey as supporting information was also seen as complicated and difficult to understand; perhaps it also could be simplified.

Summary of the responses:

1,453 responses were received from both on-line and hard copy mediums but none of the respondents answered all of the questions.

Slightly over two thirds of respondents support the Council's proposal to introduce a new contributions policy based on a fair individual financial assessment and the ability to pay.

Overall, respondents agree with the proposal to use a standardised amount when calculating the level of disability benefits.

A majority of respondents oppose removing the maximum weekly charge of £440.

More than three quarters of respondents reject the suggestion that users should be asked to contribute up to 100% of disposable income towards cost of their care.

More respondents agree than disagree with proposed changes to short term residential care. Respondents apparently found it difficult to understand this question, which might explain why it attracted the highest number of 'Neither agree nor disagree' responses.

Well over twice as many respondents agree as disagree that personal injury awards should be taken into account when the level of contribution is assessed.

Three quarters of respondents oppose the idea of charging carers for services. This question attracted the highest number of 'Strongly disagree' responses. Comments, from both users and carers, point out that the contribution carers make, often at great personal cost, is vitally important and should be acknowledged.

Considerably more than twice as many respondents disagree than agree with the idea of making a financial contribution towards the cost of Crisis Response Services, which are seen as vital to both users and carers. The view is that fear of being unable to afford the charges would prevent people from using the services, to everyone's detriment.

Summary of the statistics:

1. A new contributions policy:

single policy for all non-residential and short term residential services; individual financial assessment; contribution towards cost of personal budget for social care.

Agree/strongly agree	62%	883
Disagree/strongly disagree	23%	324
Total responses	1,413	
Additional comments	440	

2. Disability related income and extra costs:

'standardised' amount for calculating level of disability-related expenses.

Agree/strongly agree	51%	685
Disagree/strongly disagree	35%	472
Total responses	1,347	
Additional comments	326	

3. Removing the maximum weekly charge:

Those assessed as able to pay more than £440 per week for cost of services asked to do so.

Agree/strongly agree	40%	539
Disagree/strongly disagree	48%	651
Total responses	1,358	
Additional comments	294	

4. Disposable income:

Contribute up to 100% of disposable income towards cost of care.

Agree/strongly agree	12%	160
Disagree/strongly disagree	81%	1,101
Total responses	1,365	
Additional comments	341	

5. Short term residential care:

We propose bringing short term residential services under the new policy.

Agree/strongly agree	40%	534
Disagree/strongly disagree	31%	414

Neither agree/disagree	28%	377
Total responses	1,325	
Additional comments	287	

6. Personal injury awards:

We are considering taking into account all elements of a personal injury settlement when assessing the level of contribution a person may make towards the costs of their care.

Agree/strongly agree	58%	780
Disagree/strongly disagree	23%	303
Total responses	1,334	
Additional comments	226	

7. Carers:

At the moment carers are not charged for services. Do you think that the Council should consider asking carers to contribute towards the cost of services that directly benefit them?

Agree/strongly agree	13%	163
Disagree/strongly disagree	75%	942
Total responses	1,257	
Additional comments	461	

8. Crisis Response Services:

Do you agree that we should consider asking people to make a financial contribution towards the cost of Crisis Response Services?

Agree/strongly agree	25%	316
Disagree/strongly disagree	65%	833
Total responses	1,287	
Additional comments	367	

Summary of the respondents:

The average profile of someone who responded to the consultation was a white, British female, aged between 55 – 64, who lives in the New Forest. She is a carer using predominately domiciliary care services.

More of the respondents are Carers than Service Users [26% and 31% respectively].

Use of Domiciliary Care Services is slightly higher [25%] than Day Care Services [23%], followed by Residential Care Services [7%] and Direct Payments [7%].

The majority of respondents are women [50%]; almost all are White British [79%]; one fifth are aged between 17 and 54 [21%]; over half are aged 55 or over [63%].

