

SSA EQUALITY IMPACT AND NEEDS ANALYSIS

Directorate	Adult Social Services
Service Area	Commissioning and Quality Standards
Service/policy/function being assessed	Direct Payment Support Services
Which borough (s) does the service/policy apply to	Richmond
Staff involved	Abby Vella/Sarita Gogna
Date approved by Directorate Equality Group (if applicable)	26/10/2017
Date approved by Policy and Review Manager All EINAs must be signed off by the Policy and Review Manager	05/10/2017
Date submitted to Directors' Board	12/10/2017

SUMMARY

What is being proposed

It is proposed to implement a new single contract in both Richmond and Wandsworth for provision of a Direct Payment Support Service. In Richmond services are currently provided by a single provider.

The services received will remain the same for Richmond residents as the successful provider will be contracted to deliver all core elements of the service. However, there may be changes in who provides the support service.

Positive Impact of the New Service

The requirement for addressing equality is clearly specified in the contract specification and a key component of the evaluation criteria is the need for providers to demonstrate how they address equality and diversity issues and ensure equal access and quality in service delivery to all service users. It also comprises a key part of the performance and contract monitoring framework. Groups with protected characteristics will be monitored and those who are transitioned to the new service will be supported.

The requirements and key principles of the new specification are informed and shaped by consultation with various stakeholders.

A single provider approach will enable robust quality assurance and contract monitoring to ensure the provision of high quality services.

This approach supports effective financial monitoring, ensuring management of Direct Payment funds is legally compliant and complies with the Council's internal audit requirements.

In addition, this approach will build on local knowledge and more effective development of services such as a local PA register and local peer support meetings.

Benefits of this approach also include the potential to deliver efficiencies through the

rationalisation of business processes, reducing the financial administration associated with payment schedules as well as reducing overheads.

The new model will continue to support Care Act duties which are detailed in the section below.

Key Findings

- The numbers of 65 plus service users are well represented as there are proportionately more service users in the 65+ age group in receipt of DPs than the borough averages.
- There are also proportionately more service users with a learning disability and physical disability who receive a DP than the borough average. There are slightly less service users with a mental health condition than the borough average.
- In addition there are proportionately more service users from the Black and Minority Ethnic backgrounds in receipt of DPs than the borough averages.

1. Background

Introduction to service

Under the Care Act 2014, councils must offer people who qualify for services the option of having a Direct Payment. Direct Payments are monetary payments made by Councils directly to individuals who are assessed as having eligible needs for certain services. However, people may need information and practical support to enable them to manage their DPs. The Care Act also clearly states that Local Authorities “should help people who fund their own services or receive direct payments, to ‘micro-commission’ care and support services and/or to pool their budgets, and should ensure a supporting infrastructure is available to help with these activities”.

Direct Payment Support Services help people to manage their Direct Payments by providing the necessary infrastructure through offering different types of support including information and employment advice and support, payroll and third party managed accounts services.

There are currently two different models of delivery for the provision of Direct Payment Support Services across Richmond and Wandsworth which are coming to an end (contract with a single provider in Richmond and an accredited list of five providers in Wandsworth).

The ending of the contractual arrangements in both boroughs provides a timely opportunity to scope and evaluate potential options for a joint procurement model and common approach across the SSA, in line with SSA Procurement Guidance.

A single joint Wandsworth and Richmond specification for the new DP support service is in line with the aims of the Shared Staffing Arrangement for collaborative approaches, and provides opportunities to incorporate best practice from both boroughs, rationalise the business processes and pricing structures and potentially achieve savings. The successful provider for each borough will deliver all components of direct payment support including:

- Employer support and advice
- Recruitment and Development of the PA market

- Payroll
- Managed accounts
- Information and advice including peer support.

