



Appendix A: Adult Social Care Charges Consultation Analysis

Purpose

This briefing is to provide an analysis of the results of the Adult Social Care Charges Consultation conducted by Doncaster Council.

As well as overall results, some representative sampling of common themes has been provided, based on interpretation of comments and concerns raised.

Data Advice: The information contained within the first section of the briefing is based entirely on completed surveys received during the consultation into Adult Social Care Charges, and it does not contain any data gathered from other sources during this consultation.

The second section of the briefing contains data gathered from other sources outside the primary collection method.

Report Author: Paul Stabeler, Senior Strategy and Performance Manager

Part 1

Respondent Information

The below tables indicate how the respondents described themselves on the survey. Please note that not every respondent answered every question, so there will be some variation in total responses received.

Age Group and Gender

	Female	Male	Other	Prefer not to say	Total
18-24	4	2	1		7
25-34	13	6		1	20
35-44	9	6		3	18
45 - 54	21	14		1	36
55 -64	42	17		2	61
65 - 74	15	10			25
75 and over	40	24			64
Prefer not to say	7	2		4	13
Total	151	81	1	10	244

Ethnicity and Gender

	Female	Male	Other	Prefer not to say	Total
Any other background	2	1		2	5
Any other Black / African / Caribbean background	1	1			2
Any other white background	1				1
English/Welsh/Scottish/Northern Irish/British	147	76		9	232
Gypsy or Irish traveller			1		1
Indian		1			1
Irish	1				1
Pakistani		1			1
White and Asian	2	1			3
White and Black Caribbean		1			1

Do you currently pay towards your care service or support?

Don't know	5
No - Do not currently pay anything	43
Not applicable	80
Yes - Pay all the costs	55
Yes - Pay some of the costs	65

Responses Received (questions not specific to proposals)

Question: Overall, how strongly do you agree or disagree that people should contribute towards the cost of their adult social care if, subject to a financial assessment, it is established they can afford to do so?

Response	Count	Percentage
Strongly Agree	25	14%
Agree	69	39%
Neither Agree nor Disagree	31	18%
Disagree	27	15%
Strongly Disagree	17	10%
Don't Know	7	4%

Question: The council is considering the possibility of introducing some of the proposed changes over a period of time. How do you feel about this?

Note on methodology: this open question was coded using a standard framework as below, to describe the sentiment expressed by the respondent. The high-level categories indicate that just over half (52%) of respondents favoured a phased introduction.

	Code Category	Responses	Total
Agree	Agree (General)	71	76 (52%)
	Agree - Conditional	5	
Disagree	Disagree (General)	4	6 (4%)
	Disagree - Conditional	2	
Mixed/NA	Some Phased, Some Now	2	55 (38%)
	Indifferent	3	
	Not Applicable	47	
	Other Suggestion	3	
Other	Clarification Request	5	9 (6%)
	Conditional - Unspecified	4	

Analysis: Response to Proposals

Methodology

The survey was primarily composed of free-text fields, which have been coded against a set framework established prior to the analysis taking place. The complete framework can be found at the base of this document, and was established based on a sample of real responses received prior to the close of the consultation. The coding framework was designed to ensure that respondent sentiments could be appropriately measured. The first coding development session received active contributions from a representative of Healthwatch Doncaster.

Two primary lines of enquiry were established, based on the questions and their structure. These are:

- How do respondents feel about the proposals
- How will the proposals affect existing service users and their carers/family members

In total, 248 responses were received, of which 200 were online surveys, and 48 paper surveys. Not all of these respondents completed the survey or answered every question. Consequently the count of valid responses will not match the number of surveys received.

Each 'set' of questions was coded to a set framework; this means all the 'What do you think...' questions followed one framework, and all 'How may it affect you...' questions followed another. The free-text fields asking what respondents thought of phased introductions, and whether they had any other comments, were coded to their own frameworks.

For 'What do you think' questions, responses were coded to broadly show whether a respondent agreed or disagreed with a proposal, or if they neither agreed nor disagreed entirely.

For 'How Might It Affect You' questions, responses were coded to broadly show whether a respondent was affected or not.

Within each code, sub-codes were assigned to indicate why a respondent felt the way they did, or how they would be affected. These sub-codes aim to provide the opportunity for focused analysis into specific issues raised.

Overall Responses

What do you think?

These questions asked respondents what they thought of the proposal.

	Responses Received	For	Against	Neither for nor against	Other
Proposal 1 - Home Alarm Service	161	42%	35%	20%	2%
Proposal 2 - Care at Home	152	44%	29%	26%	1%
Proposal 3a - Day Opportunities	147	29%	42%	28%	1%
Proposal 3b – Transport	148	44%	21%	34%	1%
Proposal 4a - Charging for Administration of Appointeeship	151	40%	23%	34%	3%
Proposal 4b - Charge for Protection of Property Costs	144	31%	19%	44%	6%
Proposal 4c - Travel Costs for Visiting Clients	151	22%	35%	42%	1%
Proposal 5 - Arrangements for people who pay for their own care in full	148	29%	34%	33%	3%
Proposal 6 - Maximum Weekly Charge for Non-Residential Services	149	27%	38%	34%	1%
Proposal 7 - Enhanced daily living component of Personal Independence Payment (PIP)	146	40%	30%	29%	1%
Proposal 8 - Financial Assessments for Residential Respite & Short Stay Care	143	27%	29%	42%	2%
Proposal 9 - The Minimum Income Guarantee (MIG)	143	32%	44%	22%	2%
All Responses	1783	34%	32%	32%	2%

Throughout the document, valid responses are those where the respondent has provided an answer that was not blank. Common noncommittal responses such as ‘-’, ‘.’, ‘NA’ or similar have been coded as ‘neither for nor against’.