Respondents come from all eleven districts, with Hart having the lowest number [4%] and New Forest the highest [13%].

Conclusions

During the Hampshire County Council Contributions Consultation Survey, held in late 2010, early 2011, over 1400 Hampshire residents, service users, carers and health professionals responded.

Slightly over two thirds of respondents support the Council's proposal to introduce a new contributions policy based on a fair individual financial assessment and the ability to pay and overall, respondents agree with the proposal to use a standardised amount when calculating the level of disability benefits.

The average profile of someone who responded to the consultation was a white, British female, aged between 55 – 64, who lives in the New Forest. She is a carer using predominately domiciliary care services.

In summary, the statistical data from responders reveal the below conclusions:

1. A new contributions policy:	Agree	62%	883 people
2. Disability related income and extra costs:	Agree	51%	685 people
3. Removing the maximum weekly charge:	Disagree	48%	651 people
4. Disposable income:	Disagree	81%	1,101 people
5. Short term residential care:	Agree	40%	534 people
6. Personal injury awards:	Agree	58%	780 people
7. Carers:	Disagree	75%	942 people
8. Crisis Response Services:	Disagree	65%	833 people

A new contributions policy

Respondents mainly **agree (62%)**

There were 1,413 responses to this question. Slightly over two thirds of respondents support the Council's proposal to introduce a new contributions policy based on a fair individual financial assessment and the ability to pay, while slightly over one fifth disagreed or strongly disagreed.

The largest proportion of comments surrounding this question surrounded the unfairness towards savers, hard workers, tax payers; and the sense of injustice at being required to pay for social care services after a lifetime spent working hard, paying taxes and saving for their old age.

Other strong areas of contention were around the financial assessment process, being the complicated nature of the current process, the necessity for fairness and the stress it can involve and how the overall system to be applied fairly and realistically.

Disability related income and extra costs

Respondents mainly **agree (51%)**

Respondents to question 2 were overly keen to stress that one solution does not fill all, that every individual is different and everyone's needs are different. One third of the comments concerned respondents' objections to the notion, as they saw it, that disability can be standardised.

Respondents believed that individual assessment is the only fair way to assesses disability related income and that the present system is fairer than the one being proposed by the question. Respondents also believed that the right to request Individual assessment must remain and that more service users should be made aware of it

Removing the maximum weekly charge

Respondents mainly **disagree (48%)**

The largest number of additional comments to Question 3 centred around whether it was fair to impose an increase in charges on those who could afford to pay more than £440 per week for care services. Most of the respondents were unhappy with this idea, perceiving it as discriminating against the savers and hard workers.

Those who did think it was 'fair' were cautious and suggested there would be few people who would be able to afford the extra costs. They called for more transparency about how the allowance is worked out, with some believing that a cap would act as protection to the more vulnerable and would not penalise those who have complex needs or require more costly care services.

Disposable income

Respondents mainly **disagree (81%)**

There were 1365 responses to this question. With slightly over four fifths of respondents either disagreeing or strongly disagreeing with the councils' proposal to ask people to contribute 100% of their disposable income towards the cost of their care.

The strength of feeling displayed by people disagreeing with this element of the proposal was particularly strong with some of the additional comments being worded in a very strong manner.

A significant number of the additional comments made focus on the potential detrimental impact the proposal is likely to have on an individual's quality of life and their ability to be able to maintain some dignity from a monetary perspective. There were a large number of strongly worded comments expressing concern about the impact of the proposal on an individual's ability to pay for unplanned or unexpected expenditure.

It is worth noting that there was a significant number of comments which illustrated that some respondents did not understand what the definition of disposable income to be used under the proposal was. This lack of clarity in relation to the definition of disposable income may have contributed to the strength of opposition to the proposed 100% charging policy.

Short term residential care

Respondents mainly **agree (40%)**

For Question 5, the majority of additional comments criticised the wording of the survey question and asked for more information on the changes planned for short term care. Respondents felt unable to form an opinion based on the information given and the lack of clarity sparked a degree of suspicion from some.

