

## Appendix 1: Questionnaire Results

The below is the combined feedback received from both the easy read questionnaire and the non-easy read questionnaire.

### 1) Please tell us which of the following group(s) you are in?

Answer Choices	Responses
NASS Customer/service user	47
Employer of Personal Assistant(s)	50
Family/friend/unpaid carer/Power of Attorney or Deputy for individual	52
Personal Assistant	14
Interested member of the public	25
User representative group	5
Provider organisation	1
Elected Councillor	4
Partner organisation (e.g. Clinical Commissioning Group, Voluntary Sector Organisation)	1
Other, please specify:	7
	Answered 161
	Skipped 4

#### Other:

- Spouse
- Carers Voice (2)
- Parent
- Relative of person in Council run Residential home
- Forum member
- Parent of a person who uses a service (a customer)

### 2) Do you currently have a Direct Payment or administer a Direct Payment on behalf of somebody?

Answer Choices	Responses
Yes	109
No	47
Don't know	2
	Answered 158
	Skipped 7

### 3) If you answered 'Yes', do you currently use any of your Direct Payment to employ a Personal Assistant(s)?

Answer Choices	Responses
----------------	-----------

Yes	90
No	21
Don't know	4
Not applicable – I do not have a Direct Payment	22
Answered	137
Skipped	28

**Proposal 1: The way we work out how much to give people in their Direct Payment**

**4) We are considering 4 options regarding how we work out how much to give people in their Direct Payment.**

Answer Choices	Responses
Option 1a: Do nothing and carry on as we are and pay most (or new) employers the same hourly rate with occasional exceptions based on special circumstances.	37
Option 1b: Have two different rates for most (or new) employers and these would be decided based on the complexity of someone’s needs	12
Option 1c: Have a calculator that is used for all (or new) employers to work out how much their on costs are going to be and therefore how much their hourly rate would need to be. (The Council’s preferred option)	44
Option 1d: Have a calculator that works out the exact circumstances for all (or new) employers and how much their on costs are going to be.	18
Other, please specify:	26
Answered	111
Skipped	54

**Other:**

- The system needs to be fair and as easy to operate as possible for the service user and NCC. Custom and practise indicates that change for many existing users may cause difficulty and stress adverse to their Health and Wellbeing which is to be avoided by all concerned.  
 In order to consider the system and rates properly, three variables should be recognised:-  
 The total needs of the service user based on hours per week/month/year.  
 The different needs at different times of day/night.  
 The skills, qualifications and experience required of the Personal Assistants to deliver those different needs.  
 For example: a PA employed to accompany a customer to a medical appointment would need different skills, qualifications and experience to a PA providing a 24 hour care package. If option 1c can allow for these ubiquitous variations without causing a stressful bureaucratic nightmare for all concerned then it may work.
- The system needs to be fair and as easy to operate as possible for the service user and NCC. Custom and practise indicates that change for many existing users may cause difficulty and stress adverse to their Health and Wellbeing which is to be avoided by all concerned.

In order to consider the system and rates properly, three variables should be recognised:-

The total needs of the service user based on hours per week/month/year.

The different needs at different times of day/night.

The skills, qualifications and experience required of the Personal Assistants to deliver those different needs.

For example: a PA employed to accompany a customer to a medical appointment would need different skills, qualifications and experience to a PA providing a 24 hour care package. If option 1c can allow for these ubiquitous variations without causing a stressful bureaucratic nightmare for all concerned then it may work.

- My [relative] has extremely complex care needs and a 24/7 care plan. Option 1B would seem to be suitable for her except the suggested wage rate for complex needs is £8.20ph. In her case this would be too low for her to recruit and retain suitable personal assistants to provide her with the care that she MUST have. In her case I feel that it would be necessary to fund her with the correct wage rate to enable her to hire personal assistants who are able to provide and continue to provide the assistance that she MUST have in order to have physical and emotional wellbeing as laid down in the Care Act 2014.
- I definitely prefer Option b for the most part; however, I am very disappointed by your suggested eligibility criteria. As your department deals with supporting adult social care needs, I completely fail to understand what health care needs have to do with your determination of social care needs. I would therefore suggest that when you are seeking to assess the complexity of a person's needs, that your social workers spend sufficient time trying to ascertain just how much of the time, a person requires physical assistance from their PA.
- I would also like to add that I think that the two proposed wage rates, of £7.83 for standard and £8.20 for complex, are extremely unsustainable. The standard rate that you have proposed is the current National Minimum Wage and the complex rate is only 37p above this.
- I would like to remind you that the NMW has increased by at least 30p for the last four years, so I don't think there is anyway to escape the vast majority of PA employers breaking employment law next year. Do you really expect to fund a consultation every year, just to chase what you ought to be funding DP recipients, who employ their PAs? I would have thought that it would save money, in the long run, if you could fund a DP rate that was sufficiently high enough, to be sustainable for many years.
- Let us not forget that the two rates that you have proposed are wage rates. You only briefly mention what this means that the proposed DP rate should be, and even then, you only do so, on the assumption that this consultation will support the option that the council takes on responsibility for the on costs, that you suggest. I do not want the council to take on responsibility for more of the on costs, than they currently do.
- Although I would prefer you to implement option b, taking into account these alterations; I would really rather you chose option a than option c; as this is the option that would seem to guarantee me the higher DP rate.
- We need more money as we haven't had an increase for five years and the hourly rate should increase every year as you expect a carer to work on basic pay for five years.

- My [relative] needs 24/7 care and has extremely complex needs. She needs personal assistant/carers who are able to be trained to carry out all these needs and who are able to continue working for her long term, continuing supporting her in all her needs. The people who are suitable for this, command a much higher wage than the NMW. I would think at least £10 per hour.
- Special needs and circumstances cannot be categorised simply into a box ticking exercise which is cheaper but potentially unfair. Also situations and needs can change significantly over time up or down.
- I definitely prefer Option b for the most part; however, I am very disappointed by your suggested eligibility criteria. As your department deals with supporting adult social care needs, I completely fail to understand what health care needs have to do with your determination of social care needs. I would therefore suggest that when you are seeking to assess the complexity of a person's needs, that your social workers spend sufficient time trying to ascertain just how much of the time, a person requires physical assistance from their PA.

I would also like to add that I think that the two proposed wage rates, of £7.83 for standard and £8.20 for complex, are extremely unsustainable. The standard rate that you have proposed is the current National Minimum Wage and the complex rate is only 37p above this.

I would like to remind you that the NMW has increased by at least 30p for the last four years, so I don't think there is anyway to escape the vast majority of PA employers breaking employment law next year. Do you really expect to fund a consultation every year, just to chase what you ought to be funding DP recipients, who employ their PAs? I would have thought that it would save money, in the long run, if you could fund a DP rate that was sufficiently high enough, to be sustainable for many years.

Let us not forget that the two rates that you have proposed are wage rates. You only briefly mention what this means that the proposed DP rate should be, and even then, you only do so on the assumption that this consultation will support the option that the council takes on responsibility for the on costs, that you suggest. I do not want the council to take on responsibility for more of the on costs, than they currently do. Although I would prefer you to implement option b, taking into account these alterations; I would really rather you chose option a than option c; as this is the option that would seem to guarantee me the highest DP rate.

- We employ self-employed workers.
- There is no animosity between staff when they know they are all on the same rate. However, we only receive £7.92, and this is not competitive when we are advertising for new staff.
- In my case, two agencies provide care to cover my needs. They have their hourly rates for supplying carers.
- The calculator option is like the new way at government level of treating vulnerables as cost effective exercises. I understand there are budget considerations, but you are dealing with PEOPLE IN NEED. People are complex, not number's to crunch.
- I will like to employ Personal & PA Staff & PA Worker with a lot more hours for me and please can you help & Support me to Employ my own Personal Assistants & PA Staff & PA Worker with a lot more hours for me today now.

- The current hourly rate may be satisfactory for most clients if they are employing someone for a whole shift but is inadequate for when pas are needed for short periods such as an hour in the morning and an hour at night.  
The hourly rate should be more for the first hour of every visit.  
Clients with behavioural issues and a high level of medical/care needs would find it hard to recruit/retain staff and this should be reflected in the pay rate.
- Change the whole way it is done. Provide the holiday pay for the year in a lump sum worked out on how many hours per week a PA does. Provide the cost of employer insurance to be paid annually. Provide the cost of payroll per month separately (it can be worked out in the support plan how many PAs are employed. Provide a contingency fund for advertising, police checks etc OR allocate an overall fund for this which employers can request funds from. Then have an on cost just for NI/HMRC costs. If someone is likely to have a high turnover of staff then this can be treated as a special circumstance and the costs provided in the most efficient way - it should be person centred anyway.
- Increase the hourly rate currently being paid, in order to meet NMW requirements and pay sufficient amount for sleep in/ night time care.
- A big flaw in option 1c is the assumption that 30 hrs care is provided by one PA. This assumes full-time PAs and does not allow for an extended community based support structure. I cannot understand why it is difficult to reclaim excess funds at the end of the finance year provided the finance department keeps up-to-date with the review process (I have not had my finances checked for over 18 months!).
- For us, the current system works. Also, in sapping to DP vs in house care we have saved NCC a third of the original care costs.
- Problem: The support company who is employed for my [relative] put up their hourly rate last year by £3 per hour. This means there is a short fall of over £200 per month in her care pot. As it stands, unless her circumstances change for her needs, the council are not increasing her pot. If the care company have been doing an excellent job and the service user is confident and happy with her support workers, then the increase in the hourly rate should be met. It is not good enough to say " find another company", currently said to me by an employee from the council. It is more important than that and can affect the person's wellbeing and health to have a change after being with one company of support workers for 7 years! This is something that must be changed. It is obvious that over some years, these companies will increase their hourly rate for their support and as it stands, the council are not meeting those costs. When this happens, there should be a meeting with a Care Manager to work out how much of a shortfall there is and not wait for special exceptional circumstances to happen to her which would, as it stands now is the case. The special circumstances are - there is not enough to cover the hourly rate now! The shortfall will fall upon us, the parents of people like my daughter and in our circumstances, we are pensioners who will struggle to fund the difference. There has got to be a fairer way.
- The current hourly rate is too low to attract competent assistants, therefore it should be increased.
- I have 3 carers, 2 on set hours 8.5 and 18 and the 3rd on temporary hours up to 18 hours. The temporary on takes my to my parents, shopping, trips out etc (theatre, historic houses, exhibitions) and covers for Care work for the others one ill or annual leave. The 8.5 hour carer cannot and is NOT suitable/able to do my showers or

putting me to bed. I am just going through the process of taking on a 3rd carer to cover when the shower/bad carers are not able to cover.

How will this be affected by your preferred calculator?

- I am replying on behalf of my [relative] who is learning disabled and lacks capacity. I believe that ALL of your proposed options may be illegal as the law provides that while the Council sets the budget it is entirely at the budget manager's discretion how it is used. In any case my [relative]'s needs are incredibly complex and simply cannot be honed down to a precise number of hours a week so flexibility is required (which is what the law provides). I may consider a judicial review if any change impacts on my [relative]'s budget as I believe that this is NOT to help the disabled but simply a budget-cutting exercise designed as being to the contrary. I do not believe you can change positions for persons already employed without breaking the law either. Further, your consultation paper is far too complex to be understood by the vast majority of those with the disabilities whom you are "consulting" and will scare them rigid.
- We need to know what the different hourly rates would be to answer this.
- No PA.
- I really don't understand all this I am filling out the survey on behalf of my [relative] who is almost [age] has dementia lives at home and has carers, of our choice, twice a day and I make payments for her from her allotted budget. I get no payment for this am I her P A.?
- I don't understand any of these.

**5) The Council's preferred option is to have a calculator that is used for all (or new) employers to work out how much their on costs are going to be and therefore how much their hourly rate would need to be.**

**To what extent do you agree or disagree with this option?**

Answer Choices	Responses
Strongly agree	13
Tend to agree	38
Neither agree or disagree	11
Tend to disagree	20
Strongly disagree	25
Don't know	6
Not applicable	10
Please tell us why:	52
Answered	123
Skipped	42

**6) Please tell us why:**

- Please see full response to Q4.
- I feel that a calculator would not relate to cases like my [relative], who has extremely complex care needs and a 24/7 care package. The table that is shown only gives examples of the staff needed up to 90 hours plus. This does not relate to my daughter who needs 168 hours of care per week.

- It is completely unrealistic of you to tell a DP user how many staff they should employ. You claim that for someone requiring more than 90 hours of care per week, they require 4 employees, and this is false. I require 168 hours of care per week, and I would ideally like to employ 6 members of staff; the only way for me to ensure that my complex needs are met. I frequently have to make do with 5 PAs however, and sometimes less staff.

Nor is it anymore realistic of you to claim that you can determine what my on costs are. As the on costs that a DP user will still be expected to fund include Employer's National Insurance contributions and cover for when other staff take annual leave. These costs will both be nearly doubled in my case, on 168 hours of care per week, compared to the band boundary of 90 hours per week. With regards to Statutory Sick Pay, I evidently need to point out how completely preposterous it is of you to even claim that your calculator can work out how often, and to what extent, funding for SSP will be required.

