

| <b>Initial equality impact assessment screening form</b>   |   |
|--|---|
| <b>This form records an equality screening process to determine the relevance of equality to a proposal, and a decision whether or not a full EIA would be appropriate or proportionate.</b> |   |
| <b>Directorate</b>   | Health and Adult Services   |
| <b>Service area</b>  | Commissioning & Service Development   |
| <b>Proposal being screened</b>   | To amend the fees paid to Shared Lives carers for 2026/27.  |
| <b>Officer(s) carrying out screening</b>   | Adam Gray   |
| <b>What are you proposing to do?</b>   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Removal of additional day &amp; night payments</li> <li>• Reduction in Short break payments (to align with Live-in care rates)</li> </ul>  |
| <b>Why are you proposing this? What are the desired outcomes?</b>  | <p>Shared Lives is a highly personalised form of care where trained carers share their home and family life with adults who need support, enabling people to live in a community setting rather than in residential care. It can be likened to foster care for adults.</p> <p>Shared Lives promotes independence, inclusion, and better outcomes at lower cost compared to traditional models such as residential care</p> <p>Historically, payments to carers included multiple add-ons (e.g. day/night supplements), which created complexity, inconsistency and inequity. Payments to some carers are disproportionately high.</p> <p>This payment model was an anomaly nationally - most other schemes pay a single rate that aligns with level of need.</p> <p><u>Desired Outcome</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• To introduce a simplified payment model for Shared Lives carers, with three weekly bands</li> <li>• The bands will reflect the cared for persons assessed level of need, and are determined by a refreshed 'banding tool' to support decision making about the most appropriate rate</li> <li>• The rates have been increased to be inclusive of day and occasional night support. The Council will no longer pay any additional supplements on top of this.</li> <li>• This approach improves fairness, transparency; and supports recruitment and retention.</li> <li>• The proposed rates align with national, with low and medium rates close to the average, and high being among the highest nationally.</li> <li>• Any new carers that have joined the scheme since April 2025 have not received additional day and night payments.</li> </ul> |
| <b>Does the proposal involve a significant commitment or removal of resources?</b><br>Please give details.   | This proposal is not anticipated to remove any resource.  |
| <b>Impact on people with any of the following protected characteristics as defined by the Equality Act 2010, or NYCC's additional agreed characteristics</b>                                 |   |
| As part of this assessment, please consider the following questions:   |   |

- To what extent is this service used by particular groups of people with protected characteristics?
- Does the proposal relate to functions that previous consultation has identified as important?
- Do different groups have different needs or experiences in the area the proposal relates to?

If for any characteristic it is considered that there is likely to be an adverse impact or you have ticked 'Don't know/no info available', then a full EIA should be carried out where this is proportionate. You are advised to speak to your [Equality rep](#) for advice if you are in any doubt.

| Protected characteristic  | Potential for adverse impact   |    | Don't know/No info available |
|---|--|----|------------------------------|
|   | Yes  | No |                              |
| Age   |  | X  |                              |
| Disability  |  | X  |                              |
| Sex   |  | X  |                              |
| Race  |  | X  |                              |
| Sexual orientation  |  | X  |                              |
| Gender reassignment   |  | X  |                              |
| Religion or belief  |  | X  |                              |
| Pregnancy or maternity  |  | X  |                              |
| Marriage or civil partnership   |  | X  |                              |
| <b>NYCC additional characteristics</b>  |  |    |                              |
| People in rural areas   |  | X  |                              |
| People on a low income  |  | X  |                              |
| Carer (unpaid family or friend)   |  | X  |                              |
| <b>Does the proposal relate to an area where there are known inequalities/probable impacts</b> (e.g. disabled people's access to public transport)? Please give details.  | The proposal relates to an area where there are known inequalities, but the impact is likely to be neutral.  |    |                              |
| <b>Will the proposal have a significant effect on how other organisations operate? (e.g. partners, funding criteria, etc.). Do any of these organisations support people with protected characteristics?</b> Please explain why you have reached this conclusion. | No – no significant impact on how other organisations operate  |    |                              |
| <b>Decision (Please tick one option)</b>  | EIA not relevant or proportionate:   | X  | Continue to full EIA:        |
| <b>Reason for decision</b>  | The changes to carer fees are considered unlikely to have any adverse impact.<br>A 6-month income protection period has also been proposed to help mitigate risk of carer loss.<br>A discretionary payment has been proposed to reflect the additional level of intervention and support the carer is having to make that is above and beyond of what would be expected of a shared lives carer/where the primary focus is on sustaining long-term placements for individuals with complex needs who might otherwise require residential care. |    |                              |
| <b>Signed (Assistant Director or equivalent)</b>  | Mike Rudd  |    |                              |
| <b>Date</b>   | 21/05/2026   |    |                              |