Many took the change in policy to mean an increase in costs, with the main concern being that respite care in particular would be compromised and this would have a negative impact on the families of both the service user and the carer.

Those that agreed with the idea suggested that a financial assessment would be the fairest way to judge if a person could afford to pay more for care services.

Personal injury awards

Respondents mainly **agree (58%)**

Responses to Question 6, where the council suggests taking any personal injury awards into account when making a financial assessment, were evenly split into for and against.

A large number of respondents were angered by the idea that settlements would be used to 'fund council services' and argued that compensation is there to help a person through a life-changing accident or illness and the effect it's likely to have on family life and finances.

However, an equal number of respondents insisted that any money a person receives should be included in a financial assessment, with many assuming that the main reason personal injury settlements were awarded was the funding of future care – although there was some uncertainty as to whether this was always the case.

Others were keen to stress that any assessment can only be fair if it takes a person's individual circumstances into account and should not be 'one size fits all'.

Carers

Respondents mainly **disagree (75%)**

The highest number of additional comments was made to this question, almost all completely opposing any idea of carers having to pay towards care services.

Almost all comments emphasise the financial contribution made by carers who look after people at home saving the authorities costs they would otherwise have to pay, and the cost to carers themselves in terms of time, stress and personal life. The concept of carers being charged on top of everything they do is seen as totally unacceptable.

Quite a number of respondents did not understand the question or felt they needed more information; others did not know what the services are that benefit carers directly.

This question might have been better in plain English with more explanation.

Crisis Response Services

Respondents mainly **disagree (65%)**

More than twice as many respondents disagreed or strongly disagreed with the idea of people being asked to contribute towards the cost of crisis response services. They emphasised that, by settling people back into their own homes after discharge from hospital, crisis services relieve the pressure on care homes and hospitals, resulting in considerable savings.

Respondents believed that by helping people to adjust to living at home after discharge from hospital, crisis response services save money and pressure on hospitals and care homes. They also believed that the additional financial worry would hinder recovery and be counter-productive and unfair.

Respondents believed that that crisis response services should be free and requiring a financial contribution would be frightening and add stress to the vulnerable. Some suggestions were made, however, that any financial contribution should be means tested.

Recommendations

Having analysed all the data, this report presents the following conclusions:

A new contributions policy

Whilst the majority of respondents supports the adoption of a new contributions policy, it is recommended that if Hampshire County Council does adopt the new policy, it takes immediate steps to ensure the scheme is simple and easy to understand, and takes further steps to reassure service users and their carers that the scheme will be applied easily and fairly to all.

Disability related income and extra costs

Comments surrounding disability related income and extra costs demonstrated that respondents believe that every individual and their care needs are different. With the majority of respondents agreeing to the proposals, it is recommended that work be undertaken to create a standardised disability related income and extra costs scheme, and to trial the scheme whilst keeping it under review.

Removing the maximum weekly charge

Just under half of respondents disagreed with these proposals. Therefore, if Hampshire County Council continues with this policy, it is recommended that there is transparency about how the allowance is worked out and a maximum 'cap' should act as protection to the more vulnerable and should not penalise those who have complex needs or require more costly care services.

Disposable income

Respondents overwhelmingly disagreed with this proposal. It is therefore recommended that Hampshire County Council takes note of the strength of feeling from respondents against the proposals as they were presented and that further work be done on this policy and further consultation undertaken with service users, carers and the wider community before any such policy is implemented.

Short term residential care

A large proportion of respondents felt they needed more information on the changes planned for short term care before they could adequately make a decision about changes to the amounts people are expected to pay for short term residential care services. Therefore it is recommended that Hampshire County Council provide more information about these changes, specifically in a clear and easy to understand format, so respondents can make an informed response to the policy.