I need to reiterate that I do not want the council to take on responsibility for anymore of the on costs, than they currently do.

- Although a calculator could be suitable for most employers, I feel that for those with highly complex needs, who require 24/7 care it is not suitable. I believe that these cases should be looked at on an individual basis, in order to assess their needs and calculate what a suitable Direct Payment rate would be for them.
- Seems a fairer way and will also stop people being paid too much.
- See previous answer.
- I am afraid that people that have complex care needs could lose out on a calculator basis as one size does not always fit all!
- It is completely unrealistic of you to tell a DP user how many staff they should employ. You claim that for someone requiring more than 90 hours of care per week, they require 4 employees, and this is false. I require 168 hours of care per week, and I would ideally like to employ 6 members of staff; the only way for me to ensure that my complex needs are met. Nor is it anymore realistic of you to claim that you can determine what my on costs are. As the on costs that a DP user will still be expected to fund include Statutory Sick Pay, I evidently need to point out how completely preposterous it is of you to even claim that your calculator can work out how often, and to what extent, funding for SSP will be required.

I need to reiterate that I do not want the council to take on responsibility for anymore of the on costs, than they currently do.

- I am dissatisfied with the way the scheme runs. Deciding a ten minute medicine call is acceptable for the worker and the recipient is unfair. This is especially so when the recipient cannot make a cup of tea for themselves and is totally dependent on a carer.
- Our carers are self-employed.
- Some disabled people's support needs are going to be more complex, surely those PAs deserve a slightly higher rate of hourly pay for the demands expected of them.
- This would depend on so many factors, it would be difficult to have a fair calculator to give a rating for all staff to be paid by. Would it depend on the type of work, qualifications or how many hours they work?
- I don't believe in the cut backs on the adult services as there is very little service at present. My PA is very important to me and I don't agree with cutting back on how much they're paid.

- Costs change all the time, and as I have found out the Council will not increase payments very quickly to cover the extra costs. This leaves a deficit. Better to work out an overall budget that can be flexible.
- I do not think the council take account of how a person should be paid for what they do. I do not want a chimp looking after my young person.
- Takes no account of varying individuals needs but is preferable to current situation that pays a flat rate irrespective of individuals needs or varying costs of PAs i.e. more expensive in rural locations.
- I am worried this is just a cost cutting exercise and a fair cost would not be given.
- As explained before, people are complex, for example each dementia patient has different needs and work well with different methods. Unless you can regulate care companies to all give a blanket hourly fee, or regulate the cheaper ones to provide better standards in care, you are going to have vulnerables at risk.
- Fine words, but all I see are greater administration costs are these going to be passed on to service users in the form of increased contributions? Also the current system works.
- My carer [name] sometimes works after hrs if I'm unwell and for free, unless she has to take me hospital to A and E, but back up carers are not on call.
- This calculator would need to take into account the circumstances which make it difficult to recruit and retain staff.  
The care and medical needs of the client but also other practical considerations such as location and the hours required.
- I don't think enough of the employer's circumstances are taken into consideration. Using the PIP payment is going to destroy my life, as it is now I pay other people from my PIP money to look after me, as I only have 19 hours per week and that's not enough.
- Ensures transparency and reasonableness of costs.
- A defined formula may not be flexible enough to take into account the specific support needs and personal circumstances of individuals.  
The formula also needs to be dynamic and take into account changes in costs e.g. increases in National Living Wages and local market rates for wages in equivalent jobs in order to ensure that it is possible to recruit and retain workers of the right aptitude and quality.
- Because you will get it wrong.
- Why not just follow what other great performing Councils do with regard to this issue.
- I disagree as the statement is ambiguous. To reduce wages to a PA who has been in post for a long period of time seems morally wrong. A new worker is in a different position as they are applying for a post at the identified hourly rate. If the statement was just for new employers I would disagree less.
- It will not work in favour of the customer or the supplying organisation.
- The same calculations for everyone seems the fairest way.
- Each person is an individual and should therefore be treated as such. An individuals needs are specific to them and should not be lumped in a group. Direct payments are there to support individuals to maintain independence and get the most out of life living that life in a way that works for them. Putting everyone in the same box will not meet individual needs.
- It seems a fairer option.

- A fair option.
- The whole point of this review/exercise is to try and cut payments to someone who is doing the work. If the recipient is on site and doing the job then they are worth paying and worth paying at least a living wage which is not less than £9.00 ph. Some of the cared for will have onerous needs in which case the carer should be paid a premium over and above the suggested living wage. I recognise that there are those just wanting to play the system and get something they don't deserve. This needs to be addressed by onsite and cross checking with their GP's surgery as part of a vetting protocol. You should recognise that quite rightly few trust bureaucrats or their motives. How many in the council are paid less than £9.00 ph?
- The PA should be paid the Living Wage, & the should be shared between the NCC & the individual.
- The criteria is too broad and assumes each PA working up to 30 hrs a week. It does not allow for multiple PAs working shorter hours for specific/specialist activities. i.e. [name] takes me to the Gym (3 hrs). [Name] takes me swimming (2 hrs) etc.
- There is never a 'one size fits all' answer so a facility for some 'sensible' thought needs to be fitted in to any 'solution'.
- There are things not being considered with the council's 'preferred option' such as on costs, cost of living increases or holiday/sick day coverage.
- The employers (support workers) will not be able to tell you if they are going to put their prices up in 3 years or 5 years time. Unless what you are saying is, that you will use a calculator initially and again if the prices increase? I am sorry but I think I am not understanding fully what it is you are proposing by your explanation above. By employer, I assume you mean whoever is employed to do the supporting?
- You have to pay minimum wage and costs need to met of insurance pension etc by law.
- Depends how the calculator works and whether the results given will be sufficient.
- For 2 of may current 3 carers this would work but for my temp carer and cover carer, I am unsure how this would work unless we just duplicated the person they are covering?  
I have 3 carers, 2 on set hours 8.5 and 18 and the 3rd on temporary hours up to 18 hours. The temporary on takes my to my parents, shopping, trips out etc (theatre, historic houses, exhibitions) and covers for Care work for the others one ill or annual leave. the 8.5 hour carer cannot and is NOT suitable/able to do my showers or putting me to bed. I am just going through the process of taking on a 3rd carer to cover when the shower/bad carers are not able to cover.
- It should be at the employer's discretion in order to comply with the law - otherwise it is illegal. See also my previous comments.
- There isn't enough information that I can access.
- The current system seems to work for me.
- Not able to because of my memory status.
- People with more complex needs require more specialised carers (who are more expensive).
- We don't know what 'the one costs are' we don't know what this means.
- As previous comments. I would prefer to have a more realistic hourly rate paid for all. Most care companies fees go up annually but to my knowledge council rates stay the same so I would imagine most people have to pay a substantial top up.

- The stress my [relative] went through for his initial assessment was crippling for him and I would presume this would be for a lot of people.
- Because I believe people with higher needs should get more care.
- People are in different circumstances and should have their needs assessed as such.
- I have never applied for a PA.

**7) We think we should have a calculator that works out what the hourly rate should be having taken into account these things:**

- **The number of hours of support a person needs each week**
- **The number of individual people the employer is likely to have working for them**

**To what extent do you agree or disagree with the above?**

Answer Choices	Responses
Strongly agree	16
Tend to agree	43
Neither agree or disagree	12
Tend to disagree	9
Strongly disagree	29
Don't know	6
Not applicable	6
Please tell us why:	48
Answered	121
Skipped	44

**8) Please tell us why:**

- The two elements described are valid but what is missing is the CRITICAL element of the different skills, qualifications and experience required of the PAs according to the service being provided and therefore the different rates of pay they expect/can command to deliver what is required to meet the service user's needs.
- I think that this calculator is not suitable for deciding the hourly wage rate to be paid to my [relative] for her to pay her PAs. She has very complex needs and a 168 hour per week care plan. In order to provide her with a suitable hourly wage rate, her specific circumstances need to be taken into account.
- Although I would agree that a recipient's DP rate ought to be dependent upon both the number of hours of care required, and their employer expenses; I have many disagreements with the calculator that you propose. For a start, I dispute the fact that according to your banding, as I require 168 hours of care per week, I would be lumped with all recipients requiring over 90 hours of care per week. This would mean that you would expect me to be employing 4 PAs; a conclusion that I think is extremely unrealistic as further details in response to Question 5.

However, my primary reason for disputing your calculator; is just that the suggested hourly rates are just too low. As the proposed wage rate of £8.10 per hour is only 27 pence over the current NMW, and the NMW has been raised by at least 30 pence per year for the last 4 years, it is highly probable that £8.10 will be below the NMW at April 2019. Do you really expect to fund a consultation every year, just to chase what you ought to be funding DP recipients, who employ their PAs? I would have thought

that it would save money, in the long run, if you could fund a DP rate that was sufficiently high enough, to be sustainable for many years.

Nor is it anymore realistic of you to claim that you can determine what my on costs are. As the on costs that a DP user will still be expected to fund include Employer's National Insurance contributions and cover for when other staff take annual leave. These costs will both be nearly doubled in my case, on 168 hours of care per week, compared to the band boundary of 90 hours per week. With regards to Statutory Sick Pay, I evidently need to point out how completely preposterous it is of you to even claim that your calculator can work out how often, and to what extent, funding for SSP will be required.

I need to reiterate that I do not want the council to take on responsibility for anymore of the on costs, than they currently do.

- I myself and lots of other people I know have at least 2 carers on their books so to speak. I have much less hours than 30 but whether you have 5 hrs or 35 hrs you always need a back up carer. This is especially more so with people with smaller hours as they tend to be more ad hoc and is more likely that the carer may also have another primary job which can mean they are not always available and you have to ask someone else. The whole point of direct payment is its flexibility which you will be eradicating by this option. Even someone with one carer has to have holiday so there always going to be a min of 2 carers employed over a 12 month period. This option would not work for me.
- As long as its not the minimum wage.
- As I answered to question 6:-  
Although a calculator could be suitable for most employers, I feel that for those with highly complex needs, who require 24/7 care it is not suitable. I believe that these cases should be looked at on an individual basis, in order to assess their needs and calculate what a suitable Direct Payment rate would be for them.  
Also the number of employees needed to cover holidays and sickness would be greater than in your calculator.
- PA will get better rate of pay.
- It isn't just a question of time it is very much also a question of the level of responsibility the PA carries which depends on ability and willingness of PA. In our case we have required PA to undertake specific training. The amount of added value a PA provides is no the same for each PA.
- I hope that whatever happens, the hourly rate will be determined for each customer on an individual basis and provides the appropriate flexibility that direct payments are supposed to offer.
- It is completely unrealistic of you to tell a DP user how many staff they should employ. You claim that for someone requiring more than 90 hours of care per week, they require 4 employees, and this is false. I require 168 hours of care per week, and I would ideally like to employ 6 members of staff; the only way for me to ensure that my complex needs are met. Nor is it anymore realistic of you to claim that you can determine what my on costs are. As the on costs that a DP user will still be expected to fund include Statutory Sick Pay, I evidently need to point out how completely preposterous it is of you to even claim that your calculator can work out how often, and to what extent, funding for SSP will be required.
- As long as the smallest time is 30 Mins.

- Many carers work part time, so one cannot assume one carer will cover up to 30 hours per week care.
- The calculator doesn't take into account the level of support a disabled person might need.
- At the moment there are times when more staff are available to do tasks that take 2 members of staff, are they to be penalised as opposed to the single member of staff on nights?
- I strongly disagree as I believe that targeting the vulnerable is wrong. We are an easy target with no voice. The PA should not have their pay reduced as they're not paid enough for what they do already.
- The amount of hours required can change on a weekly depending on appointments, how a person is feeling and other unknown quantities.
- Same reasons as before.
- Things can change so fast & this will make it a lot more complicated I think.
- Does not take into account the complexity of needs of employers. Some will need more than just 'people' to look after them. The current budget terms allows the funds to be used for other things e.g. stair lift maintenance & adapted furniture.
- But also add the number of specialised people needed, e.g., workers that are trained in dementia care, working hoists etc., as this raises prices.
- Having no Direct Payment involvement, I can only give my personal opinion.
- I still need the hours my carer does, she also comes on holiday with me, I cannot get about with out her like today I'm very unwell.
- Not if the assumption is made that a small package requires fewer carers - I have found the opposite is true - for a small package carers are fitting an odd hour here and there around other employment/family responsibilities and as it is essential to have the help to get up in the morning and be put to bed in the evening there needs to be several carers to fill the rota.
- If it means a higher rate for small packages because you are requiring a carer to turn out in all weathers for an hours pay, then a would agree.
- My PA is worth so much more than what she gets paid for the work she does for myself, no calculator can do her justice.
- This seems very reasonable and ensures evenness of approach.
- See previous answer.
- Because you also need to work out how skilled the PA needs to be. I can't find PAs who have the knowledge and skills to support me on the current rate!
- A direct payment can be used for employing a PA. A direct payment can also be used for other things that will meet the person's unmet eligible needs. Is there a calculator already in use successfully in any other LA that can effectively do both types if calculation? If not, why does Northants think a calculator will work?
- I am concerned that the extra bureaucracy involved in setting up another system will negate any savings. The present system where those who have not used their allowance return the excess seems fairly straightforward.
- The number of hours of care is not a good indicator. To provide care for short periods across the whole day and the whole week is not directly related to the number of carers an employer needs.  
2x0.5 hours a day at each end of the day for 7 days week, 52 weeks a year would need about 5.5 part time employees. your calculator idea is wrong.
- Seems fair.