2. Analysis of need and impact

Findings

Protected group	Findings																																							
Age	<p>Census data 2011</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Age group</th> <th>Total</th> <th>% of total population</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>18-64</td> <td>121135</td> <td>65%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>65-74</td> <td>13023</td> <td>7%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>75-84</td> <td>8234</td> <td>4%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>85+</td> <td>4039</td> <td>2%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Total 18+</td> <td>146431</td> <td>78%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Total population</td> <td>186990</td> <td>100%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>Richmond DP service user data Richmond data sourced from Frameworki on 04 August 2017. Some data unavailable because field is not mandatory.</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Age group</th> <th>Total</th> <th>% of total no. service users</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>18-64</td> <td>302</td> <td>60%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>65-74</td> <td>57</td> <td>11%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>75-84</td> <td>49</td> <td>10%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>85+</td> <td>93</td> <td>19%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Total</td> <td>501</td> <td>100%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>Analysis</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In Richmond, 60% of DP service users are aged 18-64. This is similar to the borough average of 65%. • The 65+ age group of DP recipients is overrepresented when compared to the borough average, particularly in the 85+ age bracket. 	Age group	Total	% of total population	18-64	121135	65%	65-74	13023	7%	75-84	8234	4%	85+	4039	2%	Total 18+	146431	78%	Total population	186990	100%	Age group	Total	% of total no. service users	18-64	302	60%	65-74	57	11%	75-84	49	10%	85+	93	19%	Total	501	100%
Age group	Total	% of total population																																						
18-64	121135	65%																																						
65-74	13023	7%																																						
75-84	8234	4%																																						
85+	4039	2%																																						
Total 18+	146431	78%																																						
Total population	186990	100%																																						
Age group	Total	% of total no. service users																																						
18-64	302	60%																																						
65-74	57	11%																																						
75-84	49	10%																																						
85+	93	19%																																						
Total	501	100%																																						

Disability**PANSI figures (updated 2017 so projections may differ to census data)**

Service user group (age 18-64)	Total	% of population
Predicted to have a learning disability	3,055	2%
Predicted to have a moderate physical disability	9,720	5%
Predicted to have a serious physical disability	2,862	1%
Predicted to have a common mental disorder	20,408	10%
Total population (18-64)	125,800	
Total population (all ages)	202,600	

Richmond DP service user data

Richmond data sourced from Frameworki on 04 August 2017. Some data unavailable because field is not mandatory.

Service user group	Total	% of total no. service users
Learning Disability	153	31%
Mental Health	36	7%
Older People	184	37%
Physical Disability	121	24%
Vulnerable Adult	5	1%
[Data not available]	2	0.4%
Total	501	100%

Analysis

- Based on the data above; there are more residents with a learning disability and physical disability that use the service than the borough average.
- There are fewer residents with a mental health disorder who use the service than the borough average.

Gender (sex)	Census data 2011		
	Gender/sex	Richmond total	% of total population
	Male	91149	49%
	Female	95841	51%
	Total	186990	100%
	Richmond DP service user data		
	Richmond data sourced from Frameworki on 04 August 2017. Some data unavailable because field is not mandatory.		
	Sex	Total	% of total no. service users
	Male	284	57%
	Female	217	43%
	Total	501	100%
	Analysis		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In Richmond, more male residents use the service than the borough average. 		
Gender reassignment	Data not available.		

Marriage and civil partnership

Census data 2011

Marital status (normal residents 16+)	Total	% of total population aged 16+
Single (never married or never registered a same-sex civil partnership)	55070	37%
Married	70998	47%
In a registered same-sex civil partnership	665	0.4%
Separated (but still legally married or still legally in a same-sex civil partnership)	3355	2%
Divorced or formerly in a same-sex civil partnership which is now legally dissolved	11916	8%
Widowed or surviving partner from a same-sex civil partnership	8048	5%
Total (age 16+)	150052	

Richmond DP service user data

Richmond data sourced from Frameworki on 04 August 2017. Some data unavailable because field is not mandatory.

Marital status	Total	% of total no. service users
Cohabiting	5	1%
Divorced	33	7%
Married	68	14%
Separated	22	4%
Single	145	29%
Widowed	58	12%
Blank/unknown	170	34%
Total	501	100%

Analysis

- In Richmond, fewer single and married residents use the DP service than the borough average.
- There are slightly fewer residents who use the service that are divorced than the borough average.
- There are slightly more residents who are separated that use the service than the borough average.
- There are more widowed residents who use the service than the borough average.

