

FAIR ACCESS TO CARE FOR EQUIPMENT CONSULTATION

MEETING AND QUESTIONNAIRE RESPONSES

RESPONSES FROM QUESTIONNAIRES AND MEETING GROUPS

| Question Number | Questionnaire/ Group/Both | Number of times repeated | Comment |
|-----------------|---------------------------|--------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 2 | | | <u>What do you think would be the advantages of introducing Fair Access to Care for Equipment?</u> |
| 2 | Both | 6 | Quick and easier process which will cut down waiting time/assessment time |
| 2 | Both | 6 | Will save the Council money and reduce pressure/responsibilities within ASC |
| 2 | Questionnaire | 2 | Universal criteria will provide a fair way of deciding who should get equipment |
| 2 | Both | 4 | Will focus resources to those with more complex needs |
| 2 | Both | 2 | Enabling for people to be able to buy their own equipment/encourages use of direct payments |
| 2 | Both | 5 | Will mean more individual choice/greater choice of equipment and wider knowledge of availability |
| 2 | Both | 3 | Will help develop design market leading to better stock supplies, availability and competitive pricing of equipment |
| 2 | Group | 2 | Accredited retailers and trusted assessors will act as safeguard for service users |
| 2 | Both | 1 | Gives voluntary organisations a chance to provide support |
| 2 | Both | 2 | People may value equipment more and treat it better if they have to pay for it |
| 2 | Group | 3 | New businesses will open/more existing businesses get "vetted" because of this |
| 2 | Questionnaire | 2 | Cannot see any advantages to introducing FACS |
| 2 | Questionnaire | 1 | Market forces will bring prices down |
| 2 | Questionnaire | 1 | Will mean more, easily available items of equipment |
| | | | . |
| | | | |
| | | | |

| 3 | | | <u>What do you think would be the disadvantages of introducing Fair Access to Care for Equipment?</u> |
|----------|---------------|----|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 3 | Questionnaire | 4 | Changes will cause confusion to all concerned |
| 3 | Questionnaire | 1 | Loss of ASC service will mean loss of support |
| 3 | Questionnaire | 4 | May prove costly and burdensome to voluntary organisations if ASC no longer supply equipment |
| 3 | Both | 3 | Could prove costly to community resources in general |
| 3 | Both | 8 | If initial assessment not done by qualified OT, other needs may be missed |
| 3 | Both | 4 | Cuts out face to face meeting which is often preferred by service users - too impersonal |
| 3 | Group | 4 | Criteria may be unfair - potential for subjective interpretation at moderate/substantive level of need |
| 3 | Group | 2 | Need categorisation differs dependent on type of disability and assessment criteria does not account for this |
| 3 | Both | 2 | Insufficient access to information/resources/OT expertise |
| 3 | Questionnaire | 1 | Not all service users computer literate or with online access and may be too proud to ask for assistance at library |
| 3 | Both | 3 | Could lead to faulty, ill fitted equipment or problems with getting it fitted |
| 3 | Both | 5 | Difficulty with supply in more isolated/rural areas |
| 3 | Both | 4 | Unscrupulous retailers may sell equipment rather than referring service users on when indicated |
| 3 | Both | 3 | Equipment might not be recycled to Health & Safety standards/Non-returnable equipment means wastage |
| 3 | Both | 12 | People on low incomes may not be able to afford and may not apply due to cost worries |
| 3 | Both | 4 | People who need equipment but cant afford to buy may put themselves/their carers at risk by "making do" |
| 3 | Both | 3 | If people don't buy equipment due to cost, they may have accidents leading to extra strain on the NHS |
| 3 | Questionnaire | 1 | The two lower categories will lose out and not get the right to professional assessment |
| 3 | Group | 2 | People may not apply because they don't think they are eligible |
| 3 | Questionnaire | 1 | Worry that equipment that is historically provided wont be any more if service user not eligible |