It is further recommended that should changes to the amounts people are expected to pay for short term residential care services be implemented, then a financial assessment should be implemented to assess contributions.

Personal injury awards

In respect of the proposal to take all possible elements of a personal injury claim into account when assessing a service user's contribution to the cost of their care, it is recommended that Hampshire County Council defer the introduction of this element of their proposal whilst they undertake further research into the subject. It is recommended that any further work investigates the practicalities of being able to assess how much of a personal injury claim was intended to support future care needs and how much of the claim was intended to compensate for personal damages with a view to considering if a proposal that only takes into account the "provision for future care" element of any

personal injury award would be a practical and fair way of including personal injury awards in the assessment of an individual's ability to contribute to their care costs.

Carers

With three quarters of respondents disagreeing with these proposals, it is recommended that further work be undertaken with service users, carers and the wider community before decisions are taken.

Overwhelmingly, respondents emphasised the financial contribution made by carers who look after people at home, saving the authorities costs they would otherwise have to pay, and the cost to carers themselves in terms of time, stress and personal life. The concept of carers being charged on top of everything they do was seen as totally unacceptable. It is recommended that Hampshire County Council takes these concerns into account when re-examining these proposals.

Crisis Response Services

Due to the high level of disagreement from respondents to the proposals asking people to make a financial contribution to the Crisis Response Services they receive, this report suggests that further work be undertaken with service users, carers and the wider community before decisions are taken.

Many concerns were raised about the considerable savings that are achieved by settling people back into their own homes after discharge from hospital; crisis services relieve the pressure on care homes and hospitals. Therefore, it is recommended that work is undertaken to evaluate these savings, and communicate the findings to respondents.

The Consultation

It is recognised that this was a complex series of changes to communicate. Many respondents were seeking additional information, with some finding the proposed policy changes, as well as the language and terminology, difficult to understand.

The report recommends that Hampshire County Council uses the learning from this consultation when consulting with service users and the public, providing information in a simple and easy to understand format.

Appendix 3 The Outline Policy Framework

Hampshire County Council Contributions Policy Framework for Adult Social Care – paying for care at home
Effective from: xxx

The County Council has the power to charge for services under Section 17 of the Health and Social Services and Social Security Adjudication Act (1983) and seeks contributions to Direct Payments under Community Care, Services for Carers and Children's Services (Direct Payments)(England) Regulations 2009 pursuant to Health and Social Care Act 2001. In respect of temporary residential stays of up to 8 weeks the Council has discretion under Charging for Residential Accommodation Guide (CRAG) not to carry out a financial assessment and to charge an amount it appears reasonable for the resident to pay.

1. Context

- 1.1 Income from charging for services is an essential component of Hampshire County Council's financial strategy. National funding arrangements make it clear councils need to collect income locally to fund the full cost of services. This policy is concerned with contributions to be paid towards provision of non-residential care and Direct Payments. Relevant legislation includes :
 - The National Assistance Act 1948
 - The Health Services and Public Health Act 1968
 - The Chronically Sick and Disabled Persons Act 1970
 - The NHS Act 2006
 - The Carers and Disabled Children Act 2000
 - The Health and Social Care Act 2001
- 1.2 Legislation permits an authority to recover a reasonable charge for social care from a service user who satisfies the authority that he/she has insufficient means for it to be reasonably practicable for him/her to pay for the service.
- 1.3 Where the Council makes a Direct Payment as an alternative to making arrangements for direct provision of a service a contribution will be required and calculated on the same basis as when the Council commissions a service.
- 1.4 The same principles of fairness apply to those who hold personal budgets as those who do not.
- 1.5 In setting its contributions policy and determining the contribution to be paid by an individual the Council cannot be less generous in the treatment of capital than the provisions set out in the national Charging for Residential Accommodation Guide (CRAG).
- 1.6 The Council will take into account in the financial assessment capital and income unless it is required to be disregarded under legislation or statutory guidance.
- 1.7 Where permitted discretion to do so the Council charges an amount that appears reasonable for the resident to pay for residential respite care rather than carry out a financial assessment under CRAG.