Pregnancy and maternity	Data not currently available.																																													
Race/ethnicity	<p>Census data 2011</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Ethnicity</th> <th>Total</th> <th>% total population</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>White</td> <td>160725</td> <td>86%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Mixed/multiple ethnic group</td> <td>6780</td> <td>4%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Asian/Asian British</td> <td>13607</td> <td>7%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Black/African/Caribbean/Black British</td> <td>2816</td> <td>2%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Other ethnic group</td> <td>3062</td> <td>2%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Total</td> <td>186990</td> <td>100%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>Richmond DP service user data Richmond data sourced from Frameworki on 04 August 2017. Some data unavailable because field is not mandatory.</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Race/ethnicity</th> <th>Total</th> <th>% of total no. service users</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Asian or Asian British</td> <td>34</td> <td>7%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Black or Black British</td> <td>26</td> <td>5%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Mixed</td> <td>14</td> <td>3%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Not Stated/blank</td> <td>22</td> <td>4%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Other Ethnic Groups</td> <td>25</td> <td>5%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>White</td> <td>380</td> <td>78%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Total</td> <td>501</td> <td>100%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>Analysis</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In Richmond, more BME residents use the service than the borough average. 	Ethnicity	Total	% total population	White	160725	86%	Mixed/multiple ethnic group	6780	4%	Asian/Asian British	13607	7%	Black/African/Caribbean/Black British	2816	2%	Other ethnic group	3062	2%	Total	186990	100%	Race/ethnicity	Total	% of total no. service users	Asian or Asian British	34	7%	Black or Black British	26	5%	Mixed	14	3%	Not Stated/blank	22	4%	Other Ethnic Groups	25	5%	White	380	78%	Total	501	100%
Ethnicity	Total	% total population																																												
White	160725	86%																																												
Mixed/multiple ethnic group	6780	4%																																												
Asian/Asian British	13607	7%																																												
Black/African/Caribbean/Black British	2816	2%																																												
Other ethnic group	3062	2%																																												
Total	186990	100%																																												
Race/ethnicity	Total	% of total no. service users																																												
Asian or Asian British	34	7%																																												
Black or Black British	26	5%																																												
Mixed	14	3%																																												
Not Stated/blank	22	4%																																												
Other Ethnic Groups	25	5%																																												
White	380	78%																																												
Total	501	100%																																												

Religion and belief, including non belief

Census data 2011

Religion	Total	% of total population
Christian	103319	55%
Buddhist	1577	1%
Hindu	3051	2%
Jewish	1409	1%
Muslim	6128	3%
Sikh	1581	1%
Other religion	890	0.5%
No religion	53195	28%
Religion not stated	15840	8%
Total	186990	100%

Richmond DP service user data

Richmond data sourced from Frameworki on 04 August 2017. Some data unavailable because field is not mandatory.

Religion/belief	Total	% of total no. service users
Anglo-Catholic	2	0%
Baptist	1	0.2%
Buddhist	6	1%
Christian	57	11%
Church of England	46	9%
Hindu	8	2%
Jehovah Witness	2	0%
Jewish	5	1%
Methodist	4	1%
Muslim	14	3%
No Religion	38	8%
Quaker	1	0.2%
Religion not stated	33	7%
Roman Catholic	25	5%
Russian Orthodox	2	0%
Sikh	4	1%
Spiritualist	1	0.2%
Unknown	32	6%
Blank	220	44%
Total	501	100%

Analysis

- There are fewer residents that identify as having no religion that use the service than the borough average.
- There are fewer residents who use that service that identify themselves as Christian than the borough average.
- Residents who use the service that identify as a Muslim, Buddhist, Hindu, Jew and Sikh are reflective of the borough average.

Sexual orientation	Data not currently available.
Across groups i.e older LGBT service users or bme young men	Data not currently available.

Impact

Protected group	Positive	Negative
Age	<p>The re-procurement of Direct Payment Support Services using a single provider represents no change from the current service model.</p> <p>The new model will enable robust quality assurance and contract monitoring to ensure the provision of high quality services. This approach supports effective financial monitoring, ensuring management of Direct Payment funds is legally compliant and complies with the Council’s internal audit requirements. In addition, this approach will build on local knowledge and more effective development of services such as a local PA register and local peer support meetings.</p> <p>The requirement for equality needs to be met is outlined in the specification, forms one of the evaluation criteria for the tender and comprises a key part of the monitoring framework (see clause 13.4.8 – 13.4.9 on the specification).</p> <p>There are efficiencies expected in the revision of business processes supporting Direct Payment set up and monitoring but these back office functions will not impact upon groups with these protected characteristics.</p>	<p>The data shows that there are more residents age 65+ who use the DP service than the borough average. As a result, residents age 65+ are more likely to be impacted by any changes made to the service.</p> <p>There is no evidence to suggest that changing the current support service provider will have any impact on groups with these protected characteristics as the same service will be delivered.</p> <p>However change of provider could be unsettling, but this will be tightly managed through the review process, and monitored to ensure that there is no unintended consequence.</p>