- The money involved should be the same for every user. You cannot penalise a person financially because they need more care. PA's should be paid the same regardless of how many are needed to support an individual.
- Each application is different.
- The most important issue is that the person needing support has a support worker who is fully trained to meet their needs. In some cases this may include some specialism for example British Sign Language or someone trained in Multi-Sensory Impairments. Support workers with this specialism are difficult to find and their hourly rate should match the experience they have which is required for the person they are supporting.
- Two things which are irrelevant to the supported persons situation and also the employed person. These two questions demonstrate you don't understand or are ignoring the nub of the needs of those unfortunate enough to require the support. It demonstrates the true purpose of the exercise is only down to cutting payments for someone other than yourselves.
- The word 'likely' makes too many assumptions and does not allow flexibility - which was the original selling point of the 'In Control' budget
- The hourly rate needs to be based on more than just what is being proposed. Such as the PA's experience, how long they have been working for the service user and what tasks are they are hired to do
- Having different hourly rates would make it hard for some people (with lower rates) to employ a PA, this in turn ours mean the need for more agency hours costing far more than the savings made.
- A higher hourly rate would be more appropriate if the disabled person had medical needs or challenging behaviour, not how many hours of support they need.
- Disabled people who have a large direct payment package don't have choice they need this needs to be met by law Care Act if you are forgetting so to be penalized as you need a large package or more than one PA is immoral.
- For 2 of my current 3 carers this would work but for my temp carer and cover carer, I am unsure how this would work unless we just duplicated the person they are covering?  
I have 3 carers, 2 on set hours 8.5 and 18 and the 3rd on temporary hours up to 18 hours. The temporary on takes my to my parents, shopping, trips out etc (theatre, historic houses, exhibitions) and covers for Care work for the others one ill or annual leave. the 8.5 hour carer cannot and is NOT suitable/able to do my showers or putting me to bed. I am just going through the process of taking on a 3rd carer to cover when the shower/bad carers are not able to cover.
- It would be completely unworkable for anybody who cannot hone their needs down to a specific number of hours.
- I need to have more information made accessible.
- Maybe this would give people the right money for the care they need as long as it was managed properly.
- Same as answer 6.
- [Name]attends [name of nursery] three days a week.
- It needs to be a realistic rate per hour.
- Maybe if it was just based on the amount of support a person needs each week but not discriminating either way as its hard enough to get a PA for the small amount of money allocated and if this was to decrease it would be even harder to get staff.

9) We are assuming the following number of Personal Assistants are being employed based on the below total number of hours of support:

Number of hours of funded support per week	Number of Personal Assistants
Up to 30 hours	1
31 – 60 hours	2
61 – 90 hours	3
More than 90 hours	4

To what extent do you agree or disagree with this assumption?

Answer Choices	Responses
Strongly agree	20
Tend to agree	36
Neither agree or disagree	10
Tend to disagree	18
Strongly disagree	26
Don't know	5
Not applicable	7
Please tell us why:	54
Answered	122
Skipped	43

10) Please tell us why:

- Every situation is different - see responses to Q 4 and 5 above.
- A Direct Payment is made to fund employers to employ the number of employees they need in order provide them with a good quality of life, physical and emotional wellbeing. The choice of how many should be decided by the employer who received the funding.
- The whole point of receiving DPs is that the DP user is enabled to become a direct employer of their PAs. This means it should therefore be their decision, and theirs alone, how many PAs they employ; including how many hours they work, and on what rotation.  

As I require 24/7 care, this is a total of 168 hours of care per week. I do not understand why your bands end with 90+ hours per week, and fail to continue increasing by increments of 30 hours. If they did, 150 hours would mean that you would assume 6 PAs were employed; which is actually how many PAs I believe I need working for me. The fact that I have determined that I would need to be employing 6 PAs, to guarantee me any kind of stability in my care, however; does not detract from my earlier point, stating that the council should not aim to interfere in the status of DP users, as direct employers.
- See previous comment. Most families I know would have 2 people on their books including myself for reasons stated previously. However many hours you are entitled

too, you always need a back up carer. So this will not reflect the true state of carers therefore your hourly rate would be wrong.

- See previous answers to question 5 and 6.  
Some, like my [relative] who needs 24/7 care and has extremely complex needs, would need more than 4 Personal Assistants to ensure that she has suitable care at all times, including when her other PAs are on holiday or are sick. 6 would be ideal.
- Appears fair.
- What is the situation in our case where we use a care provider for getting up and dressing and a PA for the personal help during the day and I cope at night.
- Many people have to factor in relief personnel as the main PA will have holiday leave / sick leave. I have 28 hours a week and need a team of at least 3 PA's which gives me the flexibility I need to live my life.
- It is completely unrealistic of you to tell a DP user how many staff they should employ. You claim that for someone requiring more than 90 hours of care per week, they require 4 employees, and this is false. I require 168 hours of care per week, and I would ideally like to employ 6 members of staff; the only way for me to ensure that my complex needs are met. Nor is it anymore realistic of you to claim that you can determine what my on costs are. As the on costs that a DP user will still be expected to fund include Statutory Sick Pay, I evidently need to point out how completely preposterous it is of you to even claim that your calculator can work out how often, and to what extent, funding for SSP will be required.
- I a care agency and have approx 5 carers.
- I don't know anyone who gets +30 hours per week!
- It should be up to the employer to decide how much support or cross training is given, not just a set number based on the hours of care required.
- I believe the employer should be able to choose who and how many employees they have. It's about giving people autonomy.
- Most people work for 30 hours. So that is ok. There are some cases where 2 people are required as in hoisting for health and safety reasons.
- The support could be at different times of day so shared even if 30 hours a week.
- Too simplistic.
- Depends on the PAs. This is a largely female population who also tend to work more part time. Employers generally have needs across 7 days of the week so the total hours may well be technically covered by 1 PA but in actuality it may need to be more.
- This seems reasonable as a standard.
- I have 40 hour per week and have 3 PA's.
- My carer works 23 and a half I think that is enough but I don't get one weekend has [name] needs time off.
- This an incorrect statement from my experience. If the smaller packages requires essential assistance 2 or 3 times a day 7 days a week for an hour at a time several carers will be needed to fill the rota.
- This covers the number of working hours in a week.
- It's wrong to make assumptions, some people might need more than one PA if they cannot find one PA with all the skills needed for the different types of support they might need.
- Why is this assumption being used? Is this an evidence based assumption?? If not, why not?

- From previous experience of managing a personal budget for my [relative] she had 3 PAs supporting her at various times of the week and her funded hours were below 30.
- The number of hours of care is not a good indicator. To provide care for short periods across the whole day and the whole week is not directly related to the number of carers an employer needs.  
2x0.5 hours a day at each end of the day for 7 days week, 52 weeks a year would need about 5.5 part time employees. Your calculator idea is wrong.
- To provide 90 hours will need 4 people on a rotation.
- As different peoples needs are different and may take longer for the carers to do.
- However, Some PAs cannot work the hours/days required so to meet the needs a second person is employed.
- This is the situation with me.
- Depends on circumstances.
- Seems fair.
- Some people require much less hours and therefore should not be penalised through any reductions for others who require additional hours.
- Makes sense but at £9.00 ph a person on thirty hours pw makes £270 less 12% NI = £237. There is also £2540 x 20% to be paid which brings the weekly income to £225. Do you also plan on paying 28 days annual leave or is this not considered? What rates are you thinking of paying? That hasn't appeared on the survey yet but surely should have been the first question?
- There may be circumstances that a PA may need to work less than 30 hours, so two may be needed.
- Assumes (nearly) full-time PA employment. Is not flexible enough to meet individual needs.
- The number of hours option does not take into consideration weekend care or unsocial hours.
- This calculation does not take into account what times of day they are needed for.
- It depends on the needs as to what times of day the care is needed, therefore it drastically varies how many PAs will be required to fulfil these.
- We employ seven people who all work part time hours. If you rely on one person then what happens if they don't or can't come to work.
- In my [relative]'s case, we employ a company who send out various support workers to her. But the hourly rate is the same for all of them as it is the rate the company has set.
- In some cases even in small packages you may require 2 PA due to complexity of needs this is too rigid.
- It's difficult to find staff who will consistently work every week hence the need to employ more than one person.
- It is virtually impossible to attract people willing to work 30 hours as they often have other jobs. The work involved in administering Direct Payments is too high, it would be better to bring carers back in-house and be employed by the council.
- I have 3 carers for what you say are 2 carers hours, soon maybe to be 4 carers. So number of assistants in the hours worked should be more flexible, this allows for covering staff requesting leave and cover arrangements, sometimes for a weeks holiday

3 carers, 2 on set hours 8.5 and 18 and the 3rd on temporary hours up to 18 hours. The temporary on takes me to my parents, shopping, trips out etc (theatre, historic houses, exhibitions) and covers for Care work for the others one ill or annual leave. the 8.5 hour carer cannot and is NOT suitable/able to do my showers or putting me to bed. I am just going through the process of taking on a 3rd carer to cover when the shower/bad carers are not able to cover.

- This does not reflect how my [relative]'s budget is used at all - it is overly simplistic.
- Surely that is for the customer to decide. Some have more because they can have more flexibility. Covering each other easier, they have different skill sets and want to work more or less hours.
- I have 2 personal assistants who I split my weekly care between. They also cover each others holidays. I have 16 hours a week.
- I only have one PA.
- [Name] attends [nursery name] 22 1/2 hours a week.
- Personally employ 4 carers which works very well for me. By having 4 it makes it easier to cover holidays and illness etc and gives me greater flexibility.
- What is a personal assistant?
- It is not always possible to get one person to do 30 hours.
- Because sometimes it might be difficult to get one person to do 30 hours.

**11) We are proposing to work out the hourly rate based on a number of hours of support in 5 hours blocks e.g. 0-5 hours, 6-10 hours, 11-15 hours etc. Please see the supporting information document for a full list of bandings and rates. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the above?**

Answer Choices	Responses
Strongly agree	9
Tend to agree	32
Neither agree or disagree	18
Tend to disagree	15
Strongly disagree	25
Don't know	7
Not applicable	7
Please tell us why:	43
Answered	113
Skipped	52

**12) Please tell us why:**

- Far too complicated and previous responses apply. This is back to the worst of RAS... numbers driven and forgets that the service users are PEOPLE with different needs.
- I note that in all cases, the Council has decided that they should take on more of the on costs, which I do not agree with and do not think would be practical in all cases. This results in a lowering of the DP rate in all 5 hours blocks, except for 2 where it is raised by 1 pence and 2 pence. I realise that the Council is desperately short of funding and feel that the Government should make changes in its Social Care review

due to be published later this year and give more funding to Local Authorities so that they can adequately fund social care in their area.

- It has not escaped my notice that, for the vast majority of 5 hour blocks, you are actually proposing a cut to the DP rate. For the two 5 hour blocks that the DP rate that would be increased; it would be by 2 pence and 1 penny. I need to reiterate, again, that I do not want the council to take on responsibility for anymore of the on costs, than they currently do.
- Regardless of how many hours you get a minimum of 2 carers should be considered, this maybe more so for people who do a few hours a week as they are prob working a primary job too meaning they are fitting hours in so may not be always available. In any given year a carer should be taking holiday so that means someone else is standing in which is another payslip cost and another dbs etc.
- Should pay all the same flat rate, at the moment I pay mine £8.50 as I have surplus money in my account.
- It is clear from the supporting information document that the DP rate would be cut in most cases or increased by 1 or 2 pence. The present DP rate is way too low to be able to employ suitable PAs and has not increased for over a decade! I realise that the Council is strapped for cash and I believe that it is necessary for government to look at the funding of Social Care and to greatly increase the amount that is paid to local authorities. They have already looked at the NHS funding and are promising to look at Social Care funding. I do hope that they increase this funding because without it, many people like my daughter, will be unable to employ enough suitable PAs to provide her with any quality of life.
- Because more money is needed for the on costs when more care hows we need.
- Appears unnecessarily bureaucratic. Where is the value to Council or patients?
- I wonder what will happen to people whose hours come in the middle of a band of 5. Will people lose hours to fit into the band below? I am concerned that the new hourly rates, unless on a very high package, will not be enough for people who have complex needs not receiving 24 hour care.
- The whole point of receiving DPs is that the DP user is enabled to become a direct employer of their PAs . This means it should therefore be their decision, and theirs alone, how many PAs they employ; including how many hours they work, and on what rotation.
- As I require 24/7 care, this is a total of 168 hours of care per week. I do not understand why your bands end with 90+ hours per week, and fail to continue increasing by increments of 30 hours. If they did, 150 hours would mean that you would assume 6 PAs were employed; which is actually how many PAs I believe I need working for me. The fact that I have determined that I would need to be employing 6 PAs, to guarantee me any kind of stability in my care, however; does not detract from my earlier point, stating that the council should not aim to interfere in the status of DP users, as direct employers.
- A lot of our staff rota's are based on 8 or 12 hour shifts, how would that fit into this criteria?
- Employees should all get paid the same rates no matter how many hours they do. Employers already have to go through rigorous assessments as to what and how many hours they can have.
- This may work, only time will tell.