2. Policy Inclusions

- 2.1 All adult social care services for which the Council has discretionary powers to charge. See appendix 4 for a non exhaustive list of services. See also Policy Exclusions.
- 2.2 Direct Payments Scheme

3. Policy Exclusions

- 3.1 Services for which the Council may not charge under legislation and/or statutory guidance. This includes aftercare services under Mental Health Act, services provided to people suffering from any form of Creutzfeldt Jacob Disease, intermediate care services and community equipment and minor adaptations.

- 3.2 Direct access services provided by the voluntary sector and funded by the Council - these services are generally grant funded and have a vital role in preventing or deferring the need for longer term health and social care services.
- 3.3 All Residential services (of over 8 weeks). These are the subject of a national charging policy administered by councils which councils are obliged to follow.
- 3.4 Temporary residential services under 8 weeks that are not respite, intermediate or reablement.
- 3.5 Supporting People funded services which are subject to separate arrangements. Account will be taken of the impact in individual cases where a person receives a service from Supporting People programme as well as other care provision from the Council.

4. Policy Aims

This policy aims to ensure the Council requires contributions towards services that support people living at home on a fair and equitable basis. The policy is based on statutory guidance:

Fairer Charging Policies for Home Care and Non-residential Social Services (The Fairer Charging Guidance) issued in 2003.

Fairer Contributions Guidance 2010 Calculating an Individual's Contribution to their Personal Budget.

4.1 Fairness and Equity

A single policy for all non-residential services for which the Council is permitted to charge and temporary residential stays of up to 8 weeks provided as respite ensures people are treated fairly and equitably.

Contributions to a personal budget for social care are determined by financial assessment of an individual's means. In respect of temporary residential stays of up to 8 weeks the Council has discretion whether to carry out a financial assessment under CRAG or to charge an amount that appears reasonable to the Council.

4.2 Protecting people on low incomes

The financial assessment will ensure that people on low incomes are not put in financial hardship as a result of paying towards their care costs. Advice and support to claim welfare benefit entitlements will be made available to service users and carers.

4.3 Choice and Control

This policy supports the Council's wider aims to enable greater choice and control over services that meet eligible social care needs. Service users, subject to financial means, contribute to their personal budget for social care. The Council funds the difference. This budget is used to purchase services to meet the users eligible needs. Service users may take this money in the form of a Direct Payment, or ask the Council to arrange services on their behalf, or use a combination of both.

4.4 Promoting prevention and reablement

Services provided or commissioned by the Council include those that prevent or defer the need for more intensive health and social care services. These services will be free for up to 6 weeks, following an assessment of need, to encourage and enable independence. *(Other services that support this policy aim are grant funded by the Council and provided by the voluntary sector. These are free to access and can be found on the Council's Care Choice website.)*

4.5 Supporting carers wellbeing and the caring relationship

In order to support people living at home and their carers who require services the Council provides certain services free. These are identified in Appendix 4.

4.6 Provide people with timely, clear and concise information about the costs of their care

The Council will publish its Contributions policy on Hantsweb and provide clear information to service users, carers and the general public in a variety of formats.

5. Service User's Financial Assessment

5.1 Low Income

'Low income' levels are those as set out by the Department of Health (which currently states contributions to care costs should not reduce a services users net income below levels of income equal to basic levels of Income Support or the Guarantee Credit of Pension Credit plus 25%).

The Council will offer advice on benefits entitlement and assistance with claiming benefits.

5.2 Direct Payments.

The contribution to be made when the service user receives a Direct Payment instead of services is calculated on the same basis as when a service user receives a service commissioned by the Council. Wherever possible Direct Payments will be paid net of client contribution.