How might it affect you?

These questions asked respondents how they felt the proposal might affect them.

	Responses Received	Any Positive Impact	No Impact	Any Negative Impact	Other	Request for Further Information
Proposal 1 - Home Alarm Service	162	1%	46%	40%	13%	1%
Proposal 2 - Care at Home	148	1%	76%	20%	2%	1%
Proposal 3a - Day Opportunities	142	1%	76%	23%	0%	0%
Proposal 3b – Transport	142	0%	89%	10%	1%	0%
Proposal 4a - Charging for Administration of Appointeeship	142	1%	86%	11%	1%	1%
Proposal 4b - Charge for Protection of Property Costs	140	0%	90%	6%	1%	3%
Proposal 4c - Travel Costs for Visiting Clients	142	0%	80%	18%	1%	0%
Proposal 5 - Arrangements for people who pay for their own care in full	139	0%	87%	12%	0%	1%
Proposal 6 - Maximum Weekly Charge for Non-Residential Services	134	0%	86%	13%	0%	1%
Proposal 7 - Enhanced daily living component of Personal Independence Payment (PIP)	135	0%	75%	25%	0%	0%
Proposal 8 - Financial Assessments for Residential Respite & Short Stay Care	136	0%	84%	15%	1%	1%
Proposal 9 - The Minimum Income Guarantee (MIG)	137	1%	64%	34%	0%	1%
All Responses	1699	0%	78%	19%	2%	1%

Throughout the document, valid responses are those where the respondent has provided an answer that was not blank. Common noncommittal responses such as ‘-’, ‘.’, ‘NA’ or similar have been coded as ‘No Impact’.

Proposal 1 – Home Alarm Service

The proposal is to replace the current £3.30 per week charge with new charges that will cover more of the current costs and help towards improving the service; all people who can afford to would pay these charges. Two separate charges are proposed, one for the pendant alarm (which would be standard) and one for the response (which would be additional for those who wanted this).

The two separate charges give people a choice about which service would be best for them. For example, a person may just want the pendant alarm monitoring service with no response, costing £3.64 per week. Adding the response service to this would cost a total of £5.14 per week (£3.64+£1.50). The proposed charges would be paid by everyone apart from people who:

- i) Qualify for care and support as part of their assessed social care needs, where assistive technology is used to meet a person's social care need.
- ii) Have reablement services to help to get their independence back, for up to a maximum of 6 weeks.

What do you think about this proposal?

In total, we received 161 valid responses to this proposal. 68 respondents, or 42%, were broadly for the proposal, with 35% against. Among those in favour, 31 made a comment praising the value of the service. Of those against the proposal, 28 objected due to financial reasons, 12 felt there was a health/vulnerability risk.

Some respondents felt that there was no need for a tiered system, and indicated that they would prefer a flat charge for all service users rather than splitting the monitoring service and response service.

How will it affect you?

Of 162 responses to this question, 74 indicated that it would not impact them, though 18 of these suggested there may be a possible future impact.

65 responses indicated a negative impact, primarily financial (36), with 20 health/wellbeing concerns. Of these, 9 respondents indicated that they may stop the service if these charges were implemented.

Sample of Responses

"I pay the full amount already and find the service good value for money. Even with this increase it is still less than £1.00 a day so everyone should pay if they want to use this service."

"I live alone and am almost totally housebound I have no one to call on in an emergency so the pendant alarm is very important to me I get the service free and I would not be able to pay the £5.14 per week charge removing the alarm would leave me very vulnerable."

"One package of about £4.50 would be better."

"Seems fair and good to have a basic rate and higher rate for people who need the response service as well."

Proposal 2 – Care at Home

The proposal is to include the costs of all care workers attending and providing a service to a person in their financial assessment.

Some people need two or more care workers to help them at the same time. However only the cost of one care worker is currently included in financial assessments, when care has been arranged by the council. However, when people opt to take a Direct Payment and arrange their care themselves they are charged against all care workers.

Everyone's financial assessment will be treated in the same way which will be much fairer. People will only have to pay more if their financial assessment says they have enough money to pay for it. At the moment there are only about 10 people in Doncaster who would be likely to have to pay more. Advances in new types of community equipment and assistive technology mean an increasing number of people can safely be supported without more than one care worker needing to visit at once. The council is talking to people who currently have more than one care worker visiting at once to better understand their circumstances and increase their privacy and dignity whilst reducing their costs.

What do you think about this proposal?

In total, we received 152 valid responses to this proposal. 67 respondents, or 44%, were broadly for the proposal, with 29% against. Among those against the proposal, many felt that this would disproportionately impact those who were most vulnerable and required the most care.

How will it affect you?

Of 148 responses to this question, 113 indicated that it would not impact them, though 19 of these suggested there may be a possible future impact.

30 responses indicated that it would impact them negatively, primarily focusing on financial objections. Some respondents indicated that there may be a negative impact on the health of family members, and subsequent social/family impact if carers had to step in rather than paying for two carers.

Sample of Responses

"It seems fair but how will safeguarding the carers be ensured if 2 are assessed as necessary to move the disabled person as in our case, and then they are told one will do; is it safe for the client and the carers? Reductions might be logical but we were told one alone cannot care for this client."

"Each care worker should be paid for, so ensuring the correct level of care for a customer. More effective care could reduce costs in the future, as better health would be maintained."