- Most people who have P a S have somebody who comes in 30 minutes 3 time a day maybe an hour 3 times a day , 7 days a week . So no point in having block hours. It would not work.
- All service users are different.
- I don't understand why it needs to be in blocks or why the bands are varying amounts. Is this to save money? Certainly I can see no benefit to employers or any other logical reason for it.
- This seems reasonable for all concerned.
- [Name] could not do that has she has another job after me, but if did more hours would not have too.
- It is harder to recruit for short visits as the cost and time travelling and inconvenience to the carer is considerable. Longer visits enable the carer to accrue a decent income.
- The hourly rate should be the same no matter how many hours are worked.
- This would seem reasonable, but should be able to be adjusted based on circumstances.
- I have tried to read the supporting information document but it is so long and has a number of grammatical errors so I have given up trying to understand it.
- Assuming this takes into account special circumstances and if NASS are taking over paying some of the on costs I think this is reasonable. However, I still think the option of just leaving things as they are is more sensible.
- Your assumptions do not appear to reflect the reality of the provision of homecare.
- Appears too arbitrary. Should be more flexible.
- Regardless of hours worked if you need a PA you need a PA and this should be funded at the same amount for everybody. PA's are not paid enough as it is.
- Not enough flexibility prefer option 1b.
- The hourly rate should be worked out on an individual basis. One size does not fit all.
- I see no reason why the hourly rate cannot be the same across the board. There appears to be no real justification for the banding. On costs will not be that much different per support worker whether there is one or three. An across the board hourly rate would also lead to more efficient administration.
- I don't think it should be banded (see previous answers).
- If you work less hours the hourly rate might be less.
- Again too rigid and not taking into account the complexity of persons needs at all too rigid and the care plan should person centres as per care act so you would be breaking the law.
- It makes sense that the amount paid to carers will vary depending on the needs required and the hours worked. What you don't seem to have taken account of is the geography of the county, if you looked at average wages in say Brackley and say Corby I'm sure there would be huge disparity. It would make much more sense for carers to be employed directly by the council.
- That takes away the flexibility of DP.
- I couldn't see the supporting info. doc. the bit about what the 5 hour blocks are so that's why I ticked box. i.e. I don't understand, probably me.
- It is unworkable for those with needs such as those of my [relative].
- The supporting information is not in a format I can access because it is too long, on white background.
- I don't really understand this.
- I just don't understand.

- [Name] attends [nursery name] 3 days a week
- Difficult to understand what the calculator does?
- As long as the pay does not decrease.
- Carers should be getting a much higher rate as they look after people.

**13) To what extent do you agree or disagree that the calculator may be a fairer way to work out how much money people need?**

Answer Choices	Responses
Strongly agree	12
Tend to agree	32
Neither agree or disagree	18
Tend to disagree	13
Strongly disagree	23
Don't know	7
Not applicable	4
Please tell us why:	39
	Answered 109
	Skipped 56

**14) Please tell us why:**

- See previous responses.
- I feel that this calculator is not at all fair to the different users of social care. It is just a way to cover up the way that the Council is trying to save money in the cost of social cost.
- This calculator has very little to do with fairness; instead, it simply appears that you are trying to obfuscate your attempts to make cuts; to a sector that desperately needs more funding, not less.
- Although I understand the concept of being fairer to all, I think to be assessing everyone individually and reassess at every change is time consuming and therefore costly to the council which it cannot afford. PBSS when it was CIL was not an effective payroll service - it was awful! It did not work for me at all to the point I went elsewhere. I do not know if it is still the same. Although it does not make sense to charge oneself and payback to council if people are using pbss it makes sense for them to charge NCC.
- The carers will end up back on minimum rate of pay with no chance of a raise like everyone else who works and that is not right. I've received the same money for 5 years and I have been lucky I have been able to gradually increase my carers wages with surplus cash I had left in the bank, but I know many have not been to do that.
- I do not think that the calculator is a fairer way to work out how much money all of the people need.  
I think it is a desperate attempt by the council to make cuts in order to spread out the funding that they have now!
- Makes the system simple.
- There is probably no entirely fair way but because of the complexities I would prefer to an intelligent and well-trained individual or team.

- It may work for people with simpler care packages. However, I am concerned that there will not be the flexibility to adjust figures should the need arise.
- It has not escaped my notice that, for the vast majority of 5 hour blocks, you are actually proposing a cut to the DP rate. For the two 5 hour blocks that the DP rate would be increased; it would be by 2 pence and 1 penny. I need to reiterate, again, that I do not want the council to take on responsibility for anymore of the on costs, than they currently do.
- Again, as in any public sector payment bandings, a rate given at commencement of employment should be a universal flat rate, not based on a calculator.
- A flat rate should be for all. More should be paid to the PA for unsocial hours, bank holidays and weekends. This is the only fair way for our employees
- As with all things, the only way to know it works is to try it. If it doesn't work will NASS be reverting back to the old method or persevere in the hope it works because it's a cheaper option.
- There is no clarity or transparency in the calculator for end users, making an already complex system worse.
- I don't think it is fair for people severely disabled or vulnerable because it needs to take into account special needs gives rise to complex care.
- It depends on how the calculator is constructed and if there is room for flexibility as there is always reasons why individual cases don't fit the boxes (such as when the disabled person lives in a remote rural location so have difficulty recruiting)
- So some cannot abuse the system has I no they do.
- I feel it would be fair to everyone and is an open way for everyone to be dealt with.
- See previous answers - it depends on what included in the calculation and how that reflects actual local labour costs.
- I think the important point in all of this questionnaire should be that existing staff continue on their current rate (even if pay rises need to stop until everyone else is on an equivalent) and new staff at paid at a rate consistent with what they would earn working for NASS. Whether or not you use a calculator to achieve this seems irrelevant.
- See above.
- Other than the 5 hours calculations it appears to be a fair system.
- As stated before the same rate should be paid to everyone regardless of the amount of hours needed.
- But need more than one band to deal with complexity of needs and expertise needed to do the job.
- Different needs require different costs.
- The information needs to be considered individually based on full assessments.
- My care needs vary on a daily/weekly basis and the monthly assessed total I receive allows me a degree of flexibility depending upon n my needs.
- Hammer to crack a nut. Too rigid to allow the flexibility required for individual needs.
- See previous answer.
- Too rigid and doesn't meet statutory requirements.
- Not sure.
- You should leave people to manage their own budgets as that is required by the law. You can raise the amount of the budgets if people cannot obtain personal assistants at the rates paid by the Council - which are ridiculously low in any case. You have caused this by out-sourcing responsibilities to the disabled to save the Council money

and this is simply a cost-cutting exercise disguised as the contrary. I am a legal professional and this consultation will be way above the heads of probably 99% of the people who are being consulted.

- A calculator can not assess a persons care needs efficiently enough.
- It depends on each case and if it was worked out correctly.
- Because I have short term memory loss.
- [Name] attends [nursery name] 3 days a week.
- See above answer.
- I think you need to bear in mind that some areas of the country would charge more for care than others and this needs to be taken into account.
- It is difficult to know and would depend on the hourly rates and that people were being paid enough for the important care/support roles. The pay is basic and needs to improve.

**Proposal 2: The things that people with a Direct Payment pay for and the things that the County Council pay for**

**15) We are considering 2 options regarding the things that people with a Direct Payment pay for and the things that the County Council pay for. What is your preferred option?**

Answer Choices	Responses
Option 2a: Do nothing and carry on as we are which would mean that from their Direct Payment, all (or new) employers would pay for all on costs for their Personal Assistants (except Employers pensions contributions for those who use PBSS payroll).	49
Option 2b: Change things so that the County Council, through PBSS, arrange and pay for some things when they are needed by all (or new), rather than include these things in the hourly rate. (The Council's preferred option)	47
Other (please specify)	17
	Answered 96
	Skipped 69

**Other:**

- Too complicated... as previously you need Council staff who understand how things are in the world rather than another system applied blindly with high risk of errors (higher than currently for sure).
- I do not want PBSS to take on responsibility for anymore of the on costs, than they currently do.

What I do want is more of a percentage of the DP rate to be allowed for employer expenses. The current DP rate of £9.89, allows for 24% of the total to be used for employer expenses, and I do think that this is a fundamentally fairer basis for working out a DP. I do, however, recognise that for those people requiring complex care, this percentage ought to be even more increased, than the necessary increase to 24%. This includes the changes to employer NI contributions and cover for when other staff are taking their annual leave, consequent to NMW rises. I believe that the

percentage allowed for employer expenses, ought to be higher for those with complex needs; in order to allow them to fund one of their employees to be employed as a scheme manager, and ensure that the PA scheme works effectively, in all its aspects.

- Even though I disagree with you only suggesting that you raise PA wages to £8.10ph, you would need to increase the DP rate to £10.66ph, as long as the amount of 24% of the DP rate was allowed as employer expenses. I believe that this percentage needs to be raised to a higher percentage for those with standard needs, and raised even higher for those with complex needs. This would mean, when someone with my complex needs, of 168 hours per week; the hourly DP rate should be at least £13 or £14 per hour. If it were paid at this level, I would feel able to raise the wages that I could offer to high enough level that I do not think that it would be an issue that I ever had excess funding in my account.
- I think if it ain't broke don't fix it. I am siding with 2a because I feel it works better for me and I don't think pbss offer a good service.
- I agree with option 2a. The trouble with 2b is that it becomes very complicated for all involved and I can't understand how this would be cost effective.
- Option 2b will mean a longer process of application and referral making people in need suffer as they wait. For e.g., if I need to wait to get my [relative] continually assessed for new needs, we'd never get anything done.
- When I had direct payment from Kent we were paid the on costs as a separate payment.
- Current system works.
- I am unsure - this seems like tinkering with the figures because if part of the budget is not used it is clawed back periodically anyway and I would not like to see a system where certain things like recruiting costs are rationed because an employer has already got the one supposedly required employee and therefore the second or subsequent will not be funded. I have 6 carers for a 28 hr budget and still struggle to fill the rota sometimes as this equates to over 22 visits per week.
- I disagree with both statements. We should be moving towards individual personalization.
- As stated, being able to control what my needs are immediately and without the need to consult allows me much more personal control.
- Too much research for my input needed.
- This seems a benefit to the client.
- Option 2b seems to complicate not simplify.
- The hourly rate needs to be adjusted to take these into account. It must be done through direct payments as it gives the service user the choice and control without having PBSS do it for them, which removes responsibility from the SU and is given to the council.
- As long as these saving will be pass down so the hourly rate could be increased from minimum wage rate and how would this work for those not using personal budget team but work out they own taxes etc?
- Disabled people have a hard enough life without you making more and more cuts.

- I will challenge at law if necessary any attempt for you to provide personal assistants to my son whose needs are complex and who have been with him for many years which only happens because I use his budget flexibly and appropriately in accordance with the law. NCC have been proved by the government inspectors to be financially incompetent. Why should any disabled person trust them. In any case any changes should only apply to NEW employers. Leave others well alone.

**16) The Council’s preferred option is to change things so that the County Council, through PBSS, arrange and pay for some things when they are needed by all (or new) employers, rather than include these things in the hourly rate.**

**To what extent do you agree or disagree with this option?**

Answer Choices	Responses
Strongly agree	17
Tend to agree	31
Neither agree nor disagree	15
Tend to disagree	6
Strongly disagree	18
Don’t know	6
Not Applicable	5
Please tell us why	33
	Answered 98
	Skipped 67

**17) Please tell us why:**

- See q10.
- Although this is a consultation, through out the questions it is assumed that the Council will take on more of the on costs. I feel that this would not work in practice in the case of my [relative]. She needs to employ 6 PAs to cover all her needs 24/7. She is constantly having to advertise for new staff on job sites that charge for this service. Would PBSS pay for this?? She has to pay Employers NI contributions for all of her staff, pays more than 1 week SSP as suggested in the notes, she often has to call in emergency cover from another of her PAs or a care agency when a PA calls in sick at the last moment. She pays overtime rate for this cover and also extra for weekend working.
- I did think that this was a consultation, but the fact that all of your suggested DP rates given, are ‘on the assumption that the Council starts to pay for some of the on costs’, shows otherwise.  
As the consultation says, not all on costs are expected to be used, in each payday; and indeed, the whole advantage of a certain proportion of the DP rate being available for on costs, is that the money can be used when it is needed.