5.3 Disability Related Expenses (DRE)

The aim is to allow for reasonable expenditure needed for independent living by the service user. The Council will take into consideration the relevant expenses of each individual service user. The list of possible items is extensive and examples are given in further information provided to the service user.

5.4 Income, Capital and Investments

In carrying out a financial assessment, the Council will take into account all relevant income and capital that is not required to be disregarded. Examples of disregarded income include any income from earnings, Winter Fuel Allowance, mobility component of Disability Living Allowance

Treatment of capital including savings. The Council sets an amount:

- i below which capital will not be taken into account when assessing the service users contribution.
- ii Above which the service user will be expected to pay the full cost of their Personal Budget.
- iii The above amounts cannot be less generous to the service user than are set out in CRAG as amended from time to time.

Personal Injury Awards. The Council will take into account all elements (capital and income) of a personal injury award unless they must be disregarded for legal reasons.

Deprivation of capital. If someone has deprived themselves of capital or an asset to reduce their contribution, this may be treated as deprivation of funds to pay for care and the contribution will be calculated as if the individual still had the capital or asset.

5.5 Net Assessed Income

The Council will disregard 5% of the net assessed income. This means that 95% of a service user's net assessed income will be used to calculate the most someone would contribute towards their personal budget

5.6 Refusal to be assessed

A service user is required to pay the full cost of the service if they refuse to disclose their financial means. Services cannot be withdrawn because a person refuses to pay their contribution to their care costs or the full cost of care where appropriate. The Council will pursue any debt accrued.

5.7 Maximum Weekly Charge

Hampshire County Council no longer has a maximum weekly charge.

6. Carers

6.1 Carer's legislation requires councils to assess carer's needs to support their wellbeing and the caring relationship where they are providing regular and substantial care. Carers benefit from services provided as carers services as well as certain services provided to the cared for person. The Council gives consideration to meeting the needs of carers through provision:

- (i) **used directly by the carer** – these are defined as 'carers services' and are free under this policy. Such services are identified through the carers assessment of needs and are arranged by the carer using a Direct Payment provided by the Council. The range of possible services is very wide and some examples are given in the appendix.
- (ii) **used by the cared for person** – these are included in the service user's support plan and will generally be services liable to a service user's contribution.

6.2 Carer Replacement Scheme including sitting services, and Take a Break voucher scheme are free.

Legislation requires personal care to be excluded from services determined as Carers Services as it is intimate in nature and directly provided to the service user. (There are exceptions to this, where the service user requests help or is in a situation that would cause harm).

7. Joint arrangements with Children's Services

7.1 Social care legislation in relation to the provision of services to meet the needs of adult and children is complex and the Council is committed to ensuring Adult and Children's Services work collaboratively to achieve the best possible outcomes for individuals and family groups. In the context of paying for services, those arranged by Children's Services are free under legislation. Services arranged by Adult Services are subject to this policy. The following clarification is provided:

Parents who are carers of disabled children

People with parental responsibility for a disabled child are entitled to a carer's assessment. Adult and Children's Services work together to ensure that the assessment is carried out by the most appropriate person. As set out above, adult social care services directly to the carer are free.

Disabled Parents

Disabled people who are parents are entitled to an adult social care assessment; and to have their needs met where they meet the Council's eligibility criteria for adult social care. They will be required to make a contribution to their personal budget for social care services, based upon a financial assessment.

Young Carers

Young people under the age of 18 who have caring responsibilities are entitled to an assessment of their needs by Children's Services. The cared for person is entitled to an adult social care assessment; and to have their needs met where they meet the Council's eligibility criteria for adult social care. They will be required to make a contribution to their personal budget for adult social care services, based upon a financial assessment.

This policy and accompanying guidance will be monitored and reviewed by the Adult Services Department through learning from complaints, compliments and concerns raised by service users and carers.