"I think the proposal is harsh considering that those that are so severely disabled that require two care workers may not be able to afford them and cut down to just one which could have an health impact on the one carer being unable to provide the care needed which could become an health and safety issue."

"People should pay per carer ONLY if they can afford it."

Proposal 3a – Day Opportunities

The proposal is to increase the day care charge to reflect the actual cost of providing the services. This will mean that the maximum current charge per day, will increase from £31 to £46 for moderate support and from £31 to £76 for high level support. This will remain subject to financial assessment so people will only pay what they can afford.

What do you think about this proposal?

In total, we received 147 valid responses to this proposal. 43 respondents, or 29%, were broadly for the proposal, with 42% against. Among those against the proposal, many felt that this cost increase was too great, particularly for those requiring high levels of support. Among those in favour, a number of service users expressed that they felt this would still provide value for money, particularly compared to commercial services. A number of respondents proposed alternative approaches, including more flexibility and potential engagement from voluntary, community and faith groups.

How will it affect you?

Of 142 responses to this question, 108 indicated that it would not impact them, though 8 of these suggested there may be a possible future impact.

33 responses indicated that it would impact them negatively, primarily focusing on financial objections, with 13 indicating a health and wellbeing impact. Of these 13, 9 respondents indicated that they would consider stopping the service. A further impact raised related to social isolation and increased pressure on families and carers at home, if service users were unable to attend day care.

Sample of Responses

“This is a huge increase which may see people not using these services and staying at home and becoming isolated. This could have an impact on the health service if their mental health was affected by this.”

“I feel this is a fair charge to represent the true cost of the service.”

“This will make the service sustainable and is a realistic costing, however may put people who are full cost payers off coming to the service. Half days and people choosing to pay privately should also be available”

“I think we are pricing ourselves out of the market. It concerns me that people will consider these costs are too high they won't attend we will further reduce our services and over time they just won't be there leading to increased loneliness, social isolation and the safeguarding benefits to vulnerable adults will be lost. I can see the potential for voluntary community groups to do more to include people with more significant needs within their groups but this requires planned development co ordinated across the Council and the voluntary sector.”

“I think that having to pay £31 is a lot for some people to find. Any increase to this would put people off even asking for help leading to more people being unable to get out of their homes or to have much social interaction at all. Surely there must be a cheaper way to fund this? £76 a day is absolutely disgusting for a disabled person to have any form of social interaction.”

Proposal 3b – Transport

The proposal is to increase the charge for each journey from £3 to £4 from April 2020 and to further increase the cost by £1 a year after that, until the cost charged equals the actual cost of providing the transport. There are currently 150 people who still use Council transport. The relocation of day services to a range of community buildings across the borough has made it easier for the remaining 130 people to access them independently, avoiding the charge.

What do you think about this proposal?

In total, we received 148 valid responses to this proposal. 65 respondents, or 44%, were broadly for the proposal, with 21% against. Most people felt this was a fair charge, particularly compared to alternative forms of transport. In particular, the offer of healthcare professionals on transport was seen as value for money compared to bus or taxi services. Some felt that the rise was excessive and would lead to increased vulnerability for some residents, particularly when coupled with increased day charges. The prospect of increasing the charge by a small amount each year was viewed favourably by most.

How will it affect you?

Of 142 responses to this question, 127 indicated that it would not impact them, though 19 of these suggested there may be a possible future impact.

14 responses indicated that it would impact them negatively, mostly from a financial perspective. Three respondents indicated that they may stop the service if costs grow too high.

Sample of Responses

“So in addition to people having to find extra money to attend they also now have to find an extra however much a week (as we all know the transport costs in 7 years will be over £10 so the increases will not cease at that point) dependant on attendance. So if you can't isolate by attendance it will certainly happen via transportation. Not that you can justify the costs as it is due to old constantly breaking down modes of transport”

“It won't at the moment but if or when it might, transport with helpers is infinitely preferable to taking taxis and certainly cheaper as you propose.”

If people require this service, which includes an escort, I think this is a fair price. I am aware that i.e. people with dementia may need transport that may require an escort with them. This is a good price for that service”

“Again, people may think twice about using this service if both the day care and transport costs are increased, especially if it is done together. Although an increase of a pound isn't too much.”

“Seems reasonable - a higher fee would be reasonable as it is still far cheaper than a taxi and on a par with the bus services in Doncaster”

“This will be £40 a month increase for many and may have the same negative impact around health issues if people no longer attend day services as frequently. I do agree however that as the council pay a huge amount to transport it is reasonable to ask for an increase in this area”

Proposal 4a – Charging for Administration of Appointeeship

It is proposed to bring in a new charge to make sure that people using the council to look after their money and property all pay the same, whether it is an Appointeeship or Deputyship. The monthly charge will be between £2.03 and £48 depending on the persons assets/money and residential situation (see table below).

What do you think about this proposal?

In total, we received 151 valid responses to this proposal. 61 respondents, or 40%, were broadly for the proposal, with 23% against. Not all respondents appeared to be clear on the exact nature of the proposal and did not give opinions due to this. Among those with mixed feelings, some felt that a charge was appropriate, but disagreed with the size of the proposed charges.

How will it affect you?

Of 142 responses to this question, 122 indicated that it would not impact them, though 3 of these suggested there may be a possible future impact, with 2 identifying a specific future concern.

16 responses indicated that it would impact them negatively, mostly from a financial perspective.

Sample of Responses

“The increases per band of savings is not well thought through - how can you justify suddenly increasing someones monthly payment by almost £7 if they have just £1 extra in savings (band 1 to 2) - preposterous. If you only have a £3 increase between all other sections surely you have entered into an area of discrimination against those at the lower end of society. Alter your savings range or rethink your charging strategy”

“I think that it should be one flat rate charge regardless of a person's savings.”