The on cost that I am most disappointed with the council, for proposing to take over, is advertising. Because of the DP rate being so disgustingly low, I frequently struggle to recruit and retain PAs, and am therefore constantly advertising. I have had experience of asking PBSS to assist me with advertising, and have been very

disappointed with what they are able to offer. They will advertise on Job Centre Plus, which has never been successful, and I have found that there has been a delay in them forwarding on the relevant information to me. The other way that PBSS are willing to help with advertising is also free, and involves a similar delay-waiting for them to print out cards that I am expected to go around to local shops, and ask them to pin up, which the shops would charge me for anyway. Even though this consultation suggests that the PBSS would now take on the cost of advertising, through advertisers who charge me for this service; as there are no details provided about this, I must assume that they will not necessarily fund advertising at places that I have found to be successful.

You have also not mentioned all of the on costs that I am expected to pay, and that I think it's only fair that I do pay. These include-shifts at weekend rate, sickness cover (when other employees are sick and cannot work-which is sometimes at very short notice, and I pay them overtime), different wage rates for daytime and evening shifts, not to mention the fact that it seems highly optimistic of you to assume that SSP will only be required for one week a year. I have already paid far more than that amount of SSP, this year.

- See previous comments.
- Makes sense for the Council to pay for things as and when needed and to reduce work in asking for money to be paid back.
- It helps me to get a clear picture of where the money goes and I will be able to see exactly where change in costs have occurred. Otherwise the Council debit will go up without clear reasons to where the extra charge has been made.
- I think paying for some things and not others could cause confusion and this starts to take away choice and control for the customer which was the original foundation for Direct Payments.
- Idea is to give direct management and control so I wish carry on to do independently. It could be confusing about who pays for what if changed.
- Re q 18 redundancy costs and payment in lieu of notice. This depends if the redundancy is a huge reduction in care package so should be PBSS/or care management/council in these circumstances as it is a special case. Depends on reason.
- I did think that this was a consultation, but the fact that all of your suggested DP rates given, are 'on the assumption that the Council starts to pay for some of the on costs', shows otherwise.

As the consultation says, not all on costs are expected to be used, in each payday; and indeed, the whole advantage of a certain proportion of the DP rate being available for on costs, is that the money can be used when it is needed.

The on cost that I am most disappointed with the council, for proposing to take over, is advertising. Because of the DP rate being so disgustingly low, I frequently struggle to recruit and retain PAs, and am therefore constantly advertising. I have had experience of asking PBSS to assist me with advertising, and have been very disappointed with what they are able to offer. They will advertise on Job Centre Plus, which has never been successful, and I have found that there has been a delay in them forwarding on the relevant information to me. The other way that PBSS are willing to help with advertising is also free, and involves a similar delay-waiting for them to print out cards that I am expected to go around to local shops, and ask them to pin up, which the shops would charge me for anyway.

You have also not mentioned all of the on costs that I am expected to pay, and that I think it's only fair that I do pay. These include-shifts at weekend rate, sickness cover (when other employees are sick and cannot work-which is sometimes at very short notice, and I pay them overtime), different wage rates for daytime and evening shifts, not to mention the fact that it seems highly optimistic of you to assume that SSP will only be required for one week a year. I have already made far more than that SSP, this year.

- Our carers are self-employed.
- To be honest I don't think this is clear? Our direct payments cover insurance, wages, and costs incurred with the employment of a PA nothing else? I don't think this should change.
- Seems a case of paying for one half and then expecting the employer to pay for everything else. Looks like the council win out on this one.
- I would like to agree to this but the woolly statement in the question 'we think we could' makes me cautious about endorsing it.
- It will be more beneficial to the council and also to those in receipt of a Personal Budget to only have the money they need rather than being placed in the position of having surplus funds in the bank account they use to make these payments. I know a number of people who have a large surplus in their Personal Budget and it causes them concerns, they do not need this. It is also not helpful to the County Councils budgets if monies that belong to them sit in bank accounts to which they have no access. Budget monitoring is pointless if a lot of money is elsewhere an unaccounted for.
- Seems like county is taking away our independence, I should be able to decide where to advertise my job vacancies not have county advertise where they choose to give one example.
- As I have said previously this will not work if recruitment costs are not funded if a small package requires several carers.
- I am on benefits and I cannot afford to help pay iv cut back on stuff has it is I starved my self because I couldn't afford to eat, but now I've been given advice on that and help I am ok.
- Seems reasonable.
- The processing of staff payments is unlikely to be of significance to a person in terms of control of the way a support service is delivered.  
Employer duties and costs are likely to be a disincentive to people to choose Direct Payments as their preferred option for the commissioning of their support.
- Employers would not incur unexpected costs that they were not expecting.
- I believe the service should be provided within the public sector or by not for profit charitable organisations. Remove the need to reward private investors.
- System appears more flexible and better value.
- If a user is required to pay themselves for any extra costs incurred for assistant to work bank holidays this could cause problems - care needs do not change on a bank holiday.
- Seems reasonable.
- I know at present that anything I need I have to pay for. To split things off would complicate my life.
- Extra over costs for out of hours and bank holidays should be included within the base rate paid by NCC.

- Statutory sick pay and should be covered by the PBSS.
- If the hourly rate is increased to take all items mentioned in to account, this would resolve the problem and leave the SU in control (which is the whole concept of Direct Payments).
- This is what we have now??. We have never received support for advertise so I don't see why these would save anything for client unless you have proper directory of possible workers.
- It makes sense for the council to pay for us much as possible, provided the hourly rate doesn't lower so that it becomes impossible to employ carers.
- A blended system will not work - you will end up with conflicts with the disabled and the Council and more costs of legal challenges.
- I wouldn't understand without their help.
- I do not understand the question as I am struggling to find the supporting information in the notes that you have enclosed.
- If I need extra support sometimes my carer would be paid.

**18) We could change things so that the Council, through PBSS, arrange and pay for some costs when they are needed by all (or new) customers, rather than include these costs within the hourly rate. Whilst other costs could remain within and be paid for by the employer (on costs) from the Direct Payment hourly rate.**

**Which of the following do you think should, in future be arranged and paid by PBSS or included within the hourly rate and paid for by the employer?**

	Paid by PBSS	Paid by employer	Total
Adverts for Personal Assistants if an employer chooses to advertise somewhere that makes a charge	49	35	84
Police checks	62	23	85
Payroll charges for those people who use the PBSS payroll service	60	23	83
Redundancy costs (if there is not enough money in a person's Direct Payment account)	63	21	84
Payments in lieu of notice (if there is not enough money in a person's Direct Payment account)	59	25	84
Other (please specify)			14
		Answered	87
		Skipped	78

**Other:**

- Statutory sick pay. Still have to pay for a replacement carers so paying twice.
- Cannot say as I do not know how this would affect me in practise.
- Could employer insurance also be included or separated from on-costs and funds paid to the employer as part of the DP.
- I believe the service should be provided within the public sector or by not for profit charitable organisations. Remove the need to reward private investors.
- Simplicity is the key.
- Also statutory sick pay.

- This ALL needs to be paid by the SU/employer, otherwise you are taking control away which is a direct contradiction of the purpose of DP.
- I refuse to answer this question - refer to all my previous comments.
- Don't understand question.
- The very reason a person needs a Personal Assistant means they do not have the expertise to do any of the above efficiently or thoroughly. Meaning inconsistent care and attention across the system. Many of the clients are at risk of receiving a standard of care that is appropriate.
- Not applicable.
- Don't think this is relevant.
- This would make it easier for people who have already stressful lives.
- What is pbss?

**Proposal 3: The minimum amounts we hope Personal Assistants would be paid**

**19) We are considering 5 options regarding the minimum amounts we expect Personal Assistants to be paid. What is your preferred option?**

**What is your preferred option?**

Answer Choices	Responses
Option 3a: Do nothing and leave the rate that we pay to all (or new) employers at the rate it is now (£9.89).	37
Option 3b: Reduce the rate that we pay to all (or new) employers to £9.56 and this would mean all employers would be able to be paid at the national Living Wage. (this would only work if the Council through PBSS started to pay for those things we asked about in Question 16)	7
Option 3c: Introduce the banded calculator on the assumption of Personal Assistants being paid £8.10 per hour. (The Council's preferred option)	21
Option 3d: Introduce the banded calculator on the assumption of Personal Assistants being paid £8.20 per hour	5
Option 3e: Introduce two rates, standard and complex, on the assumption of Personal Assistants being paid £7.83 per hour for standard rate and £8.20 per hour for complex rate.	11
Other (please specify)	24
	Answered 81
	Skipped 84

**Other:**

- The rates you show above are too low for highly skilled, qualified and experienced PAs. Ok for the last set of issues to go to PBSS (i.e. exceptionals) but not the day to day matters of looking after the service user's needs.
- My daughter experiences a great deal of difficulty in trying to recruit and retain staff at the low level of wages that she is able to offer them. However, these wages far exceed the wage levels offered in any of your options; and it would therefore be stupid of me to choose an option that would necessitate her giving her hardworking staff a pay cut, through no fault of their own.

- I experience a great deal of difficulty in trying to recruit and retain staff at the low level of wages that I am able to offer them. However, these wages far exceed the wage levels offered in any of your options; and it would therefore be stupid of me to choose an option that would necessitate me giving my hardworking staff a pay cut, through no fault of their own.
- Although I would welcome the council awarding me a higher rate, as someone with complex needs; I can also plainly see that both the standard rate and complex rate need to be far higher. All PAs should be better remunerated for their vitally important work, often at irregular and/or inconvenient times.
- For me they are already in order -my preferred option is to leave it as it is. A) then b) then c) then d and lastly e).  
By the time anything gets sorted the minimum wage will have gone up again then will be out of date very quickly. Also £7.83 is not enough I pay for someone to care for son and basically protect him and keep him safe. If you want people to stay you need the flexibility.
- The present amount £9.89 has been the same for years so we need more money to cover sick and holiday pay and other expenses. You offer £8.10 what happens when you need money for other things where does the money come from. I all ready pay my carer £8.50 already does she have a pay cut? It makes me mad that the cost you pay a care company chargers twice as much and don't give a good service, as hear from my friends who use that service.
- Provided we still have the option to pay more or less depending on the value added by the PA.
- Having a standard rate is ok for most people - £8.10 but there are many people with complex needs and people need more skills paid at a much higher rate for example very clear speaking/language/BSL for me as a deaf/blind person. This is currently recognised for me so I do not want to lose that.
- I experience a great deal of difficulty in trying to recruit and retain staff at the low level of wages that I am able to offer them. However, these wages far exceed the wage levels offered in any of your options; and it would therefore be stupid of me to choose an option that would necessitate me giving my hardworking staff a pay cut, through no fault of theirs.  
Although I would welcome the council awarding me a higher rate, as someone with complex needs; I can also plainly see that both the standard rate and complex rate need to be far higher. All PAs should be better remunerated for their vitally important work, often at irregular times.
- I think it's unfair to drop PAs current hourly rate. New rate should be used for new employees to PA roles. Disabled people may lose PAs with a wage decrease.
- It is quite important to get Personal Assistants of the right calibre. It will be difficult to get a Personal Assistant to cover complex care if they are not paid a rate that covers their additional skills.
- Option 3c "plus" - based on current and future adjustments to the rate based on a basketful of local pay rates in the social care sector and equivalent non care sector jobs in order for the direct care payment to be competitive and sustainable.
- Option 3c but with the addition that this only applies to new employees.
- I have selected Option 3a, but actually think that all carers and health professionals are undervalued in the UK, and should be paid significantly more than they are

currently. It is wrong to suggest that the National Living Wage is appropriate and sufficient for anybody to live on.

- Make sure the carers receive proper reward. I believe the service should be provided within the public sector or by not for profit charitable organisations. Remove the need to reward private investors.
- I'm surprised at the rate. It makes my previous input irrelevant.
- I do not prefer any option that complicates things. I already pay living wage and have had no problems - why fix what isn't broken?
- Northamptonshire pays one of the lowest DP allowances in the country and if anything, should be raised!!
- To be honest, I don't think this applies to my [relative] as she does not have a personal assistant. I manage the care pot for her. So I pay the invoices each month to the care support company.
- I do not get paid for doing it.
- We were never given the option of paying high rate if though daughter has complex needs as we were told we could pay minimum wage £7.83 as the rest go on coats so if you reduce the rate how can we even meet the minimum wage rate. And even £8.20 is inadequate for meeting some needs of clients it needs to be person centres as per care act requirement.
- You are having a laugh! Pay peanuts, get monkeys. Remember you can pay what you want but under the law the person managing the budget can pay whatever they want provided it is in the budget. You would need primary legislation to change that and I would immediately contact my MP to oppose this. Nobody should have any faith in NCC's financial management abilities - and will you still be around to implement all these really complex changes which will frighten your clients in any event?
- The low pay is one of the reasons people can't find appropriate personal assistants.
- All carers should be trained to a standard that would need the appropriate pay rate for services given.
- Not applicable.
- How can you justify such low choices. Consider how much people who manage people get paid and compare it with those who actually make a hands on difference. You should be ashamed for considering such a minimal amount.