Appendix 4 Illustrative list of services

Hampshire County Council Contributions Policy for Adult Social Care – paying for care at home

This list is not exhaustive and will be updated from time to time. There are some services for which the Council may not charge under legislation. These services are identified with an asterisk* The personal budget for social care is made up of the service user's contribution, if any, based on a financial assessment; together with the Council's contribution. Service users may receive the Council's contribution to their personal budget, or part of it, as a Direct Payment from which to buy their services, or alternatively they may choose to ask the Council to arrange the services for them.

Service Type	Illustrative Description (this is not a legal definition)	Examples of services in Hampshire. (see Care Choice for more services)	Current Charging Policy	Proposed Contributions Policy
Advice and Information*	On the range of social care and support services available, including welfare benefits. These services help guide people towards the right help which can prevent or defer the need for intensive social care.	HantsDirect contact centre Hantsweb Care Choice Guide to Care publications Community Innovations Teams Community Development Workers	Free	Free
Assessment*	An assessment by the Council to determine an individual's needs, goals and eligibility for funded care and support.	Hospital Teams Community Teams	Free	Free
Carers Assessment*	An assessment by the Council to determine a carer's needs.	Hospital Teams Community Teams	Free	Free
Carers Services (see also non-respite)	Provision directly to the carer to enable them to fulfil their caring role.	Direct Payments. Used for example for costs of travel, mobile phone, laundry.	Free	Free
Carers Emergency Planning and Support	Emergency plan and up to 48 hours care at home, should an emergency or crisis occur.	Princess Royal Trust for Carers	Free	Free
Community Equipment*	Aids to daily living such as eating and drinking utensils, grab rails, raised toilet seats or more complex equipment such as beds and hoists.	Equipment Store Sensory Services British Red Cross	Free	Free
Day Services	Social contact and activities for people who are socially isolated or have difficulty living at home. Also enables the carer to have a break from the caring role.	Available from a number of service providers.	Free	Assessed user contribution to personal budget
Financial Assessment*	Information and financial assessment to determine the person's contribution to their personal social care budget	Financial Assessments and Benefits Team	Free	Free
Long term Personal Care at home – day and night time See also Support	For people with long term care needs. Help with intimate personal tasks such as getting into and out of bed, using the toilet, dressing, bathing, eating and personal hygiene.	Available from a number of service providers.	Chargeable	Assessed user contribution to personal budget*

*Where two paid carers are required to meet eligible personal care needs, the personal budget will reflect this cost. The contribution paid by the service user will be based on the financial assessment

Service Type	Illustrative Description (this is not a legal definition)	Examples of services in Hampshire. (see Care Choice for more services)	Current Charging Policy	Proposed Contributions Policy
Meals	Meals provided to people unable to cook for themselves.	Available from a number of service providers.	Chargeable Fixed amount charged for meals on wheels.	Assessed user contribution to personal budget Fixed amount charged for meals on wheels.
Non Residential Respite Care	Support provided to the cared for person, to enable the carer to take a break from the caring role.	Only Take a Break Voucher Scheme and Carer replacement scheme/ Sitting Services	Mix of chargeable and free services	Free
Short term residential respite care (up to 8 weeks)	Gives service users a break from their home circumstances; also enables a carer to have a break from the caring role.	Available from a number of service providers.	Chargeable – different amounts and financial assessments	Assessed user contribution to personal budget
Short term residential care of up to 8 weeks that is not respite or reablement/intermediate care will be charged for, as required under national guidance – please ask for details.				
Client Affairs	The Council manages service users financial affairs where they lack the mental capacity to do so themselves	Acting as Deputy	Charged for in accordance with Court of Protection	Charged for in accordance with Court of Protection rules
		Acting as Appointee	Free	Free
Reablement*	Care and support to recover from or live with a disability or illness, by (re) learning skills for daily living. Aims to avoid hospital or long term care admission and support hospital discharge.	Commissioned services: Community Response Welcome Home Time to Think Beds	Free for up to six weeks	Free for up to six weeks
Safeguarding	The co-ordination of investigations into allegations of the abuse of a vulnerable person	Community Teams Safeguarding Team	Free	Free
Shared Lives	A scheme through which vulnerable adults live with people who are paid carers, offering a home and support in a family environment.	Shared Lives	Chargeable service users	Assessed user contribution to personal budget
			service users also contribute separately to their board and lodgings	
Support Planning	Setting out agreed goals and a plan of action, including the services to help achieve these.	Hospital Discharge Teams Community Teams	Free	Free
Support (day and night time) See also personal care	Advice, encouragement and supervision for vulnerable adults who live independently. Includes emotional and psychological support including behaviour management.	Available from a number of service providers. Support Workers	Free	Assessed user contribution to personal budget
Telecare Equipment*	Equipment that senses risks such as smoke, floods and gas, remind to take pills or phone for help.	Available from a number of service providers.	Free	Free
Telecare Service	Response to the alarm or alert generated by the telecare equipment.	Available from a number of service providers.	Chargeable	Assessed user contribution to personal budget