“I feel it is unfair to charge an individual who it is likely has no family to support, I believe this should be a free service as it appears this punishes those with less support networks who are probably the most vulnerable.”

“If have the money to pay then should, as long as financially assessed.”

“I will have to pay but am ok with this. I like how they help me”

“Absolutely fine to charge the actual costs. This should be a first rate service invest in staff training recruit and retain the very best staff and expand to offer the opportunity for people to make appointments in their community with someone who can offer advice. There is not enough of this in Doncaster.”

Proposal 4b – Charge for Protection of Property Costs

It is proposed to reclaim any money it costs the council for protecting the property of adults being cared for away from home. Charges will be for property searches (£70 per visit); weekly property checks (£10 per visit); storage of property (actual cost), and; boarding of animals (actual cost).

What do you think about this proposal?

In total, we received 144 valid responses to this proposal. 44 respondents, or 31%, were broadly for the proposal, with 19% against. On this proposal, half of all respondents did not indicate an opinion either way, with many of them not understanding it or asking for further clarification. Those who supported the proposal felt that it was fair, particularly considering that it isn't a statutory service. Those disagreeing tended to object from a philosophical or financial perspective.

How will it affect you?

Of 140 responses to this question, 126 indicated that it would not impact them, though 9 of these suggested there may be a possible future impact, with 3 identifying a specific future concern.

9 responses indicated that it would have a negative impact.

Sample of Responses

"It would be nice to read something about this proposal - all you have redirected to is the same as 4a. If this ends up being two separate charges instead of being all in one you are about to send a whole new section of people into poverty"

"I can't see any need for this service so if it is requested it should be charged for"

"totally agree as given current economic climate we cannot continue to do this and not be able to cover our costs. again brings doncaster in line with other councils and what they do"

"I feel the storage of property and boarding of animals based on the actual cost is reasonable. However, the proposed charges of £70 per search is unacceptable - searching for what??"

"If people would have to pay for this service elsewhere if it was not available via the council then it is reasonable to ask for a contribution providing people can afford it."

"Seems a big jump from nothing to up to £70 plus travel time. could this be reduced or at least brought in gradually?"

"There again not fair on the people who have worked and have savings. It seems that these people are hit the hardest. Whilst other's without savings do not have to pay. The system is not fair."

"Again hitting those who have no relatives to look after the property. You could consider tendering this service out to third sector organisations to keep costs to a minimum"

Proposal 4c – Travel Costs for Visiting Clients

The council proposes to charge a fixed rate of £40.00 per hour for travel costs when staff visit clients, which is what the Court of Protection allows.

What do you think about this proposal?

In total, we received 151 valid responses to this proposal. 33 respondents, or 22%, were broadly for the proposal, with 35% against. On this proposal, a relatively high number of people (24) had mixed feelings, agreeing in principle but suggesting an alternative, usually at a lower cost. People tended to be referring to a £40 flat fee on these occasions; many of the other suggestions related to charging on a distance or time basis, rather than a flat fee.

How will it affect you?

Of 142 responses to this question, 114 indicated that it would not impact them, though 4 of these suggested there may be a possible future impact.

26 people felt there would be a negative impact, primarily due to what was perceived to be a high cost per visit.

Sample of Responses

“That seems a huge cost from zero to £40 per journey. One trip within Doncaster may be 10 miles there and 10 back but that may be the most; is that really £40? And what of visits of only a couple of miles? Costs for those in the farther reaches should be the same; I can understand that but it does seem rather high at £40.”

“Agreed as this is what the Court of Protection allows and is not required to be provided as a service by the council”

“I don't feel that is justified as £40 would fill a tank for most cars-I feel you should set a mileage charge which would be fairer”

“This should be staggered costs related to the assets of the person in question so that it is fair”

“Per journey regardless of mileage - really is that the best idea in the world - how about a £40 cap but have a tiered system like you are proposing with the monthly fee. Why should someone who lives 1 mile travel distance pay the same as someone who lives 14 - and why on earth should those who may have problems finding £2.03 per month for you to do any work at all suddenly have to find £40 just to have someone come to talk to them. I don't pay that much for a vet visit”

“I would offer another option, telephone or IT support to avoid a visit”

“No should be free”

“This is fair and right.”

Proposal 5 – Arrangements for people who pay for their own care in full

At the moment the council helps around 450 people in this group to arrange their care without charging them. The majority of people in this group make their own care arrangements using free information and advice that is available. It is proposed that an annual charge of £300 is introduced to contribute to the costs of providing the services described above and to encourage people to arrange their own care where appropriate, using information and advice that the council is already required to provide.

What do you think about this proposal?

In total, we received 148 valid responses to this proposal. 43 respondents, or 29%, were broadly for the proposal, with 34% against. This proposal had a larger than normal proportion of people with philosophical objections, feeling that it disproportionately penalised those who had planned ahead and saved for retirement. A number of respondents felt that by depleting service users' savings quicker, this would shorten the time before people required financial support from the state. Some people suggested an alternative to a £300 lump sum payment, such as a staggered fee or payment by instalments.

How will it affect you?

Of 139 responses to this question, 121 indicated that it would not impact them, though 8 of these were concerned about a future impact.

17 people felt there would be a negative impact, mostly due to higher costs being imposed.