Disability	As above	<p>The data shows that more residents with a learning or physical disability use the DP service than the borough average. As a result, residents with a learning or physical disability are more likely to be impacted by any changes made to the service.</p> <p>There is no evidence to suggest that changing the current support service provider will have any impact on groups with these protected characteristics as the same service will be delivered.</p> <p>However change of provider could be unsettling, but this will be tightly managed through the review process and monitored to ensure that there is no unintended consequence.</p>
Gender (sex)	As above	<p>The data shows that more male residents use the DP service than the borough average. As a result, male residents are more likely to be impacted by any changes made to the service.</p> <p>There is no evidence to suggest that changing the current support service provider will have any impact on groups with these protected characteristics as the same service will be delivered.</p> <p>However change of provider could be unsettling, but this will be tightly managed through the review process and monitored to ensure that there is no unintended consequence.</p>
Gender reassignment	As above	<p>There is no evidence to suggest that changing the current support service provider will have any impact on groups with these protected characteristics as the same service will be delivered.</p> <p>However change of provider could be unsettling, but this will be tightly managed through the review process and monitored to ensure that there is no unintended consequence.</p>

Marriage and civil partnership	As above	<p>The data shows that more residents who are separated and widowed use the DP service than the borough average. As a result, residents who are separated or widowed are more likely to be impacted by any changes made to the service.</p> <p>There is no evidence to suggest that changing the current support service provider will have any impact on groups with these protected characteristics as the same service will be delivered.</p> <p>However change of provider could be unsettling, but this will be tightly managed through the review process and monitored to ensure that there is no unintended consequence.</p>
Pregnancy and maternity	As above	<p>There is no evidence to suggest that changing the current support service provider will have any impact on groups with these protected characteristics as the same service will be delivered.</p> <p>However change of provider could be unsettling, but this will be tightly managed through the review process, and monitored to ensure that there is no unintended consequence.</p>
Race/ethnicity	As above	<p>The data shows that more BME residents use the DP service than the borough average. As a result, BME residents are more likely to be impacted by any changes made to the service.</p> <p>There is no evidence to suggest that changing the current support service provider will have any impact on groups with these protected characteristics as the same service will be delivered.</p> <p>However change of provider could be unsettling, but this will be tightly managed through the review process and monitored to ensure that there is no unintended consequence.</p>

Religion and belief, including non belief	As above	<p>There is no evidence to suggest that changing the current support service provider will have any impact on groups with these protected characteristics as the same service will be delivered.</p> <p>However change of provider could be unsettling, but this will be tightly managed through the review process and monitored to ensure that there is no unintended consequence.</p>
Sexual orientation	As above	<p>There is no evidence to suggest that changing the current support service provider will have any impact on groups with these protected characteristics as the same service will be delivered.</p> <p>However change of provider could be unsettling, but this will be tightly managed through the review process and monitored to ensure that there is no unintended consequence.</p>

3. Actions

Action	Lead Officer	Deadline
Contractors will have to comply with equality legislation and ensure their staff are trained and support individuals with protected characteristics.	Sarita Gogna	Ongoing
Monitoring for possible disruption will take place through a number of means including individual service user reviews, contract and performance monitoring framework and meetings with providers and user satisfaction surveys.	Range George-Naidoo	Ongoing
Ensure equalities forms part of the monitoring framework.	Sarita Gogna	November 2017
Ensure equalities forms one of the evaluation criteria for the tender.	Sarita Gogna	November 2017

4. Consultation.

<p>Service users and carers have been widely consulted during the development of the new joint service model via a questionnaire and face to face via peer support forums. Other Stakeholders who have been consulted include providers of Direct Payment support services, the Learning Disability Partnership Board, internal staff including operational teams, Finance, Quality Assurance and Contract Teams. Richmond Council for Voluntary Service helped design and comment on the survey. The results have informed the requirements and key principles of the specification. The service specification will ensure that hard to reach groups are engaged and supported by new services.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • User survey (August 2017) • Market Engagement Event(August 2017) • Staff consultation with front line staff including: MH Social Care Team, LD Social Care

Team, Twickenham and Teddington General locality team