**20) The Council’s preferred option is to introduce the banded calculator on the assumption of Personal Assistants being paid a minimum of £8.10 per hour. To what extent do you agree or disagree with this option?**

Answer Choices	Responses
Strongly agree	16
Tend to agree	23
Neither agree nor disagree	8
Tend to disagree	14
Strongly disagree	25
Don't know	2
Not Applicable	4
Please tell us why	38

Answered	92
Skipped	73

**21) Please tell us why:**

- Minimum is ok provided there is scope for higher rates.
- The council's preferred option assumes that they will take on responsibility for more of the on costs, than they currently do, and this means that the DP rate will actually be reduced. As I have noted earlier my various objections to this suggestion, and belief that my [relative] would still have to pay as many on costs as she currently does, out of a reduced DP rate; then I would effectively, be approving a cut to her DP rate, by selecting this option.
- The council's preferred option assumes that they will take on responsibility for more of the on costs, than they currently do, and this means that the DP rate will actually be reduced. As I have noted earlier my various objections to this suggestion, and belief that I would still have to pay as many on costs as I currently do, out of a reduced DP rate; then I would effectively, be approving a cut to my DP rate, by selecting this option.
- I agree with £8.10 per hour but don't agree with the banding due to needing more than 1 carer on your payroll.
- Already pay my carer £8.50.
- Fair rate.
- Can I reinforce the question of added value? The accompanying information keeps referring to "(being) fairer to PAs" if paid at same rate. We pay highest rate affordable because of the quality and work-rate of my wife's PA - she is worth much more. Some carers are worth much less.
- The council's preferred option assumes that they will take on responsibility for more of the on costs, than they currently do. Hence, this means that the DP rate will actually be reduced. As I have noted earlier my various objections to this suggestion, and belief that I would still have to pay as many on costs, out of a reduced DP rate; then I would effectively, be approving a cut to my DP rate- by selecting this option.
- Think it should only be for new PAs not currently employed PAs it's unfair.
- Our rate of pay is lower than this already!
- Most people would struggle to live on that hourly rate.
- PA do not get paid enough.
- It is less than the current amount with no guarantee of any other costs being met elsewhere.
- People who have complex needs have to pay their employees at a higher rate per hour.
- Personal Assistants should be paid a rate commensurate with the skills they require for the job in hand, so basic skills one rate, more skilled then a higher rate.
- Be nice to be able to give my PA a pay rise after years on minimum wage at county's dictate.
- There certainly need to be a pay rise as it has not increased for years. This has not saved money as difficulty in recruiting and retaining staff has lead to some people needing agency care which is more expensive.
- My carer does a lot for me if she did not I don't think I would manage at all, she takes me hos dr dentist on holiday, gives me advice, helps with things.

- As long as this is adjusted each based on some form of inflation or the government minimum wage.
- See Q.13.
- I do not know the current rates paid by NASS, but if this is comparable I agree. However, if this is below the rate someone doing the same job is paid I strongly disagree. I also think this should only apply to new employees.
- It's not sufficient reward for what these people do. Minimum pay should be £10 per hour plus travel allowance and full employment rights.
- Amount should be more.
- Trying to cut pay after all.
- PAs are highly valued and enable me to live independently. I think they should be paid appropriately.
- Northamptonshire pays one of the lowest DP allowances in the country and if anything, should be raised!! Lowering the wage does NOT take into account holiday pay, pensions, sick coverage etc!!
- Too rigid not person centred.
- Cleaners get paid £10-£12 in this area, it is very difficult to employ personal assistants for £8.10 an hour.
- Every PA is providing a specialist service.
- It's very low at the moment.
- Try and find a decent assistant at the wage you are thinking of paying. This is disgusting as this will affect the care that would be given, pay peanuts get monkeys, some assistants are skilled and need at least £14 per hour, time to look at the real price of care instead of making cuts.
- Change my right to manage my son's budget - I will challenge this at law if necessary. None of your proposals work for those with my son's needs whose budgets are complex.
- It will be good to give some PA's a pay rise, but only if their work load requires this.
- I am happy with things the way they are and not able to cope with change easily.
- Appropriate pay for experience and training. To give a standardised service, then no client loses out on poor care.
- Not applicable.
- I believe that people with more complex needs require more specialised carers who would need to be paid at a higher rate.
- £8.10 an hour is very low and means that staff are hard to come by I would rather pay them more and top up myself as needed as if I didn't I would not be able to get a decent PA for that kind of money per hour.

### How we may introduce any changes

#### 22) Should any new ways of calculating the Direct Payment rate be introduced when existing people get a new Personal Assistant?

Answer Choices	Responses
Yes	33
No	30
Don't know	25

Please tell us why	27
Answered	88
Skipped	77

**23) Please tell us why:**

- Depends on the upper and lower rate limits - fine if flexible.
- My [relative] has a team of employees, and it would be completely unfair of her to offer one PA a different wage rate, to the rest of her staff.
- I have a team of employees, and it would be completely unfair of me to offer one PA a different wage rate, to the rest of my staff.
- To make sure it's the correct rate.
- I would like to see what the outcome would be.
- If a person has a team of existing staff they may be on a certain rate of pay so a process may cause disruption/issues amongst the team if the rate is changed. If you have a single PA it would be ok to look at this.
- I have a team of employees, and it would be completely unfair of me to offer one PA a different wage rate, to the rest of my staff.
- If there's a new rate new PAs will need to accept that rate or not take the role.
- If you are going to make changes, change it across the board, not running 2 separate systems.
- Not sure. Depends on what calculations are going to be used and on what terms
- It would create inequity.
- Probably more practical.
- It makes sense to move everyone to one system over time.
- Any changes should only apply when new staff are recruited.
- It will only work to the disadvantage of customers and benefit the County Council.
- It's no because your motives are untrustworthy.
- To make them in line with new claimants.
- If the initial assessment was done properly, the hourly wage would automatically take in to account, pensions, holiday pay, sick coverage, and insurance. Then, you would see that if anything, the rate should be increased to about £11 an hour.
- I haven't the scope of knowledge or experience to answer this.
- I would just say that your rates are laughable - they should be double but of course you cannot afford that. However, none of this pie in the sky nonsense you have come up with to scare people should apply to anything other than new budgets - and that does not mean to new PAs.
- Doesn't seem fair to pay the people have already been looking after someone for years to suddenly get less money as they may depend on that money.
- I suppose it will have to start sometime and that would be a good time.
- Complicated for me.
- It should be standardised - easier to process - easier to manage - easier to check standards of care.
- Not applicable.
- The stress level are too high I would prefer it to stay the same.
- Everyone should have the same process otherwise it isn't fare.

**24) Should people who already have a Direct Payment for employing a Personal Assistant(s) be able to stay on their current rate if they can demonstrate that any new ways of calculating their rate would not be suitable for them?**

Answer Choices	Responses
Yes	65
No	9
Don't know	17
	Answered 91
	Skipped 74

**25) If you said 'Yes', what type of information do you think people would need to evidence in order to demonstrate that none of the new ways of calculating their rate would be suitable for them?**

- Skills, qualifications and experience of PAs linked to the service provided to meet user's needs.
- I believe that looking at a copy of the latest return of their DP account would clearly demonstrate the amount of funding they actually need.
- I believe that the DP account return should be sufficient.
- Having 2 or more people in your employment.
- Can only [eligible] this if we see how the old and the new compare as an outcome. Then we can provide the relevant evidence.
- By what PA need to do or communication professionals and through support plan. Need to negotiate with care management.
- I believe the DP return should be sufficient.
- Generally rates for care staff are much higher than the PB allows for.
- The council need to calculate exactly the amount the employer needs per month to cover the hours rather than letting large surplus amounts build up in accounts then there would be more money for others. Again, it's unfair to cut PAs current rates due to mismanagement.
- It doesn't take into account external factors.
- If things work don't alter then and probably make them worse.
- Log of activities undertaken; Routine records from NHS services.
- The type of care that is provided and qualifications of staff.
- An increase in personal cost to the employer not in line with that already calculated as their contribution to the budget.
- Evidence of their complex needs and that they would need an increase in the rate to be able to fund their care needs.
- Why should they have to demonstrate why they should continue as is? The evidence should be provable with their Financial statement.
- That would be difficult to foresee but in my cases if I can show that I need numerous carers but I am only supposed to need 1!
- It should be that it disadvantages them from what they currently receive, or causes them a health problem.
- How much the PA is paid and that the rate of pay is necessary in accordance with the skills the PA must have to meet needs.

- Evidence of an employee working for them and knowing their needs well over a long period, with an hourly pay rate above the proposals. Evidence that they use the budget to the full each year (bank statements).
- Amount of care needed and real cost of that provision.
- Experience, time in the job, qualifications.
- Physical needs. Doctors assessment. Other support from family friends.
- On there needs bases.
- I don't know.
- It's dependent on circumstances but if they want to stay as they are I think a thorough check of the spend for the past year should be made to ensure value for money.
- They may not fully comprehend the new measures.
- That there needs do not change but they are able to make additional cost decisions on their own.
- It should be without question.
- Individual extra needs.
- I will like to employing my own Personal Assistant(s) & PA Staff & PA Worker for me to get sign up to get my own Business & Employment & Advocacy Group & One To One & CV & Bill & Bank & Office Work & Holidays & Disability & Disabled Meeting & Conference & Event & Disability & Disabled Club in Kettering & Northampton & East Northants & Northamptonshire & The East Midlands & Other Town in the UK and get out and about better more in the community and at home to have a lot more better good choice of rights & Life and get a lot more Friends & Friendship & Relationship with my own Personal Assistant(s) PA Staff & PA Worker with a lot more hours for me & Disability & Disabled People with your help & Support from you for us today now
- If you take the living wage, add in holiday coverage, add in sick days, add in insurance, add in cost of living rises (which never get addressed) add in accounting costs etc, you will see that the current rate is not enough.
- Medical complex disability so requires trained staff. Challenging Behaviour so require trained staff. Social worker should have this evidence.
- As little as possible.
- My carers charge £14 per hour, I can find a carer in my area, that would do it for less, these carers are skilled, they plan days out and social events, not just turning up to make you a cup of tea.
- Individual needs.
- How about the fact that the budget has been working perfectly satisfactorily for 10 years? And what about the fact that you will probably be breaking the law either in relation to the provision of budgets or employment law? I reserve the right to ask my [relative] (who is a [media professional] and member of the back bench team at the [national newspaper]) what attitude the media, either his own employer or his numerous media contacts, would think of this whole debacle.
- Special needs carers cost more than the hourly rate, you have already deducted from my allowance already ,how much more are you going to take, I've had to reduce my carer, because of your cutbacks.
- If they can give good reasons why the current rate and system works well for them.
- Look at how the rate was put in to place, is it appropriate for care given. This is a chance to check standards.
- Not applicable.

- People could fairly be asked to explain their personal care and mobility requirements and also to say whether or not and to what extent they are also receiving practical support from relations (or very good friends) who visit them at least every other day.
- I don't think showing can help I just think that it will suit some more than others, in some cases if it's not broken why fix it - it works for my son and his PA we pay her a little more so she can survive and I top up anything else that's needed.
- Hours and explain needs of person.
- This is difficult because it's unfair on both sides.
- Their needs and abilities should be re-assessed with compassion.

**26) Do you have any alternative suggestions about how we could calculate the Direct Payment rate to make sure that people get what they need but don't get more than they need?**

- Big question - would be happy to contribute to depth discussions and work with NCC/NASS on a solution.
- For a start, you need to research what is offered in the local job market, for care workers. For those with standard needs, you can pay them a DP rate that enables them to pay their employees an amount at the lower end of the local job market. For those with complex needs, you can pay them a DP rate that enables them to pay their employees at the higher end of the local job market.  
You must also forget the idea of paying more on costs, and instead research what percentage of the DP rate, is allowed by other LAs, for employer expenses. There should be 2 different percentages allowed for employer expenses, a standard rate and a complex rate. This will reflect the fact that employer expenses are higher for some people; and particularly reflect the fact that some recipients may need to employ a scheme manager, to ensure the smooth running of their PA scheme. After you have worked out sufficient wage rates to be locally paid, you should then add these percentages to them; and the resulting amounts might then be sufficient amounts to start suggesting. However, it would be even better if you offered DP rates above these minimums, and then DP users can be free to build up money in their DP bank accounts when it is not needed, so that they have that reserve to rely upon, when it is needed.
- For a start, you need to research what is offered in the local job market, for care workers. For those with standard needs, you can pay them a DP rate that enables them to pay their employees an amount at the lower end of the local job market. For those with complex needs, you can pay them a DP rate that enables them to pay their employees at the higher end of the local job market.