Sample of Responses

"I cannot imagine it would cost anywhere near £300 to assist clients, whom will have to pay for everything themselves when they are in the care home. From everything I am reading today I am surprised you are even offering any assistance to anyone. I am sure you have carried out a Lean assessment to find out which vulnerable group you can use to fund your council projects. The groups you are choosing are often in a position that they cannot help themselves, sometimes families do not understand the system and vast sums of money are deducted from these customers without their knowledge or understanding."

"I think that if people have that kind of savings amount then £300 seems a fair amount"

"No don't agree, why should the residents of Doncaster who have saved for their retirement/ future care be penalised even more. Those just above the threshold would suffer. What would they get for that money, there usually left to get on with it"

"When broken down into a weekly charge more acceptable for the service provided"

"I wonder how this charge compares to the expenses of those who arrange their own care? It should be comparable or less, but the cost to council tax payers should be recouped if the service user can afford it"

"could this be paid in instalments? consider some may struggle to pay it and not have access to services as a result."

Proposal 6 – Maximum weekly costs for residential care

No matter how much a home care and support package costs, the council will only charge those who are deemed able to afford to pay a maximum of £429.20 per week. For some people it costs more than this for their care and support package, but the council does not ask for more than the maximum amount. The proposal is to take away the maximum amount and instead charge the full cost of the service provided to those people who can afford to pay.

What do you think about this proposal?

In total, we received 149 valid responses to this proposal. 40 respondents, or 27%, were broadly for the proposal, with 38% against. A high proportion of people had a philosophical objection to this proposal, feeling that it unfairly penalised those who had planned for retirement. A number of respondents proposed alterations to the proposal.

How will it affect you?

Of 134 responses to this question, 115 indicated that it would not impact them, though 8 of these were concerned about a future impact.

17 people felt there would be a negative impact, mostly due to higher costs being imposed, with some concerned about the health and wellbeing impact of charging the full cost.

Sample of Responses

“I'm honestly not sure how I feel about this - just because a person is deemed to be able to afford the £429 does not always mean they can afford any more than that. Does this then mean you will be responsible for the removal of required services based on the fact that they can't pay more - probably. Will you be responsible for the potential reduction in mental health - probably. Does this idea need revisiting - most definitely”

“I think it should just be one set price.”

“This is the worst proposal because it gives the idea that the potential charges could escalate to unknown levels. A constant source of worry. No idea at what stage the care becomes unaffordable. Very distressing”

“Although in principal this is fair it feels as if the people who have saved for their later life are penalised for this.”

“Fair, if the financial assessment is done fairly.”

“This is a stupid issue. Everyone should pay the full cost of their care no matter how much it is, if they are judged to be able to afford it.”

“The maximum will be in excess of income and therefore very quickly erode any savings and will require additional financial support”

“Yet again those who have thought about the future suffer”

Proposal 7 – Enhanced daily living component of PIP

The proposal is to move towards including all of the enhanced rate of PIP in financial assessments from April 2020. If a person receiving PIP can show that they pay for additional care at night, their night care costs will be looked at as part of the assessment.

What do you think about this proposal?

In total, we received 146 valid responses to this proposal. 58 respondents, or 40%, were broadly for the proposal, with 30% against. There was a general feeling among those agreeing that it was fair to include all of a person's income. Among those against the proposal, many felt that it penalised those with legitimately higher living costs, and that it would unfairly leave them out of pocket.

How will it affect you?

Of 136 responses to this question, 101 indicated that it would not impact them, though of these were concerned about a future impact.

34 people felt there would be a negative impact, primarily as they felt they might not be able to afford the required level of care. Two people indicated that they may have to stop some services were this proposal to be implemented.

Sample of Responses

“That seems counterproductive too. The PIP was meant for other costs than carers. So those costs would be impossible to make and care be reduced.”

“The enhanced component is given to those who need it. They will have gone through a rigorous assessment by PIP and so will need this amount. Again this proposal will penalise those who are the most vulnerable just for being that!”

“This is reasonable proposal as that is what the benefit is for”

“Yes absolutely we should include PIP that's what the money is for. The problem with these payments is that too many people see it as additional personal income. It's like the families where a child with a disability is provided with a car, the parent takes this to work every day and the council pays for home to school transport.”

“It affects my mental and emotional well being. I thought I lived in a decent community. I think it means I will move location.”

“Makes sense. All money a person earns or has access to needs to go into the money assessment.”

“I believe the government not the Council should determine what you should include or not”

Proposal 8 – Financial Assessments for residential respite and short stay care

The Care Act allows options to carry out this financial assessment under residential or non-residential rules. Up to now, the Council has chosen non-residential rules. Where the respite and short stay care is residential based, the proposal is that in future the financial assessment for this service would be carried out under the residential care rules.

What do you think about this proposal?

In total, we received 143 valid responses to this proposal. 38 respondents, or 27%, were broadly for the proposal, with 29% against. A large proportion of respondents did not express an opinion either way, with many seeming to not understand the parlance.

How will it affect you?

Of 136 responses to this question, 114 indicated that it would not impact them, though 6 of these were concerned about a future impact.

19 people felt there would be a negative impact; the social and family impact of respite care onto non-service users was mentioned as an impact, and several people indicated that they would have to stop services.

Sample of Responses

“It should be the going rate, the service user will still be in receipt of state benefits for 28 days whilst in care so I think a higher rate needs to be set.”

“I think you need to let people know exactly what the difference is - too vague to form a detailed assessment as to whether this is a good option or not. What is involved in the decision making? What is the financial difference? Define residential and non-residential in this context - to most people reading this the person going into short term respite is not a resident of the facility so is this what it means - if not provide accurate descriptors.”

