



Falkirk Council
Chief Executive Office

Enquiries to: Mary Pitcaithly
Direct Dial: 01324 506002
Date: 19 December 2014

Mr Andrew Howlett
Assistant Clerk to the Public Petitions Committee
Public Petitions Committee
T3.40
Scottish Parliament
Edinburgh
EH99 1SP

Emailed to: petitions@scottish.parliament.uk

Dear Mr Howlett

Falkirk Council Response to request for information relating to Public Petition PE1533

1. Introduction

This response has been prepared at the request of the Public Petitions Committee which has asked for views on the above petition. The Petition calls on the Scottish Government to abolish all local authority charges for non-residential care services as under Part 1, Paragraph 1, Subsection (4) of the Community Care & Health (Scotland) Act 2002. The Committee has asked the Council to respond to the following two questions.

2. Question 1

What are your views on what the petition seeks and the discussions that took place at the meeting on 11 November 2014?

- 2.1. I would offer the following comment. Acceptance of this petition and implementation of the action which is called for would require a significant injection of additional resources to Councils in order to meet the rising costs of care. The abolition of charges for non-residential care would involve a loss of income of approximately £1.1m to Falkirk Council in relation to social care services which are already under significant pressure. It would also create an anomaly between those people in receipt of residential care, who are subject to charging arrangements, and those who receive non-residential social care who would not be subject to charging were the petition to be accepted.

Chief Executive: Mary Pitcaithly OBE

Municipal Buildings,
Falkirk FK1 5RS.
LP 3 Falkirk-2.
Telephone: 01324 506070
Fax: 01324 506001

www.falkirk.gov.uk

3. Question 2

What are the reasons for the non-residential social care charges in your local authority being relatively low compared to other local authorities?

3.1. Falkirk Council agreed, in principle, to introduce charges for non-residential social care as part of the budget setting process in February 2010, relating to the 2010/2011 Revenue Budget. The background to this “in principle” decision was that the Council’s budget for Social Work Services had come under increasing pressure over the previous 4 financial years resulting in overspends ranging from 0.9% to 4.9%. It was considered to be untenable for the Council to maintain a position of no charges in the face of increasing budget pressures and it was also noted at that time that most other Scottish Local Authorities already had well established systems of charging. Following the agreement “in principle” and the setting of a target income of £1m, a consultation was embarked upon and detailed proposals were presented and approved by Members of Falkirk Council in September 2010. A copy of the report outlining these proposals and the rationale behind them is attached for the information of the Committee.

3.2. The proposals which were made reflected the key themes to come out of the consultation, which were that the charging policy should:

- Be equitable across care groups;
- Be affordable for service users;
- Include measures to ensure income maximisation;
- Be cost effective.

Service user feedback also advocated that charges should be introduced incrementally.

3.3. The proposals which were approved by Members, therefore, were described as stage 1 and covered the introduction of charges which would be **capped at an upper limit** of:

- £23.90 per week for adults under the age of 65, payable only where the person was in receipt of middle or higher rate DLA and whose income was above the thresholds set out in the COSLA charging guidance.
- £13.00 per week for older people, with the maximum only being chargeable if someone was in receipt of a shopping service, domestic only home care and MECS and where their income was above the COSLA threshold.

3.4. In the following budget rounds, no further changes were proposed to the charging arrangements until February 2014 when it was agreed that the capped charges would increase in line with inflation since 2010 to £26.00 and £14.10 per week respectively.

3.5. Since the introduction of charges, the net income which has been received has been:

2011/12	£1,021,000
2012/13	£1,106,000
2013/14	£1,110,000

I trust that this information will be of interest to the Committee.

Yours sincerely

CHIEF EXECUTIVE

Our ref: AA1214/MP/IP

FALKIRK COUNCIL

Subject: DEVELOPMENT OF A CHARGING POLICY FOR NON-RESIDENTIAL ADULT SOCIAL CARE SERVICES

Meeting: FALKIRK COUNCIL

Date: 7th SEPTEMBER 2010

Author: ACTING DIRECTOR OF SOCIAL WORK SERVICES

1. PURPOSE

- 1.1 The purpose of this report is to advise Members on the findings from a recent consultation exercise relating to charging for non-residential social care services and to make proposals for how a fair and equitable charging policy can be developed and implemented in Falkirk Council.