You must also forget the idea of paying more on costs, and instead research what percentage of the DP rate, is allowed by other LAs, for employer expenses. There should be 2 different percentages allowed for employer expenses, a standard rate and a complex rate. This will reflect the fact that employer expenses are higher for some people; and particularly reflect the fact that some recipients may need to employ a scheme manager, to ensure the smooth running of their PA scheme. After you have worked out sufficient wage rates to be locally paid, you should then add these percentages to them; and the resulting amounts might then be sufficient amounts to start suggesting. However, it would be even better if you offered DP

rates above these minimums, and then DP users can be free to build up money in their DP bank accounts when it is not needed, so that they have that reserve to rely upon, when it is needed.

- Honesty! If people truly were accruing monies then it could be made crystal clear that by giving some back to NCC without fear of rates or hours being changed or stopped then maybe people would freely give back what they didn't need. It sometimes happens for example that you may have lull between to carers or for whatever reason for a few weeks the money isn't spent cause of holiday etc. This can be a simple transaction back to NCC. Surely it must be cheaper for someone to monitor the amounts through audits rather than sending social workers out every 5 mins to reassess people.
- An annual review would be fair.
- The most important suggestion I have is that when payments change the recipient and the budget manager is given the reasons. No effort I have been able to make has requested the reasons on annual loss of over £2k. Unacceptable.
- Look at the whole picture of what people need including need for flexibility and looking at what contingencies might be required.
- Personal care, level of disability/learning disability, level of support required, travel mileage for those needing to travel over a set mileage to access activities, all. Things that should be taken into account when calculating.
- For a start, you need to research what is offered in the local job market, for care workers. For those with standard needs, you can pay them a DP rate that enables them to pay their employees an amount at the lower end of the local job market. For those with complex needs, you can pay them a DP rate that enables them to pay their employees at the higher end of the job market.  
You must also forget the idea of paying more on costs, and instead research what the percentage of the DP rate, is allowed by other LAs, for employer expenses.  
After you have worked out sufficient wage rates to be locally paid, you should then add this percentage to it; and the resulting amount might be a sufficient amount to start suggesting. However, it would be even better if you offered DP rates above these minimums, and then DP users can be free to build up money in their DP bank accounts when it is not needed, so that they have that reserve to rely upon, when it is needed.
- Personalise the direct payments. Talk to the employers and work out how much they need monthly rather than dumping a set amount in monthly an leaving it there to increase or decrease and leave people short. It's clear the current direct payments system isn't working but cutting PAs wages could incur a crisis requiring extra help in the long term.
- Yes I do for me for you to employing my own PA Worker with a lot more hours for me & Disability & Disabled People in Northamptonshire about some staff & Worker are on the Bus in Kettering & Northamptonshire & The East Midlands & Other Town in the UK and about who other people are with me keep on looking at me out in the Community and at home for a long time and about some child keep get on at me & Keep me name out in the community at home with me and with Disability & Disabled People for a long time and it is not on & I will like my own PA Worker with a long more hours for me to Help & Support on the Bus out in the community and at home to help & Support me at Disability & Disabled Meeting & Conference & Event with me and for my own PA Worker to help & Support me at Disability & Disabled Club in

the UK and to help & Support me to get out about better more out in the community & At home to have a lot more better good choice of rights & Social Life & Social Skills and to help & Support me to get long more Friends & Friendship & Relationship & My own PA Worker with a lot more hours for me to get my own Business & Employment & CV & Office Work & Bill & Bank & Holidays & One To One for me with my own PA Worker with a lot more hours for me today now.

- Reviews of their accounts should provide adequate data for whether they are getting paid too much to cover their costs.
- No.
- More scope to take into account varying costs of PAs e.g. scarcity pushes up the price in rural areas. Are these end users to be penalised? Other needs outside of PAs e.g. living aids or other additional costs.
- The only way you can ensure that they are getting what they need is to improve communication with them and to monitor the Personal Budgets on a regular basis.
- If a client does not use their whole budget it is clawed back. If they need more than allocated there has to be a re-assessment which is time consuming ,stressful and costs the council more money. Being generous in the calculation will not necessarily cost more.
- No.
- See previous answers.
- I do not see any evidence in the document that explains how many people receive more than they need or by how much. Bringing in these changes (especially for existing customers) could result in the loss of their PAs, appeals against the changes or the need to use agencies (at a higher cost) to meet essential needs. Is there not a danger that costs to the council may increase rather than decrease as a result of these proposals.
- Direct provision by direct labour force.
- Thorough assessment.
- N/A.
- It needs a very clear itemised list of needs and expectation vs spend to ensure value for money.
- Regular reviews as circumstances and situations change rapidly
- No.
- No.
- Regular (on time and timely) finance reviews with claw back for underspend which may be different each year as needs and circumstances change.
- Need a lot more help & Support with my own Personal Assistant(s) PA Staff & PA Worker with a lot more hours for me with information & Agree & Disability & Disabled People today now.
- Yes...see above.
- Person centres by needs as stated in care act maybe you should try reading it.
- I think with varying needs paying too much and recalling the money on post 6 monthly audit allows NCC not to put clients at risk because the money is there when needed. You might get NCC into a situation where care is not given as money has run out that you allocate monthly and the care managers are not able to assess emergency circumstances quick enough to then get the finance people to get money to client to pay staff, thus creating a situation where some clients families would be

upset and got to the media. i.e. you sailed to close to the wind so would suggest you have an emergency response fast track care manager/finance option available.

- How can any disabled person get more than they need. Every disabled person uses their personal care allowance, in fact you should increase their direct payment, and give them a better quality of life, shame on you for trying to find anyway of justifying any cutbacks, yet again the disabled are discriminated against.
- Proper assessment's and listening to what people need.
- If people manage the budget sensibly and they have more than they need in any one accounting period (which varies wildly in any case), then the Council take the money back. That is a fair, sensible and legal system, does not leave the Council out of pocket or the client at risk of running out of money, and complies with the law. What is wrong with that?! Oh - of course - silly me it is so that you can CUT people's budgets which are all you are interested in.
- If it's not broken why try to change it. The system seems to work well but for more extreme help then yes that needs looking at.
- Disabled people have a hard enough life as it is, STOP cutting back on their care.
- To work out how much care and what it entails and tailor money appropriately.
- I feel the system is a fair system, and don't cope with change.
- As 17.
- Not applicable.  
If it turns out that there is a sum left in the account after a year then by all means it can be paid back to assist someone else.
- Talking to service users.
- I doubt people are getting too much but it's more about not being able to spend the money because they can't find the PA or service.
- No.
- No idea.

**27) Do you think that people who already have a Direct Payment for employing a Personal Assistant(s) should be able to move to any new ways of working (if this works for them) from their next annual review?**

Answer Choices	Responses
Yes	55
No	11
Don't know	22
	Answered 88
	Skipped 77

**28) If you said 'No', when do you think people who already have a Direct Payment for employing a Personal Assistant(s) should be able to move to any new ways of working?**

- Please note that the answer to 19 fully depends on the phrase "if this works for them".
- This should only happen when the people who have already a DP, ask to do so.
- Only when they specifically request to do so.

- They should stay on their original rate until the new lowest rate goes above £9.89.
- That means you have basically changed things already so this survey is a waste of time.
- Only when they specifically request to do so.
- They should only move if they want to. If something is working well then why try and change it, when you do this it quite often leads to confusion unless sufficient training has been put in place.
- I would have ticked 'Yes' but want to emphasise that I only think that if it really works for them and not if they are pressured to do so.
- It depends on the detail.
- On significant change in circumstances or on new employment of assistant.
- Provided there is no undue pressure to conform!
- It's another way for you to implicate another cut back.
- NEVER - if you want to comply with the laws that exist.
- This is a joke, try and find a good paying job for adults with learning difficulties, another excuse to cut back.
- No as I have pointed out in previous questions.
- Not applicable.

### **Any other comments**

#### **29) Do you want to make any other comments about the Council's proposals for Direct Payments for those people who employ a Personal Assistant(s)?**

- Covered really in response to Q 4 and negative stance to "system/calculator" - service users are individuals with varying needs and potentially, therefore, need to employ "differently qualified" PAs at different rates of pay. Any new approach should recognise and allow for this and acknowledge the stresses of change on the service users. Thank you for the opportunity to contribute.
- This is a quote from my [relative]:-  
"As I am sceptical that this is actually a consultation, rather than a foregone conclusion; I would obviously choose to stay on my current DP rate, for as long as possible. As I have stated more than a few times, I have great difficulty in recruiting and retaining staff; and this means that I would actually prefer you to significantly raise the DP rate(in the way that I have detailed in responses to Question 10) .

The primary cause of all my problems with PA recruitment and retention is the fact that I am just not able to offer high enough wages, to actually be a competitive employment option, taking into account all the negative aspects of working for me. These include the facts that the hours of employment that I require are usually irregular, and sometimes inconvenient, that working for me is physically demanding, and requires my staff to be comfortable with taking on entire responsibility for my life and health. It is almost surprising that I manage to find anyone who is willing to work for me, despite all the negative aspects of doing so, at the pittance that you enable me to pay their wages at."

- As I am sceptical that this is actually a consultation, rather than a foregone conclusion; I would obviously choose to stay on my current DP rate, for as long as possible. As I have stated more than a few times, I have great difficulty in recruiting

and retaining staff; and this means that I would actually prefer you to significantly raise the DP rate (in the way that I have detailed in responses to Question 10) . The primary cause of all my problems with PA recruitment and retention is the fact that I am just not able to offer high enough wages, to actually be a competitive employment option, taking into account all the negative aspects of working for me. These include the facts that the hours of employment that I require are usually irregular, and sometimes inconvenient, that working for me is physically demanding, and requires my staff to be comfortable with taking on entire responsibility for my life and health. It is almost surprising that I manage to find anyone who is willing to work for me, despite all the negative aspects of doing so, at the pittance that you enable me to pay their wages at.

- I don't think this proposal would save NCC any money particularly. It seems it would be more time consuming for staff and therefore costly in that way let alone the stress it may cause to staff.

I think it would be 2 inflexible - if at review you did have 1 carer and very little on costs - 6 months later they could have left and you then employ 2 people to share the role you would then have more on costs and you can never predict how long staff will stay, it could change again 3 months later this is then much more costly to keep going out and reassessing the rate because the first one wouldn't be enough.

- I feel you have already made your mind up, you have a PA because you need one and don't want to worry about financial matters. The PA deserves to be paid a decent rate.
- I will like the County Council to help & Support me employing a Personal Assistants with a lot more hours for me to go to Disability Disabled Meeting & Conference & Event & Disability & Disabled Club with my own Personal Assistants with a lot more for me and to get out and about better more out in the community and at home with my own Personal Assistants with a lot more hours for me to have a lot more better good choice of rights & Social Life & Social Skills out in the community and at home with my own Personal Assistants with a lot more hours for me and to help & Support me to get a lot more better good choice of new Friends & Friendship & Relationship with my own Personal Assistants with a lot more hours for me and to help & Support me to get my own Business & Employment & Advocacy Groups & CV & One To One & Office Work & Pay Bill & Bank & Disability & Disabled Holidays in the UK & Social Life & Social Skills and on Bus with my own Personal Assistants with a lot more hours for me about who some Bus are not good with me & Disability & Disabled People in Kettering & Northamptonshire & The East Midlands in the UK for a long time and it not on about other people keep on looking at me out in the community and at home for a long time and it is not on and keep on looking at Disability & Disabled People out in the community and at home for a long time and it not on and who some child keep get on at me and keep call me name out in the community and at home for a long time has it is not on and who some child keep get on at Disability & Disabled People and keep call Disability & Disabled People name for a long time out in the community and at home and it is not on and will like your help & Support from you and Northamptonshire County Council to employ Personal Assistants with a lot more hours for me & Disability & Disabled People in Kettering & Northamptonshire today now?
- I do think it's important for the system to be regularly monitored and reviewed.