“It seems sensible to have one set of rules.”

“Should not change the financial assistance given. Enough carers feel guilty about putting relatives in respite etc when they really have need to, in order to maintain their own health and sanity (so reducing the need for other paid for social care in the future due to ill health/exhaustion) adding additional fees will discourage carers even further.”

“This is a sensible proposal residential rules for residential care. Why would you do anything different? The big question is why the council would take their current approach in the first place.”

“respite is needed for a reason, if becomes more expensive people may not take advantage of respite & lives could become endangered”

“I don't think this is fair, some people may need to use this service after coming out of hospital and should not have to pay that amount when it's out of their control”

“I don't have any experience to understand what this might mean in practice”

Proposal 9 – Minimum Income Guarantee

From April 2020, the council is proposing to move towards the government set MIG rates and use these in financial assessments instead of working out its own rate.

What do you think about this proposal?

In total, we received 143 valid responses to this proposal. 46 respondents, or 32%, were broadly for the proposal, with 44% against. Those in favour tended to feel it was fair to apply the same rules as the rest of the country, with some question over why Doncaster set a higher rate in the first place. Others felt the higher rate was fairer than the government rate, and were against reducing the rate.

How will it affect you?

Of 137 responses to this question, 88 indicated that it would not impact them, though 10 of these were concerned about a future impact.

46 people felt there would be a negative impact, the largest number of any proposal other than the home alarm question. As well as the financial impact, several people mentioned a wellbeing concern.

Sample of Responses

“the rate should be set by the local authority that can adapt this to local cost of living”

“Think Doncaster has been generous here, however its easier to give than take it away. I personally think its right to move towards the government set rate”

“Makes sense, Doncaster has very low living costs”

“they need as much as they can towards living cost so no the rate should stay”

“Not happy with this one. Government rates reflect National Average which may have a detrimental affect on local Communities. I think it should be a Local Rate set locally in the knowledge of Local circumstances with the Government rate as being the minimum.”

“Is MIG mandatory? is it population and demographic weighted? Experience tells me the minimum will be below what people need to live well!”

“I don't agree as it depends where you live in the country, as the cost of living varies so greatly depending on areas/regions.”

“I'm concerned that the present government's idea of the money one needs for "everyday living costs" is unrealistically low. I think the current rate should continue, perhaps mitigated by smaller increases each year until it does match the national rate”

“Why should those living in this Council be better provided for than those in other (maybe close by) areas! I think it is fair to use the Government MIG rate”

Are there any other comments you would like to make?

Top Level Code	Theme of Comment	Count of Responses
Positive	Financial	0
	Health or Wellbeing	0
	Philosophical	6
	Family/Social Impact	0
	Other Positive	5
Mixed	Mixed Feelings	11
	Process - Positive	1
	Process - Negative	13
	Indifference	2
	Not Applicable	52
Negative	Financial	13
	Health or Wellbeing	7
	Philosophical	4
	Family/Social Impact	2
	Other Negative	7
Suggestion	Alternative Proposals	12
Other	Request for Clarification	2

The 'any other comments' responses tended not to focus on the proposals themselves, and where applicable tended to represent an overall feeling towards the process or towards the local authority in general. A relatively small proportion of responses were explicitly positive or negative.

Sample of Responses

"I am concerned with the continuing increase to council tax especially with the inclusion of covering social care costs. I feel the council tax should not increase."

"Being almost 70 years old, I thought we paid over our working life through Council Tax and National Insurance contributions for health care in our later years."

"I think there needs to be open and honest consultation and research in to potential impact on other services, such as NHS/RDASH in case their budgets are impacted. Frank and honest discussions about cost savings and the need to increase revenue or public may think the council are just trying to make money, instead of trying to maximise resources."

"Yes. If people are able to pay for their care or support then they should. This will allow DMBC to focus and prioritise it's long term goals."

"We went through this a few years ago and wasn't listened to then so don't think you will now the truth is never given"

"Old people 90 years and above should not have to pay for their care needs this is extortionate."

Part 2: Supplementary Analysis

Purpose

To provide further narrative based on feedback gained from focus groups and representations outside the main dataset.

Methodology

The analysis provided is based on a report from the Consultation Institute, containing detailed responses from focus groups, and has been analysed using a qualitative sentiment analysis.

Responses are not unique to individuals, rather they are extracted from a series of discussions and may represent the sentiment of a group. The intention of these focus groups was to gain broad understanding and themes around the same basic primary lines of enquiry, these being:

- How do respondents feel about the proposals
- How will the proposals affect existing service users and their carers/family members

In total, 27 participants including service users and carers attended the series of focus groups. A further 11 representations and opinions were received outside the standard survey data set, and have been considered as part of this additional analysis. This analysis also considers feedback from Active Independence, a Doncaster-based charity, and from the Doncaster and District Deaf Society.

Format for Focus Groups

Doncaster Council asked the Consultation Institute to independently chair a series of focus groups on its behalf, and provided facilitators to these focus groups where required. Feedback was gathered from small group and whole group discussion, and was fed back to Doncaster Council by the Consultation Institute.