Service Type	Illustrative Description (this is not a legal definition)	Examples of services in Hampshire. (see Care Choice for more services)	Current Charging Policy	Proposed Contributions Policy
Transport	Transport to access services	Available from a number of service providers.	Mix of free and chargeable	Assessed user contribution to personal budget
Welfare Benefits Advice	Advice and support to claim welfare benefits	Financial Assessments and Benefits Team Hantsweb	Free	Free

Appendix 5 Illustration of the impact of maximum weekly limits

The financial assessment works out an individual's income and outgoings to arrive at their 'net assessed' income. A number of calculations are then carried out to arrive at the actual contribution the service user will pay towards their personal social care budget. This includes applying maximums to limit the amount of income and costs of care used in the calculations. They affect individuals differently but aim overall to protect service users income.

The following illustrations show how the maximum weekly charge and maximum weekly contribution currently affect people with lower and higher incomes. The illustrations show the impact of removing each limit, set alongside the impact of removing both limits as they have joint and separate implications.

Illustration 1: A service user with a lower income

	Current Policy	Impact of removing 95%	Impact of removing £440	Impact of removing both
Personal Budget/cost of chargeable services	£500	£500	£500	£500
User's assessed net income	£100	£100	£100	£100

(i) Impact of the Maximum Weekly Contribution (to be paid by the service user)

	95%	100%	95%	100%
Max Weekly Contribution (% of net income used to contribute towards care costs)	95%	100%	95%	100%
Service User's Max Contribution (what would be charged unless the care cost is less)	£95	£100	£95	£100

(ii) Impact of the Maximum Weekly Charge (made by the Council)

	£440	£440	£500 (full cost of care)	£500 (full cost of care)
Max weekly charge possible from the service user	£440	£440	£500 (full cost of care)	£500 (full cost of care)

(iii) Impact on Contributions

Council's Contribution	£405	£400	£405	£400
Service user's contribution	£95	£100	£95	£100
Service user retains	£5	£0	£5	£0

Illustration 2: A service user with a higher income

	Current Policy	Impact of removing 95%	Impact of removing £440	Impact of removing both
Personal Budget/cost of chargeable services	£500	£500	£500	£500
User's assessed net income	£700	£700	£700	£700

(i) Impact of Maximum Weekly Contribution (to be paid by the service user)

Max Weekly Contribution – % of user net income used to contribute towards care costs	95%	100%	95%	100%
Service User's Max Contribution (what would be charged unless the care cost is less)	£665	£700	£665	£700

(ii) Impact of Maximum Weekly Charge (made by the Council)

Max weekly charge <u>possible</u> from the service user	£440	£440	£500 (full cost of care)	£500 (full cost of care)
---	------	------	--------------------------	--------------------------

(iii) Impact on Contributions

Council's Contribution	£60	£60	£0	£0
Service User's contribution	£440	£440	£500	£500
Service user retains	£260	£260	£200	£200