2. BACKGROUND

- 2.1 Since 2006, the Social Work overspend has increased incrementally as outlined below:

	%
• 2006/07 £0.505m	0.9
• 2007/08 £1.663m	2.7
• 2008/09 £3.249m	4.9
• 2009/10 £2.889m	3.6

These increases reflect increased demand for services as well as increased costs of services. The increased demand is certainly expected to continue in future based on current demographic projections, with there now being the additional pressure arising from anticipated reductions in levels of grant provided to Local Authorities.

- 2.2 On 10th February 2010 in recognition of the demographic and financial pressures facing the Council as a whole and Social Work services in particular, Members agreed in principle to the development and introduction of a charging policy for non-residential social care services, with the aim of achieving an income of circa £1m. It was further agreed that the policy should be consistent with the COSLA guidance and should be developed in consultation with key stakeholders.
- 2.3 At the time of the report in February 2010 it was anticipated that the promoted use of Independent Living Fund (ILF) monies would assist in reducing financial pressure on the Social Work budget. However, since that time the Independent Living Fund has been closed to all new applications due to the increasing financial pressures. No new applications will be considered this year (2010/11) and existing recipients of these funds will not be eligible for any increased funds should their care needs increase – other than in exceptional circumstances (guidance is not yet clear on what these might be). The ILF is under ongoing review, which

may well see further restrictions on the levels of funding that will be afforded existing recipients.

- 2.4 The combination of factors highlighted in 2.1 and 2.3 bring ever increasing pressure on the Social Work budget both in the current year and in coming years. The Independent Budget Review (IBR) was released on 29th July 2010 and it highlights the pressures being faced by all Public Sector bodies. The purpose of the Review was to inform public and Parliamentary debate in advance of the next UK Comprehensive Spending Review (which will cover the four years 2011-12, 2012-13, 2013-14 and 2014-15) about the challenges and choices which will exist in a significantly constrained public spending environment.
- 2.5 The Independent Budget Review cites the appropriate use of charging (increase to existing charges and introduction of eligible new charges) as a principal tool for ensuring that vital services remain available to as wide a section of our communities as possible. The view expressed is that by charging those who can afford to pay we are better equipped to continue to subsidise the costs for those who cannot. This is the foundation for a robust but fair charging policy.
- 2.6 It should be noted at this stage that while personal and nursing care are free to people aged 65 and over, the Independent Budget Review does recommend that this will have to be given further consideration. The decisions made as a result of the Comprehensive Spending Review will indicate if there are likely to be changes in this policy. Accordingly, any agreed charging policy will be subject to possible change from April 2011.
- 2.7 The charging policy will sit alongside the national eligibility criteria previously agreed by Council and which is in the process of implementation. It is worth noting that the eligibility criteria cover all care groups within Community Care provision and this paper will propose that the charging policy does the same. This will ensure coherent and joined up policy across all groups for eligibility and charging.
- 2.8 The charging arrangements for residential care are covered by detailed national guidance. By contrast, the arrangements relating to non-residential social care services have been much more variable, resulting in inequities between service users whose needs are such that residential care is required and those service users who are still able to live in their own homes and communities. The implementation of a charging policy for non-residential care services would assist the Council to address this issue.
- 2.9 COSLA produces annual guidance relating to non-residential social care services. The COSLA guidance is not intended to be prescriptive. It provides a framework based on common principles and practice across Scotland. It is intended to assist Councils in demonstrating local accountability, in developing charging policies to support service objectives locally and in demonstrating they have followed best practice in arriving at locally determined charges.
- 2.10 A copy of the 2010-2011 guidance is attached at **Appendix 1**. The guidance describes the rationale for charging and acknowledges that charging policies have been developed in response to serious concerns about shortfalls in funding arising from limited budgets, growing demand and additional responsibilities. Charging policies have the primary objective of offsetting the costs of providing services and it is unusual for charges to cover the full economic cost of providing the service.
- 2.11 The guidance provides very helpful advice on how charging policies should be developed with the key messages being that Councils should:

- think strategically about charging policy and relate this to overall plans and objectives
 - develop new charging policies on the basis of a reliable information base
 - take account of a sufficient range of advice
 - undertake appropriate stakeholder consultation
 - manage the implementation process
 - ensure that policies are reasonable.
- 2.12 The guidance describes the current legal framework for charging and clarifies that Councils have the power to charge for the following adult non-residential care services:
- Practical assistance in the home and meals provided to physically disabled people
 - Lunch clubs
 - Domiciliary services, including meals on wheels
 - Community alarms
 - Laundry services for disabled people
 - Day care
 - Equipment and adaptations for disabled people
 - After care services for people with a mental illness
 - Wardens in sheltered housing.
- 2.13 Charges cannot be made for:
- Advice and information about the availability of services
 - Assessment of care needs or care management
 - Elements of food preparation for older people
 - Services and support of people with a mental illness who are subject to a Community Care Order or a Supervision Order
 - Nursing care and personal care for people aged over 65
 - Criminal Justice Social Work Services.
- 2.14 The guidance suggests a common approach to how income and capital is treated and also recommends that policies are developed relating to cases of hardship and relating to income maximisation. It recommends that policies should:
- adopt common age thresholds that should maintain a link with the Department for Work & Pensions (DWP) thresholds
 - have a common income threshold at which charges should apply, with the income level having a 16.5% “cushion” built-in to ensure that service users’ disposable income does not fall below subsistence levels of benefits
 - allow for a spectrum of charges that can be applied, depending on the percentage of excess income which may be charged. This is referred to as the taper level.

3. CONSULTATION

- 3.1 A consultation exercise was undertaken across existing homecare and community care service users and carers. This was done through a mix of sample surveying and focus groups. In addition, the views of representative and provider groups were also consulted through a focus group meeting. The consultation focused on the principles of a fair charging policy and the value that stakeholders placed on the services they receive or may need in the future.
- 3.2 The consultation was conducted by the Council for the Voluntary Sector (CVS) to provide an independent process into which participants could feel comfortable in making open and

honest expressions of views. The consultation was done from within existing resources in CVS and there were no additional costs to Falkirk Council in carrying out the process.

3.3 The findings of the process are appended to this report (**Appendix 2**) and the general themes are summarised as follows:

- Charging is generally accepted as being appropriate given the significant change in the financial climate
- Strong acceptance that where a person receives benefits which are specifically designed to be used to pay for care needs, then these funds should be used to contribute to the cost of care provided by the Local Authority
- There are differing views on which specific services should be charged for but overall the indication is that charging should see all those receiving services making a contribution to meeting costs rather than meeting the whole of the costs – based on the provision that individuals have been assessed as being able to afford to contribute
- Any charging policy introduced must be fair, open and transparent
- There should be a clear policy on how people with multiple services will be charged to ensure that no-one is paying more than they can afford
- The Council should ensure that all financial assessments are streamlined
- While current services are generally well regarded there should be a focus on maintaining and where possible improving the choice and quality of provision – charging will bring an increased sense of accountability
- The change period for introducing charging should be handled sensitively and if possible charges should in some way be limited – at least in the short term. This is to assist people in financially managing during the change to a charging regime
- People should receive detailed information on the cost they are being asked to fund – in particular people should receive some form of detailed invoice specifying what their charge relates to
- There is a need for continued dialogue and communication during the implementation of any charging policy

4. GENERAL PRINCIPLES FOR THE CHARGING POLICY

4.1 In developing a fair charging policy for non-residential adult social care services the underlying principles of the policy should reflect the key messages from the consultation exercise and should therefore:

- be equitable across care groups
- be affordable for service users
- include measures to ensure income maximisation
- be cost effective.

There was an expressed interest by a number of consultees to be involved in ongoing discussions during the implementation stages and the service will ensure a commitment to maintain communication.

4.2 The consultation set out to seek the views on key areas. These included:

- what services should be eligible for a charge;
- the levels of charges and whether this should be full cost or a contribution and;
- affordability and whether this should be based on full financial assessments or based on a capped fixed amount (linked to care related benefits).

The consultation findings would indicate the policy should cover:

- **all services**
- **reasonable cost*, where there is available disposable income**
- **full financial assessments.**

* The consultation indicated that there were very mixed views on whether charges should be in any way limited other than by affordability to the individual. Only just over 25% indicated that they felt charges should be capped below full cost recovery. However, the largest group response was ambivalence on the issue. The main deciding factor seemed to be affordability for the individual rather than across the board charging limits.