Proposal List

Proposal 1 - Home Alarm Service

Proposal 2 - Care at Home

Proposal 3a - Day Opportunities

Proposal 3b – Transport

Proposal 4a - Charging for Administration of Appointeeship

Proposal 4b - Charge for Protection of Property Costs

Proposal 4c - Travel Costs for Visiting Clients

Proposal 5 - Arrangements for people who pay for their own care in full

Proposal 6 - Maximum Weekly Charge for Non-Residential Services

Proposal 7 - Enhanced daily living component of Personal Independence Payment

Proposal 8 - Financial Assessments for Residential Respite & Short Stay Care

Proposal 9 - The Minimum Income Guarantee (MIG)

Proposal 1 – Home Alarm Service

Across the respondents, there was a broad feeling that the charges were reasonable considering the service provided, and that the response service was good value compared to the alternatives available, such as carers. Several respondents said that they were users of the service, and were satisfied. The necessity of charging was accepted to a large extent, particularly among those who seemed idealistically opposed to the idea of paying for care, there was nevertheless an acceptance that the current economic climate for local authorities demanded it. The service is seen as a valuable means of living independently at home, and comparatively the participants felt that it was worth paying more for if necessary.

There was some question over the nature of the service, such as whether the responders were trained to perform lifts if the service user fell. Some participants disagreed with the charges increasing, with some feeling that no charge at all would be preferable; this largely mirrored the pattern of responses to the consultation questionnaire. Vulnerability concerns were raised, with the idea that people were being forced into paying or losing the service. Similarly to the questionnaire, those respondents who made additional suggestions tended to favour a single service, for both alarm and response, at a slightly lower overall cost. This proposal generated a substantial amount of discussion among participants, this may be due to it typically being the first proposal offered for discussion.

Proposal 2 - Care at Home

Respondents tended to be in favour of this proposal, with more than half of all comments suggesting that it was a fair thing to charge for the care supplied, where a service user has been deemed able to pay for it. There were some concerns raised that this might lead to an increased vulnerability for some, who might try to make do with a single carer due to cost. There was some confusion about why direct payment clients and commissioned clients were charged differently, and overall people felt that we should move towards charging for both carers if required.

Proposal 3a - Day Opportunities

The different parts of proposal 3 were often discussed together, and created a reasonably large amount of discussion. Generally, this proposal tended to attract negative comments, particularly among those likely to be directly affected, and their families. There was some feeling that the attendance increase indicated was too much to impose in one go, and several expressed a moral objection to the idea that new service users would have to pay more, and be treated differently to existing ones. This was particularly noted for those who may have to pay the higher-level support fee of £76. Some objections rested on the double fee increases for both transport and attendance, with a feeling that one or the other would be more palatable in one go. These feelings tended to mirror those expressed by the main survey cohort.

Some respondents did agree that it was fair to charge a fair amount if they have been assessed as being able to afford it. There were a number of queries relating to what defined 'high-level' support against a normal level, with some attendees unfamiliar with the terminology.

Proposal 3b – Transport

This proposal generated a large amount of discussion among some focus groups, and in contrast to the proposal to increase day charges, it was broadly supported. Comments from service users and their families focused on the value of the transport service when compared to the alternatives, and made reference to the fact that transport services included someone to accompany and care for service users on the way, whereas buses or taxis would not. This proposal also generated a number of queries around alternative provisions being used instead by those who were able to travel independently, such as commissioned taxi services, mobility cars or public transport. Alternative proposals to charge based on the distance or time of journey, rather than have a flat rate irrespective of distance, were suggested by some. Overall there were very few objections to this proposal, though one focus group did query whether this was the beginning of privatising transport services by pushing people towards using taxis.

Proposal 4a - Charging for Administration of Appointeeship

This proposal generated relatively little discussion among groups, with a general feeling that these charges were fair, particularly when compared to the charges a private company might levy. The value of the service was praised, with comments suggesting that for them, it was more important for the service to remain available, even if it were to start costing. Negative comments tended to focus on the administration of SAPAT, rather than the principle of introducing charges. A minority of comments were against the proposal, suggesting it was attacking the most vulnerable, who did not have any choice over whether they were taking the service. Several comments asked for clarification on what alternatives might cost if they were provided privately, and were therefore unsure whether the proposal was monetarily fair or not.

Proposal 4b - Charge for Protection of Property Costs

This proposal received mixed responses, with some feeling that the charges were entirely fair, or mostly fair. Some respondents were philosophically opposed to the idea that someone who has saved for retirement would then be penalised, and suggested that this service should be free for everyone. Some respondents felt that some of the fees were too high, for example the £70 for property searches, and there was some lack of clarity on what 'away from home' meant in this context. Overall this generated relatively little discussion.

Proposal 4c - Travel Costs for Visiting Clients

Responses tended to focus on requesting clarification, rather than agreeing or disagreeing fully with the proposals; in particular there were concerns over who would define when visits could take place. For example, one participant suggested that infrequent visits might be affordable, but frequent ones would not, and asked if the service user or council would decide when a visit was required. On average, this tended to generate less discussion than average among proposals, and responses from focus groups and additional representations were mixed. Some participants suggested a cap for potentially very high charges, if long-distance journeys were required.

Proposal 5 - Arrangements for people who pay for their own care in full

This proposal received mixed feedback, but overall the focus groups were supportive of the idea, with some questioning why Doncaster Council performs this function at all. However, some group members felt that this would be a negative thing to do, and had philosophical objections to adding further burdens to people who have saved and prepared all their lives, only to then have to pay for more things that those without savings did not have to pay for. There was relatively little discussion within the groups on this proposal, and it was not clear if it would affect any respondents.

Proposal 6 - Maximum Weekly Charge for Non-Residential Services

Responses and discussion on proposal 6 tended to be similar to that for proposal 5, with a broad support for the idea that people should pay if they are deemed financially able, but some philosophical concerns over the burden it would place on people who had savings, compared to people who did not have them. A recurring theme was the criticism of only applying these rules to new service users, which was morally objectionable for some participants. Alternative proposals were made by some, suggesting a smaller increase for all service users, but keep some degree of subsidy for new and current users. There were concerns that this proposal would simply act to deplete a service user's available funds sooner, placing financial pressure on the council in the long run anyway.