| | | | |
|---|---------------|---|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 3 | Both | 2 | Concerns over implication of job losses due to bringing in FACS |
| 3 | Questionnaire | 3 | Sometimes low/moderate need people have rapidly deteriorating health/disability and cant be reassessed quickly |
| 3 | Questionnaire | 1 | Vulnerable/sick people who live alone being disadvantaged by not being able to access equipment for simple needs |
| 3 | Both | 2 | Further disadvantages and discriminates against people with low to moderate needs |
| 3 | Questionnaire | 5 | Those on low income may “slip through the net” |
| 3 | Questionnaire | 1 | Elderly people with no families will have to rely on others when arranging to buy equipment |
| 3 | Questionnaire | 1 | Feel the cost of equipment is not necessarily an issue in itself |

| <u>4</u> | | | <u>What are your views on asking people with low to moderate needs to buy their own equipment?</u> |
|----------|---------------|----|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 4 | Group | 2 | Think it is reasonable to do this |
| 4 | Questionnaire | 1 | Think it is ok if they can afford it and can access somewhere to buy it from |
| 4 | Questionnaire | 3 | Council should not abdicate responsibility to make provision for those who cant/wont buy |
| 4 | Both | 4 | Think those on low income will be less likely to get the equipment they need |
| 4 | Both | 3 | Think some desperately in need and unable to pay will be put at risk by not getting equipment |
| 4 | Questionnaire | 2 | People with low to moderate needs can still be debilitated and struggle day to day and should not have to pay |
| 4 | Both | 4 | Failure to provide equipment to low/moderate need service user can lead to them becoming substantial/critical need |
| 4 | Both | 6 | People should not be discriminated against because they cant afford equipment, there should be a way of helping them |
| 4 | Questionnaire | 1 | How can you assess who can and who cant afford equipment? |
| 4 | Questionnaire | 1 | If means testing is to be introduced it should be across the board at all levels of need |
| 4 | Questionnaire | 2 | Wrong to be asking for "means testing" - outdated and unequal system |
| 4 | Questionnaire | 3 | Unequal system - people with no family will be eligible and then others with supportive families will have those families put under pressure |
| 4 | Questionnaire | 1 | People on benefits will get free equipment and those on a small pension will have to pay which is unfair |
| 4 | Both | 2 | If people cant afford equipment and go to a voluntary organisation, no statutory duty for them to supply |
| 4 | Both | 2 | People who have a short term need and cant afford equipment will be less likely to get it |
| 4 | Both | 2 | Doubtful that voluntary organisations could supply equipment for the same price as ASC - will be costlier |
| 4 | Questionnaire | 1 | Cost of taxis/transport not factored in - could cost too much to get to retailer |
| 4 | Questionnaire | 1 | When incapacitated, often more than one piece of equipment needed - could prove expensive |
| 4 | Both | 12 | Loan scheme/spread payments/hire arrangements should be offered/made available |

| | | | |
|---|---------------|---|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 4 | Questionnaire | 1 | A waste of time - these people by their nature do not go out much and have no access to internet so cannot be accessed |
| 4 | Questionnaire | 1 | Diabolical idea - asking a single unemployed parent to pay when their unencumbered next door neighbour doesn't is not fair |
| 4 | Questionnaire | 1 | Don't think they should – or if so, perhaps only a small proportion |
| 4 | Questionnaire | 2 | Feel this should be offered by ASC |