- 4.3 On the basis of the consultation findings it is recommended that the scope of the policy should be all adult non-residential care services listed in paragraph 2.12, with the exception of warden services as these are not applicable in Falkirk and equipment and adaptations as these are covered by separate policies. A separate policy relating to transport for service users should be developed which clarifies what transport is provided and which also makes proposals for how the costs associated with this should be met.
- 4.4 Following on from 4.2 the consultation suggested that while in the longer term limits to charges should be more influenced by affordability to individual circumstances, there should be across the board capping in the short term. This is to allow people to adjust gradually to charging. The national guidance on charging also notes that charges are not normally set at levels which cover the full cost of service provision.
- 4.5 There is however, a need to ensure that charge levels are set in a way that will achieve realistic and effective income against the true cost of the care being provided.
- 4.6 Where charges are not specifically for care but instead relate to food costs in day care services, meals on wheels and lunch clubs, it is proposed that there would be a move towards full cost recovery. This reflects the fact that whether or not people are in receipt of care services, their state benefits are intended to cover the cost of food.

5 PROPOSED LEVELS OF CHARGING

- 5.1 Having considered the national guidance and the consultation feedback the proposed charges have been set at rates which would both be reasonable for individuals, but would also realistically raise the levels of revenue required to sustain service delivery in the current financial environment and facing the increased levels of demand expected in the coming years.
- 5.2 In response to the particular request within service user feedback that charges should in some way be introduced incrementally, the following set of charges are proposed as stage 1 of a two stage process.
- 5.3 Stage 1 provides easy to understand flat rate charges which are straightforward to implement, along with very clear limits on maximum payments that people can expect to pay. Financial assessments will not be required as a matter of course. A capped level of maximum charge, however, will assist with ensuring affordability for all, while we will also ensure that no one falls below the nationally agreed income thresholds (set out in 6.2).
- 5.4 Income maximisation will be available to anyone and in particular to those at or near these thresholds to ensure that they have available all possible financial support. Charges would be subsidised up to full level, for anyone who would otherwise fall under the thresholds due to paying for services.

- 5.5 Stage 2 will be developed over the coming months and will be based on full financial assessment based on the principles set out in 2.14. It will also be developed in line with any changes following the Comprehensive Spending Review in October 2010 and in particular with reference to whether personal care continues to be deemed to be free to all those aged 65 and over.
- 5.6 The table below sets out the proposed stage 1 charging levels for each type of service. These charges are explained in 5.7 – 5.16.

Table 1 – Proposed charges

	Current charge	Proposed charge	Maximum estimated Income P/A	Implementation Date	2010/11 max estimated income
Lunch Clubs per meal	£1.70	£2.00	£2k	1 st November 2010	£1k
Meals on Wheels per meal	£1.70	£2.00	£12k	1 st November 2010	£5k
Day Care Meal provision Per meal	£1.70	£2.00	£6k	1 st November 2010	£2k
Shopping per delivery	No charge	£5	£100k	1 st November 2010	£42k
Community Alarm Service per week	No charge	£3	£900k	1 st November 2010	£375k
Domestic only Home Care per week	No charge	£5	£90k	1 st November 2010	£37k
Care at Home/Day Care (Adults – under 65) per week	No charge	£23.90 (cap)	£735k	1 st November 2010	£306k
Gross Total			£1.845m		£0.768m
Uncollectable income (10%)			£0.184m		£0.077m
Total			£1.661m		£0.691m

- 5.7 The charge of £2.00 proposed for lunch clubs, meals in Day Care services and meals-on-wheels is an incremental move towards the recovery of the true cost of provision of two course meals (currently £2.75). Other costs associated with the delivery of these services such as transport would continue to be met by the Council.
- 5.8 There are also meals provided in the Housing with Care service but these will be reviewed during stage 2 of the charging process to ensure that charges are set for the whole of the service delivered.
- 5.9 The shopping service has been free to this point. It costs approximately £10 per person to supply which is double the cost of similar services provided by supermarkets. The introduction of a charge at £5 per delivery would therefore be in line with the alternatives open to people and would be within the principle that people should only contribute to the cost rather than meet the full cost. This remains an optional service and therefore allows individuals to elect to choose an alternative to the council service.
- 5.10 Similarly the cost of Community Alarms has until now been free to service users. The proposed charge of £3.00 per week relates to the provision and administration of the alarm system, to the initial response from the control centre, and staff time towards installing and maintaining the alarm units. It does not cover the personal care service associated with it, which will remain free of charge.

As this is a flat charge there will be no additional costs to service users regardless of how often a response is required. Again, this means that we are charging only a contribution element rather than the whole cost of the service. This will ensure that the system can be made available to as many service users as possible and we would continue to promote this very cost effective way of ensuring vulnerable people are safe in their own homes.

5.11 All of the above proposals require minimal administration and are therefore cost effective to collect. This was seen as being an important element to people in the consultation exercise, ensuring that monies raised can be invested in the services rather than in the administration of the services.