Proposal 7 - Enhanced daily living component of Personal Independence Payment (PIP)

Responses to this proposal varied, with some feeling concerned about increases in vulnerability of service users if this were to go ahead. The proposal received some limited support, but the majority of responses were either negative, or sought further clarification on the proposal. Further concerns were raised about the pressure this might place on carers, who would have to pick up any slack if the proposal went ahead. This proposal received an above-average amount of discussion, particularly among service users and family members who felt they would be personally affected. Some concern was raised that some respondents felt that the enhanced PIP rate should be reserved for users to spend on other things than social care, rather than being included.

Proposal 8 - Financial Assessments for Residential Respite & Short Stay Care

This proposal was widely discussed, but discourse tended to focus on clarifications and questions about the proposal. Some respondents felt that this might put pressure on people who would stop using respite services, which would increase vulnerability for both carers and service users. However, a similar number of responses were supportive of the idea, on the condition that it was fully clear which services were covered. The status of Shared Lives was queried a number of times, and other respondents wanted more clarification on the differences between the assessment types proposed.

Proposal 9 - The Minimum Income Guarantee (MIG)

This proposal was widely discussed, and received a broadly negative response, particularly from service users who felt they would be directly affected. Many felt that they were already under significant pressure financially, and that any further reduction in their available funds would leave them vulnerable to poverty, homelessness and debt. Some discussion took place querying why Doncaster set this higher rate in the first place, but overall most participants felt that the government MIG rate was unrealistically low and had known issues. Some respondents queried whether the changing political landscape, and any new funding approaches of the national government, would be considered prior to any changes being made.

General Discussion and Other Comments

Participants tended to take a negative view of the proposals, and cited some concerns with the standard of care provided in Doncaster, particularly around assessment waiting times, consistency between service areas, and the links and communication between services. However, a number of respondents praised Doncaster's historically good service for service users with learning disabilities, reflected in the opinion that Doncaster has tended to provide above the required standard in some areas, such as the MIG. Many participants understood the financial pressures that local authorities may have, but there was a feeling that the proposals would target the most vulnerable, and some suggestions were made to increase the amount taken in general taxation and council tax instead. There were recurring themes and additional comments made about the fairness of targeting those who have saved, while others who didn't put money away in case of emergency would continue to receive the same care for free. Overall, the focus groups tended to be more polarised than the overall respondent population, with fewer indifferent or neutral responses among this cohort. Some respondents expressed concern with the process, and whether sufficient support was provided to make the consultation accessible for all stakeholders.

Qualitative Coding Framework

Part 1 Questions – What do you think?

Top-Level Category	2nd-Level Category	Code
Agree	Specific Comment from Service User about good value	A1
	Agree (Other)	A2
Neither Agree nor disagree	Partial Agreement - Alternative Proposal Made	B1
	Indifferent	B2
	Answer not applicable/blank	B3
Disagree	Cost Objection	C1
	Health or Vulnerability Objection	C2
	Philosophical Objection	C3
	General Disagree	C4
Clarification Request	Respondent asked for clarification	X1

The framework asks the coder to consider the sentiment behind each response (agree, disagree, neither agree nor disagree, clarification request) and then to assign an alphanumeric code to the response.

Part 2 Questions – How might this affect you?

Top-Level Category	2nd-Level Category	Specific Concern?	Code
It Will Affect Me Negatively	Financial Impact		D1
	Health/Wellbeing Impact	No specific concern	D2
		Concern about stopping service	D3
	Family/Social Impact		D4
	Other/Not Specified Impact		D5
It Won't Affect Me Negatively	General/No Answer		E1
	Concern - Possible Future Impact		E2
	Concern - Specific/Certain Future Impact		E3
Not Applicable	Not Applicable		F1
Positive Impact	Any Positive Impact		G1
Clarification Request	Respondent asked for clarification		X1

The framework asks the coder to identify whether, based on the response, the respondent feels the specific proposal will affect them, and then to assign an alphanumeric code to the response. Negative impacts were not limited to the respondent themselves, and could include impact felt by family members or proxies.

Phased introduction

Top-Level Category	2nd-Level Category	Code
Positive	Agree (General)	J1
	Agree - Conditional	J2
Negative	Disagree (General)	K1
	Disagree - Conditional	K2
Mixed/NA	Some Phased, Some Now	L1
	Indifferent	L2
	Not Applicable	L3
	Suggestion	L4
Other	Clarification Request	X1
	Conditional - Unspecified	X2

This framework asks the coder to identify how the respondent feels about a phased introduction for charges.

Are there any other comments you would like to make?

Top-Level Category	2nd-Level Category	Code
Positive Comments	Financial	P1
	Health or Wellbeing	P2
	Philosophical	P3
	Family/Social Impact	P4
	Other Positive	P5
Middle-Range	Mixed Feelings	Q1
	Process - Positive	Q2
	Process - Negative	Q3
	Indifference	Q4
	Not Applicable	Q5
Suggestion	Any Alternative Proposal	S1
Negative Comments	Financial	R1

	Health or Wellbeing	R2
	Philosophical	R3
	Family/Social Impact	R4
	Other Negative	R5
Other	Request for Clarification	X1

This framework asks the coder to assign a category to the respondent's comments, concerning any other thoughts they had. As a very open question, it was not viable to assign categories at a greater depth than those shown.