| | | | |
|----------|---------------|---|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 5 | | | <u>The Council is thinking of directing people who do not meet Fair Access to Care criteria to voluntary organisations or local equipment retailers. What are your views on this?</u> |
| 5 | Questionnaire | 3 | Think this is reasonable |
| 5 | Questionnaire | 1 | Should not be allowed |
| 5 | Both | 2 | Good idea as long as equipment is safe, not sub-standard and can be recycled if and when no longer needed |
| 5 | Group | 2 | People may be more willing to go to voluntary organisations for help and tend to trust places they already know |
| 5 | Questionnaire | 1 | Voluntary organisations will not be able to cope with the volume of assessments/orders |
| 5 | Questionnaire | 1 | Not eco-friendly to stop the recycling done by loan stores |
| 5 | Both | 7 | Will put more work/burden on voluntary organisations and they need funding for this |
| 5 | Both | 5 | Concerned as to whether there would be adequate and proper training, supervisions etc |
| 5 | Both | 2 | Some people wont attend after being signposted and will "slip through the net" |
| 5 | Questionnaire | 1 | Wherever help and information can be easily access would be good - the right information is very important |
| 5 | Questionnaire | 1 | Voluntary organisations should not be seeking to make money from FACS - should be impartial |
| 5 | Questionnaire | 1 | It is an imposition to expect voluntary organisations to take on the responsibilities expected |
| 5 | Both | 2 | Council should still be responsible and should have strict formal contract with organisations |
| 5 | Questionnaire | 1 | Could be very confusing - people could end up without equipment they need due to confusion as to which agency supplying it |
| 5 | Both | 3 | Could be "postcode lottery" regarding equipment availability and accessibility |
| 5 | Both | 4 | Retailers will not be as accountable as ASC/no governance in place |
| 5 | Both | 2 | Equipment at retailers is expensive and not many retailers locally |
| 5 | Group | 1 | Retailers may only sell the ranges of equipment that make the most profit for them |
| 5 | Group | 3 | Could be problems with communication with retailers, especially for deaf service users |

| | | | |
|---|---------------|---|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 5 | Questionnaire | 1 | Think it would put people off getting equipment |
| 5 | Both | 4 | It's a good idea as long as the information reaches the right people |
| 5 | Both | 3 | Think ASC should continue to offer the service that is currently being provided |

| | | | |
|----------|---------------|----|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 6 | | | <u>The Council is thinking of setting up a service within voluntary organisations to help people who do not meet Fair Access to Care criteria and cannot afford to buy equipment. What do you think is the best way to do this?</u> |
| 6 | Both | 10 | Communicate retail model etc. more and explain further to the public |
| 6 | Questionnaire | 1 | Provide people with a list of approved local organisations |
| 6 | Both | 6 | Give voluntary groups funding to help them - an "enabling fund" or "pot" of money |
| 6 | Both | 6 | Provide access to alternative funding for voluntary organisations |
| 6 | Both | 5 | Make access to small grants easier |
| 6 | Questionnaire | 1 | Hold "open days" for service users who cannot access voluntary organisations |
| 6 | Both | 2 | Have a stockpile of equipment for emergencies |
| 6 | Questionnaire | 1 | Implement a scheme similar to Impact Housings furniture scheme where people can take equipment they have finished with to a centre and others who need it can collect it |
| 6 | Both | 2 | Do recycling via the Red Cross etc. - "cost effective and saving the planet" |
| 6 | Both | 2 | Advertise in the papers etc to ensure families know equipment can be donated |
| 6 | Both | 6 | Make equipment available for rent for those who cannot afford to buy |
| 6 | Questionnaire | 1 | Decide "ceiling" amount for funding |
| 6 | Both | 1 | Implement a voucher scheme |
| 6 | Group | 2 | Advertise in lunch club newsletters, papers, pension and allowance books, Your Cumbria etc.,. |
| 6 | Questionnaire | 1 | Make sure GPs aware of FACS as they are usually service users' first point of call |
| 6 | Questionnaire | 1 | There isn't a way to do this - leave the system as it is and don't penalise pensioners/disabled |
| 6 | Questionnaire | 1 | Do away with "means testing" aspect of this - it is demeaning |
| 6 | Both | 2 | ASC stores could donate equipment to voluntary organisations |

| | | | |
|---|---------------|---|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 6 | Questionnaire | 1 | Keep the administration/monitoring committee very small |
| 6 | Questionnaire | 2 | Would be better funded by re-directing Council funds from some areas which are wasteful - the Council's firework display for example |
| 6 | Questionnaire | 1 | Ask the voluntary organisations themselves how this should be done |
| 6 | Questionnaire | 1 | Seems to make the system more complicated - elderly/disabled people don't need the extra "hassle" |
| 6 | Both | 2 | It has already been done/hasn't it already been done? |
| 6 | Both | 4 | TV adverts, local radio, local newspaper adverts. |
| 6 | Questionnaire | 1 | Asda and Tesco could support the scheme through their pharmacies |
| 6 | Both | 4 | Recycling is vital as long as it is cost-effective |
| 6 | Questionnaire | 1 | Postal ordering with free delivery for those in rural areas |
| 6 | Questionnaire | 1 | Don't withdraw the current service |
| 6 | Questionnaire | 1 | Don't understand - help in what way? |