5.12 **Care at Home Services**

5.12.1 There are particular differences between the nature of Care at Home services delivered to people under 65 and those over 65. In general people under 65 receive higher levels of hours of care and the needs are usually based on physical or mental disabilities (including Learning Disabilities). Over 65's are more usually in receipt of services due to limited mobility or some other form of limited capacity related to age rather than specifically any underlying physical or mental disability.

5.12.2 Despite these differences the establishment of a fair rate to charge for such services should be the same. Again, taking the principle of charging based on a contribution rather than the full cost it is suggested that a capped hourly rate is applied. This would also address the fact that external Care at Home providers have varying rates – otherwise individuals could pay significantly different costs for the same level of care, purely due to the particular care provider delivering their care. Setting a rate of £9/hr would represent 60% of the current In-House Homecare rate (£14.95) and this would ensure a rate which is below any external provider rate.

5.12.3 While in stage 2 we will calculate contributions based on full financial assessments, in stage 1 the options proposed for each group are nominal low level fees:

- Older People (Aged 65+) – flat rate charge of £5 per week for those in receipt of domestic only Homecare. This is based on such services only being supplied for ½hr per week.
- Adults (Under 65yrs) – capped (maximum) charge of £23.90 per week. This charge will be levied on anyone in receipt of Disability Living Allowance (DLA) – Middle or Higher Rate, and is at a rate equivalent to 50% of the middle rate of DLA. (This reflects the views expressed that benefits paid in respect of care needs should be used to contribute to the associated costs).

5.13 Day Care will generally be covered in stage 2 of implementation of a charging policy. However, it is often integral to care packages for under adults (under 65) who are in receipt of DLA. The cost of such Day Care is generally around £80 per day and is a considerable cost to the Council. Therefore in relation to the capped charge of £23.90 in 5.12.3, this will be set against the combined full cost of the Day Care and Care at Home costs (based on £9/hr) included in any one package.

5.14 Where an adult under 65yrs is not in receipt of DLA (middle or higher rate) then the charge will be suspended while an income maximisation assessment is carried out. If the person continues to not qualify for these levels of DLA then the council will meet the costs of the care package.

- 5.15 The charge will be levied to all Care at Home and Day Care service users aged under 65 and the invoice will include guidance on how to claim for exemption in a similar way to the process used for Council tax exemption.
- 5.16 A key issue in the national guidance on charging for non-residential care which was mirrored in the feedback during the consultation exercise was about fairness and equity. One area which requires to be addressed under stage 1 of this policy is the unequal practice of paying some people to attend Day Care and not others. We are therefore proposing that all such payments to individuals are stopped. In addition to bringing equality to all users of Day Care services, this also gives an equal platform on which means tested charging can be put in place under stage 2 of this process.
- 5.17 By stopping all such payments to attendees of Day Care there would be a saving of approx £18,000 per annum which is not reflected in Table 1 above. This money would be used to ensure that service users and their families have access to advice and assistance to maximise their incomes which is likely to be of considerable long term benefit.
- 5.18 The recommended options proposed to Council represent a moderate charging policy, reflecting Members aspirations and the concerns raised in the consultation process around affordability and managing the change over to a charging regime.

6. AFFORDABILITY

- 6.1 As already stated stage 2 of this process will introduce full financial assessments as the mechanism to ensure affordability. This process will make full use of the thresholds and associated tools set out in 2.13. It will also have regard to the treatment of any capital people may have.
- 6.2 In stage 1 we are using three tools to ensure that people do not fall below the income thresholds linked to the Department for Work & Pensions (DWP) levels. The rates set out below include the 16.5% cushion referred to in 2.14:

2010/11 rates

Single person under 60 years	£109
Single person over 60 years	£155
Couples under 60 years	£167
Couples over 60 years	£236

- 6.3 Firstly, we have set charges at affordable levels for each individual element of service provision.
- 6.4 Secondly, we are proposing capped (maximum) charges for care provision to both older people and adults under 65yrs. Food costs will be over and above these.
- The capped charge for older people would be a maximum **£13/week** and this would be based on someone getting a shopping service, domestic only Home Care service and also with MECS in place.
 - The capped charge for adults (under 65yrs) would be a maximum **£23.90** (and would only be payable where the person is in receipt of Disability Living Allowance (middle or higher rate))

- 6.5 Finally, anyone who would otherwise see their income fall below the thresholds set out in 6.2 will only be charged up to the amount which still protects the minimum income levels identified for their circumstances. This means that should someone have income which is only £5 above their relevant threshold, they would only be charged up to £5 even if they were in receipt of services which would attract charges higher than this. **Appendix 3** provides illustrations of how these arrangements would apply in practice.
- 6.6 In cases of hardship which arise despite these three measures, each case will be assessed on its own merits. This is in line with the national guidance and reflects the fact that in a generic charging policy not all personal circumstances can be forecast.
- 6.7 A particularly significant element of the financial assessment process will be to ensure that all service users have access to income maximisation advice. This is a process which is already undertaken by council officers.

7. FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

- 7.1 A target of c£1m has been set for Social Work Services to recoup through the implementation of a fair and appropriate charging policy in 2010/11. This is a significant sum which was challenging from the outset to achieve especially and this has become more difficult considering the figure was set based on a full year implementation of a charging policy and implementation to be from 1st November 2010.
- 7.2 It is acknowledged that any shortfall in the actual amount collected through a charging policy will have to met through other savings which will be extremely challenging for Social Work Services.

8. RESOURCE IMPLICATIONS

- 8.1 There is already infrastructure within Social Work Services which deals with financial assessments/income maximisation and invoicing/collection, for residential charging. However, the levels of activity in these areas which would be required to cover non-residential services are clearly significant and would require additional resources.
- 8.2 The main impact of stage 1 will be increased levels of invoicing and collection of monies. We would offer and promote the use of Direct Debits for the proposed charges as this process is easier generally for service users as well as easier to administer for the Council. This should minimise the resource burden and we would look for this to be managed from within existing council resources.
- 8.3 In terms of financial assessments we will monitor the impact of the stage 1 policy but anticipate that to properly prepare for stage 2 we will require to commit additional resources at least on a temporary basis to undertake financial assessments.

9. EQUALITIES ISSUES

- 9.1 The equalities impact of the proposed policy has been considered in its development. Given the nature of the services covered by the proposed policy, it will impact more on older people and disabled people than on the general community. This should be considered by Members bearing in mind the terms of Council's Equalities Scheme and the general duty on public authorities in the Disability Discrimination Act 1995.

In this context, it is important to note that consultation has been undertaken with service users. The proposed policy takes account of the consultation responses. Measures are proposed in the policy to mitigate any adverse impact of introducing or increasing charges, in particular, the adoption of protection for minimum income levels and setting of charges significantly below cost level. In addition the policy adopts an equitable approach in charging across care groups. It is considered that the policy can properly be adopted having regard to Council's duties to promote equality.

10. NEXT STEPS

- 10.1 We will prepare the required resources with a view to implementation of the policy from 1st November 2010. This will be done in tandem with the work being undertaken to introduce eligibility criteria and the redesign of the community care and integrated teams and the pilot intake assessment team. The result will be a robust infrastructure and set of processes which will ensure that Social Work Services manage and deliver the changes in a coherent and planned way.
- 10.2 We will communicate with key stakeholders and in particular service user and carers throughout this period to ensure that they are fully informed and prepared for the changes. This will also include further consultation to ensure that the changes are implemented in a way that is empathetic to the needs and concerns of service users who will be affected by the changes. This was a particular issue raised in the initial consultation process – that people wanted to be kept fully informed and involved to the extent possible.
- 10.3 We will prepare a further report to Members advising of the learning and outcomes of the preparation period and any amendments that are seen as being required to make sure the implementation of charging, eligibility criteria and service re-organisation are effectively managed. This further report will also provide revised projections of income based on refined modelling and data gathering.

11. RECOMMENDATIONS

It is recommended that Council

- 11.1 note the guidance produced by COSLA on charging for non-residential social care services;**
- 11.2 agree to the implementation of the stage 1 proposals as outlined in sections 5 & 6;**
- 11.3 agree to commence work to undertake financial assessments in relation to all service users under the age of 65 and those service users over the age of 65 as required (in line with decisions made in the Comprehensive Spending Review)**
- 11.4 request that the Acting Director of Social Work Services bring an update report to Housing and Social Care Committee in February 2011 to provide an update on the implementation of stage 1 of the charging policy, a progress report on the completion of financial assessments and detailed proposals for stage 2.**

.....
Acting Director of Social Work Services

Date:

Contact Officer: Margaret Anderson, Acting Director of Social Work Services

BACKGROUND PAPERS

1. Making It Fair (Murphy, K) 2010
2. Independent Budget Review (Beveridge et al.) 2010