

## Equality Impact Assessment (1)

### Section 1: About the proposal

<p><b>Title of Proposal</b></p> <p><i>Mental Health Services</i></p> <p><i>2223-3 - Review of specific high cost care packages</i></p>
<p><b>Intended outcome of proposal</b></p> <p><i>This proposal is intended to deliver £115k in recurring savings during 2022/23. It is also intended to ensure that individuals are supported appropriately and encouraged to live independently as far as possible and appropriate.</i></p> <p><i>The saving is a prudent estimate made in respect of known likely changes to high-cost packages, taking into consideration that some of the anticipated changes may not be deliverable due to users' individual circumstances or worsening of their condition. The £115k target makes allowance for individual circumstances changing.</i></p> <p><i>The expected increase in the social care pay uplift will be funded and the 22/23 financial plan will include a reasonable allocation for new care packages (based on prior year values).</i></p>
<p><b>Description of proposal</b></p> <p><i>Perform a care package review of current high-cost packages to re-assess what is the most appropriate level of care that the users should receive. It is anticipated that this process will result in a reduction in the number of hours or a change in the way in which services are provided (from high to reduced support and surveillance or from forensic structures to community based structures).</i></p> <p><i>Clinically appropriate alternatives to the current and care providers will be identified, to ensure both the right level of care and improved value for money.</i></p> <p><i>The review process will continue to ensure that individuals receive the correct level of support. Judgements on this will continue to be made on a needs assessment basis and will not be driven by the proposal to reduce costs. Relevant SG guidelines (or the guidelines applicable for each particular case) will continue to be applied funding allocations for each case will be appropriate to individual circumstances and risk assessments.</i></p>
<p><b>HSCP Strategic Priorities to which the proposal contributes</b></p> <p><i>Working together to improve potential of our people;</i></p> <p><i>Working together to improve potential of our communities;</i></p> <p><i>Working together to improve potential of our areas; and</i></p> <p><i>"People in Argyll and Bute will live longer, healthier and independent lives"</i></p>

<b>Lead officer details</b>	
Name of lead officer	Nicola Gillespie
Job title	Service Manager - MH and Addictions
Department	Health - MH and Addictions
<b>Appropriate officer details</b>	
Name of appropriate officer	
Job title	
Department	
Sign-off of EIA	Nicola Gillespie
Date of sign-off	10/03/2022

<b>Who will deliver the proposal?</b>
Mental Health Services - NHS

## Section 2: Evidence used in the course of carrying out EIA

<b>Consultation / engagement</b>
<p><i>Social Worker engagement / interview with Service Users / Families as appropriate in order to assess current care needs and conduct risk assessments.</i></p> <p><i>Engagement is now being progressed as a central co-ordinated function of the HSCP to ensure it aligns with National Standards.</i></p> <p><i>Meetings with Social Work Lead, Service Manager and Finance.</i></p>

<b>Data</b>
<p><i>Ledger transactions (Cost details 201021, Care Package Ledger Transactions, HA5080 Care Package report as at m6, Complex Care Packages, Current Care Package Expenditure, Current Budget) Inflation and Cost projections, Government funding allocation.</i></p>

<b>Other information</b>
<p><i>Changes to service will impact on a small number of service users who will continue to be supported by the service in an appropriate way. It is noted that the service users affected all have significant / acute mental health issues.</i></p> <p><i>As high cost care packages normally apply to MH service users with very complex profiles and needs ( 24h surveillance, forensic etc.) a downward review of such care packages is dependent upon the user showing improvement or stability. In these cases it is appropriate to transition to less restrictive environments (with appropriate support) in the community and closer to their relatives.</i></p> <p><i>The expectation is that the impact of those users will be positive as after the review, they would be receiving a more appropriate level of care within their communities. A full risk assessment will be completed in each case prior to any change.</i></p>

<b>Gaps in evidence</b>
#NA

### Section 3: Impact of proposal

#### Impact on service users:

	Negative	No impact	Positive	Don't know
<b>Protected characteristics:</b>				
Age		X		
Disability			X	
Ethnicity		X		
Sex		X		
Gender reassignment		X		
Marriage and Civil Partnership		X		
Pregnancy and Maternity		X		
Religion		X		
Sexual Orientation		X		
<b>Fairer Scotland Duty:</b>				
Mainland rural population		X		
Island populations		X		
Low income		X		
Low wealth		X		
Material deprivation		X		
Area deprivation		X		
Socio-economic background		X		
Communities of place		X		
Communities of interest		X		

#### If you have identified any negative impacts on service users, give more detail here:

NA

#### If any 'don't knows' have been identified, when will impacts on these groups be clear?

NA

#### How has 'due regard' been given to any negative impacts that have been identified?

NA

#### Impact on service deliverers (including employees, volunteers etc.):

	Negative	No impact	Positive	Don't know
<b>Protected characteristics:</b>				
Age		X		
Disability		X		
Ethnicity		X		
Sex		X		
Gender reassignment		X		
Marriage and Civil Partnership		X		
Pregnancy and Maternity		X		
Religion		X		
Sexual Orientation		X		
<b>Fairer Scotland Duty:</b>				
Mainland rural population		X		
Island populations		X		
Low income		X		
Low wealth		X		
Material deprivation		X		

	Negative	No impact	Positive	Don't know
Area deprivation		X		
Socio-economic background		X		
Communities of place		X		
Communities of interest		X		

**If you have identified any negative impacts on service deliverers, give more detail here:**  
#NA

**If any 'don't knows' have been identified, when will impacts on these groups be clear?**  
#NA

**How has 'due regard' been given to any negative impacts that have been identified?**  
#NA

#### Section 4: Interdependencies

**Is this proposal likely to have any knock-on effects for any other activities carried out by or on behalf of the HSCP?** #NA

**Details of knock-on effects identified**  
#NA

#### Section 5: Monitoring and review

**Monitoring and review**  
*Monthly review of Financial Information.*  
*Quarterly Meetings with Lead officer and Social Worker Lead for follow up based on individual risk assessments and on-going support and monitoring processes.*