| <u>7</u> | | | <u>Are there any other issues the Council should consider as part of this consultation?</u> |
|----------|---------------|---|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 7 | Questionnaire | 8 | Go out and explain FACS more to people who will be affected – service users need to be more informed than they are at present |
| 7 | Group | 2 | Possible freephone phone-in to assessors/hotline for low level cases? |
| 7 | Group | 1 | Have support offices/facilities in local shopping centres like Shopmobility do |
| 7 | Group | 1 | Have "quiet" areas in shops to aid people to communicate without noise/distraction |
| 7 | Group | 3 | Check "loop" systems present and working properly in all retail outlets |
| 7 | Both | 3 | Provide free of charge training for assessors at voluntary organisations |
| 7 | Both | 4 | Exclude family and friends when doing assessment and concentrate on individuals needs only |
| 7 | Questionnaire | 1 | Implement graded introduction to FACS - start at moderate for eligibility and work towards substantial later |
| 7 | Questionnaire | 1 | FACS may encourage families to opt for residential care for a relative rather than pay for equipment |
| 7 | Both | 4 | FACS should be re-evaluated after, say, 12 months |
| 7 | Questionnaire | 1 | Where does falls prevention fit in? |
| 7 | Both | 2 | If equipment badly installed resulting in an accident, who is responsible? |
| 7 | Both | 2 | Recycling scheme should be put in place/"Charity shop" for equipment |
| 7 | Both | 1 | ASC should have an equipment "amnesty", encouraging people to return equipment |
| 7 | Both | 2 | When equipment provided for short term needs, people need to be contacted re: possible collection/recycling |

| | | | |
|---|---------------|---|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 7 | Questionnaire | 1 | Consider applying FACS across all services to make it fair |
| 7 | Both | 2 | If present system was more efficient/better organised, money could be saved without the need for changes |
| 7 | Both | 2 | Retaining service as it is at current level should be considered |
| 7 | Group | 2 | Supply information by DVD with signing for the deaf/on audio for the blind |
| 7 | Group | 3 | Make retailers more deaf aware/able to sign or type-talk |
| 7 | Group | 2 | Be aware of language barriers/accent barriers with staff when service users lip reading |
| 7 | Group | 3 | Recruit more signers/interpreters for the deaf |
| 7 | Questionnaire | 1 | Distinction between health and social needs at local level is becoming blurred - critical to consider this |
| 7 | Questionnaire | 1 | Consider how to access people who require the service - "roadshows" are not adequate/enough |
| 7 | Questionnaire | 1 | Consultation is a waste of time and money - will Council publish the findings? |
| 7 | Questionnaire | 1 | Drawbacks and disadvantages to the proposed scheme outweigh advantages |
| 7 | Questionnaire | 2 | Council should consider an equipment rental scheme to offset capital costs |
| 7 | Questionnaire | 1 | Implement safeguards to ensure equipment is provided equitably |
| 7 | Both | 2 | Doubt it will improve the service, which appears well run as it is |
| 7 | Questionnaire | 1 | Tightening up on collection of equipment when it is no longer needed would save money without implementing FACS |
| 7 | Both | 2 | It may save money, but the Council supplying simple equipment to all means less falls, less hospital visits and people being able to stay at home longer |

| | | | |
|---|---------------|---|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 7 | Both | 2 | If the majority are against it, will it make any difference? - don't suppose it will... |
| 7 | Questionnaire | 1 | Equipment supplied should be followed up with a personal visit because it may be unsuitable and not used, so would need collection |
| 7 | Questionnaire | 1 | Appreciate need to cut costs and prioritise where greater need, but short-sighted not to invest more in prevention as this could save funds in longer term |
| 7 | Questionnaire | 1 | FACS booklet /document not easy to read - too much print in one block and difficult to keep track |