- As I understand it, the purpose of direct payments was to provide freedom to spend the bucks in a way that provides the biggest [eligible] for the recipient. Don't take that freedom away. The total provided can never be enough.
- I understand the need for the efficient use of public money as long as DP users are looked at in a holistic way so any changes do not impact on their life.
- Better information for me & Disability & Disabled People in Northamptonshire I will like your help & Support to employ a Personal Assistant(s) with a lot more hours for me about who some Bus are in Kettering & Northamptonshire & The East Midlands & Other Town in the UK for a long time & I am not happy about it for a long time & About some child keep get on at me and keep call name out in the community & At home for a long time & I am not happy about it for a long time & Other people keep on looking at me out in the community and at home for a long time & I am not happy about it for a long time & Disability & Disabled People are not happy about it for a long time today now.
- As I am sceptical that this is actually a consultation, rather than a foregone conclusion; I would obviously choose to stay on my current DP rate, for as long as possible. As I have stated more than a few times, I have great difficulty in recruiting and retaining staff; and this means that I would actually prefer you to significantly raise the DP rate (in the way that I have detailed in responses to Question 26) .
- I will like to employ a Personal Assistant(s)? & How come you are not help & Support me to employ a Personal Assistant with a lot more hours for me about who some Bus are with me & Disability & Disabled People for a long time and it is not good & Who other people with me & Disability & Disabled People and about some child keep get on at me & Keep call me name out in the community and at home for a long time & I am not happy about it for a long time & I will like a Personal Assistant with a lot more hours to help & Support me to get out and about better more out in the community and at home to have a better good choice of rights & Social Life & Social Skills and to help & Support me to get a lot more Friends & Friendship & Relationship for me and to help & Support me to go to Disability & Disabled Meeting & Conference & Event & Disability & Disabled Club and help & Support me to get my own Business & Employment & CV & Advocacy Group & One To One & Office Work & Bill & Bank & Holidays & Rights & Social Life & Social Skills and to be a lot more happy & Safe out in the community and at home with my own Personal Assistant with a lot a long more hours for me with your help & Support from the County Council today now?"
- Employing carers via a PB is very challenging when you cannot find agencies or carers that will work for the rates suggested. People who are trained and give quality care simply will not work for these rates of pay. It then becomes a balancing act between quality of care and quantity of time (which can continue to increase or vacillate due to failing health).
- The proposals are not clear because there isn't a clear set of conditions for people on how they're to spend the money. People seem to use it to pay for different expenses depending on what they've been advised. Be clear on what the money is to be spent on, then calculate exactly what people are using. Before trying to change PA rates.
- it will be for me employing PA Worker with a lot more home for me to have a lot more better good choice of rights & Social Life & Social Skills & One To One for me to get out and about better a lot more on the Bus with a lot more hours with my PA Worker about who some staff & Worker are on the Bus in Kettering & Northamptonshire & East Midlands & Other Town in the UK with me a lot more

better to keep me a lot more happy & Safe to have a lot more better good choice of rights & Social Life & Social Skills & I am not happy about who some staff & Worker on the Bus and about other people and some child are for a long time and it is not on in Kettering & Northamptonshire & The East Midlands & Other Town in the UK for me & Disability & Disabled People today now.

- I live in Supported Living Accommodation and whilst I receive 4 hours support a week I was not aware that this constitutes employing a Personal Assistant.
- Am worried that with new calculations with employers are going to lose out. If this can be guaranteed not to happen then I am in favour. If not then No to the proposals.
- I found it all too confusing. This survey needs to be greatly simplified.
- Please can you can help & Support me to my own Personal Assistants(s) PA Staff & PA Worker with a lot more hours for me has I have agree & Learning Disability for me in Kettering in Northamptonshire for me has I am not happy about who some Bus are and some staff and some Worker on some Bus in Kettering & Northamptonshire for a long time and it is not on for a long time & Some child are keep get on at me and keep call me name out in the community for a long time and it is not on and who other people keep on looking at me out in the community and at home for a long time and it is not on and I am not happy about it for a long time out in the community and at home and it will a lot better to get out and about better more in the community with my own Personal Assistants & PA Staff & PA Worker with a lot more hours for me to have a lot more better good choice of rights & Social Life & Social Skills to be a lot more happy & Safe with my own Personal Assistants & PA Staff & PA Worker for me and to get sign up to get my own Business & Employment & Advocacy Group & CV & One To One & Office Work & Bill & Bank & Holidays to have my own Personal & Assistants & PA Staff & PA Worker with a lot more hours for me and for Disability & Disabled Meeting & Conference & Event in Kettering & East Northants & Northampton & Northamptonshire & The East Midlands & Other Town in the UK and for Disability & Disabled Club in Kettering & East Northants & Wellingborough & Northampton & Northamptonshire to go with my own Personal Assistants PA Staff & PA Worker with a lot more hours all day and all week for me and to get a lot more Friends & Friendship & Relationship to have my own Personal Assistants & PA Staff & PA Worker with a lot more hours for me with your help & Support from you and your team for me today now.
- As long as individual contributions don't increase to cover extra costs.
- More help is needed for recruiting. The current arrangement simply does not work. There could be an online register of available carers and vacancies set out in regions as it is easier to recruit people especially for short visits if they are local. Recruitment drives similar to those for foster carers and tapping into potential carers from schools ,community groups ,churches. The council could be far more pro-active in helping to match carers with clients.
- Please do not forget about outcomes, what is meant to be achieved through this self directed support. Please ensure that people with disabilities stay in control.
- I think you should save the expense and leave things as they are.
- No.
- N/A.
- The present system is working well for us - it seems unnecessary to change.
- I think annual review of hourly rate should be built into the bands.
- No.

- No.
- It will good and a lot better for me to employing my own PA Staff & PA Worker with a lot more hours for me to get sign up to get my own Business & Employment & Advocacy Group & One To One & CV & Office Work & Bill & Bank & Holidays & Disability & Disabled Meeting & Conference & Event & Disability & Disabled Club in Kettering & Northampton & East Northants & Northamptonshire & The East Midlands & Other Town in the UK and to get out and about better more in the community and at home to have a lot more better good choice of rights & Life and to be a lot more happy & Safe in the community and at home with my own PA Staff & PA Worker with a lot more hours for me and to get a lot more Friends & Friendship & Relationship & Agree and information and who some child keep get on at me and keep call me name out the community has it has be on for a long time and it is not on has it has be on for a lot long time and about who some child keep get on Disability & Disabled People and call Disability & Disabled People name out in the community for a long time and it is not on and Disability & Disabled People have not be happy about it for a long time we so of has better good choice of rights & Life in the community and to have our own Business & Employment & Advocacy Group & CV & One To One & Bill & Bank & Holidays & Disability & Disabled Meeting & Conference & Event & Disability & Disabled Club and information and to get out and about better more in the community to be a lot more happy & Safe to have a lot more better good choice of rights & Life & Friends & Friendship & Relationship and with our own Personal Assistant(s) with a lot more hours with your help & Support from you for me today now.
- The 'In Control' Budget has allowed me to live a life that is independent and meaningful. Because of the existing system I am able to contribute to my community and feel valued and safe.
- If I haven't made myself clear, I can only apologise. Because the current rate should be increased in order to take in to account all items mentioned and should be closer to the £11 an hour rate.
- I am sorry but I have realised that this does not apply in my/our circumstances as we pay a company not a personal assistant. But please ready my account of how my [relative] is being short changed for not increasing her care pot money to cover the increase in the care company's hourly rate.
- £10.00 per hour would more appropriately for complex needs as we train the staff and the lose them to agencies who pay better.
- Will you be taking any notice of the consultation response as you have not with previous consultations?
- Control should always remain with the person employing the PA. Individual circumstances must be taken into consideration. DP aren't a one size fits all option as everyone's situation and needs are totally different.
- I use an app to clock carers in and out, then transpose to spreadsheet, then to timesheet, sending to payroll, then I print/email payslips and pay the salary. When paying for carers travelling on trains and meals etc, I have never understood why you just did not set up the payroll etc to be paid from central fund by NASS so your keep all your money in house at NCC and have a separate system to cover paying for carers non payroll salary expenses (travelling on trains and meals etc).
- Perhaps stop discriminating against disabled people, and increase their personal care, and give them a better quality of life, instead of making them suffer, because

this council has got its self into financial difficulties, oh let's hit the disabled with cutbacks, shame on this council.

- As everyone one is different what might be good for 1 may not be good for another service user. At the end of the day it's the service users needs that should be met in the best possible way not what the NASS think they need they should get what they need to give them a quality of life they deserve.
- Yes - I cannot emphasise too strongly that what you have produced will by way over the heads of most of your clients and will frighten them. I know this from experience.
- Why change it if it's working? If there are extremes cases then they need looking at if it doesn't work. But on the whole if it's working don't change it. Also look at the agencies you use, they make a profit from employing and paying them people less than they would be paid, hourly, for miles driven, then if they were employed direct which I consider highly unethical.
- Having a personal assistant is life changing, to adults with learning difficulties, don't you think that being disabled is hard enough, without you making cutbacks again, you have just done it, how many more times are you going to cut back on the most vulnerable of society, give disabled people a life, it's disgusting how you can justify your cutbacks.
- It's really difficult to get the appropriate funding and services and further cuts are going to put vulnerable people at more risk. Staff need better training to be able to assess and understand the type of support people need. It might be helpful to offer staff in SEND NCC teams the option to do PA work as finding people trained and able to understand autism and behaviour is difficult.
- I would like to keep it as it is as it's simple and works for me.
- Who is monitoring care and standards?
- No.
- No.
- If this is the easy to understand survey well. I don't think this is really relevant to my [relative].
- I think they should stay the same.
- This appears to be yet another cost cutting measure which will affect the more vulnerable in our community.
- This is something I'd like to talk to someone face to face as it all depends on the individual support.
- If you were a PA wouldn't you want a decent wage and if you were looking for a PA for a loved one wouldn't you find it difficult paying them peanuts.
- No.
- I think a pa should be paid for all time spent with her or his employer i.e. taking them to all appointments as they have no other means of transport employer should be able to pay for this time out of their direct payments money.

## Appendix 2: Demographic Questions

### 30) Are you responding to this questionnaire as an individual or on behalf of an organisation/community group?

Answer Choices	Responses
As an individual	90
On behalf of an organisation/community group	1
	Answered 91
	Skipped 74

**Organisation:**

- East Northamptonshire District Council

**Role:**

- As a Ward Councillor

### 31) Which borough or district do you live in?

Answer Choices	Responses
Corby	7
Daventry	6
East Northamptonshire	20
Kettering	14
Northampton	23
South Northamptonshire	10
Wellingborough	7
Other (please specify)	1
	Answered 87
	Skipped 78

**Other:**

- Out of county in this instance

### 1) What sex are you?

Answer Choices	Responses
Male	36
Female	47
Prefer not to say	5
	Answered 88
	Skipped 77

### 2) Are you currently Pregnant or have you had a baby in the last 6 months?

Answer Choices	Responses
Yes	5
No	69
Prefer not to	6

say		
	Answered	80
	Skipped	85

### 3) How old are you?

Answer Choices	Responses	
0 to 9	0	
10 to 19	0	
20 to 29	4	
30 to 49	26	
50 to 64	34	
65 to 74	16	
75+	2	
Prefer not to say	6	
	Answered	88
	Skipped	77

### 4) Do you have a disability?

Answer Choices	Responses	
Yes	42	
No	32	
Prefer not to say	7	
	Answered	81
	Skipped	84

### 4a) If Yes, please tick the appropriate box(es) which best describes your disability?

Answer Choices	Responses	
Mental Health	10	
Physical Disability	31	
Hearing Impairment	4	
Learning Disability	13	
Sight Impairment	7	
Other	7	
	Answered	49
	Skipped	116

### 5) What is your religion or belief?

Answer Choices	Responses
None	21
Christian	49

Hindu	0
Jewish	1
Muslim	0
Sikh	0
Buddhist	0
Prefer not to say	10
Any other religion (please specify)	3
Answered	84
Skipped	81

**Other:**

- Agnostic
- Wiccan
- Church of England

**6) How would you describe your ethnic origin?**

Answer Choices	Responses
White - English, Welsh, Scottish or Northern Irish	70
White - Irish	0
White - Gypsy or Irish Traveller	0
White - Other White Background	3
Asian or Asian British - Indian	1
Asian or Asian British - Pakistani	0
Asian or Asian British - Bangladeshi	0
Asian or Asian British - Chinese	1
Asian or Asian British - Other Asian Background	0
Mixed / Multiple ethnic Background - White & Black Caribbean	1
Mixed / Multiple ethnic Background - White & Black African	0
Mixed / Multiple ethnic Background - White & Asian	0
Mixed / Multiple ethnic Background - Other mixed / multiple background	0
Black or Black British - Caribbean	1
Black or Black British - African	0
Black or Black British - Other Black Background	0
Other - Arab	0
Other ethnic group	1
Prefer not to say	7
If other, please specify:	1
Answered	85
Skipped	80

**Other:**

- Awaiting DNA return

**7) If you are 16 or over which of the following options best describes how you think of yourself?**

Answer Choices	Responses
----------------	-----------

Bisexual	1
Gay Man	0
Gay Woman / Lesbian	1
Heterosexual	59
Other	1
Prefer not to say	17
Answered	79

**8) Is your gender identity the same as the gender you were assigned at birth?**

Answer Choices	Responses
Yes	64
No	0
Prefer not to say	12
Answered	76
Skipped	89

**9) What would you describe your marital status as?**

Answer Choices	Responses
Married	34
Single	29
Civil Partnership	1
Cohabiting/Living Together	4
Widowed	3
Other	1
Prefer not to say	9
Answered	81
Skipped	84

## **Appendix 3 – Consultation Distribution List**

The organisations/groups listed below were asked to actively promote the consultation amongst their members.

- Users of the service and/or their named carer member where applicable
- Personal Assistants on PA Register
- Carers Voice
- Northamptonshire Carers
- Healthwatch Northamptonshire
- Getting on Board (formerly known as Learning Disability Partnership Board)
- Voluntary Impact Northamptonshire
- Nene Valley Community Action
- People First Northamptonshire
- Northants Parent Forum Group
- Northamptonshire Local Offer
- CVS Northamptonshire
- NCC's Residents' Panel
- NCC's Consultation Register members
- NCC social media subscribers