٦

### Common Themes from Consultation on the Proposed New Fees Framework for Older People Residential and Nursing Home Care Questionnaire sent March 2015

Number of providers this questionnaire was sent to	440	Reply Percentage
Number of respondents	30	6.82%

# Q1 a) Do you agree with incentivising and rewarding investment in care homes?

	Number of respondents	%
1 - Yes	27	93%
2 - No	2	7%
Total who responded	29	100%
No response	1	

# Q1 b) Do you agree with creating a simple, clear, and affordable fee structure based on levels of assessed individual need and dependency?

1 - Yes	29	100%
2 - No		0%
Total who responded	29	100%
No response	1	

# Q1 c) Do you agree with incentivising and rewarding the quality of care?

1 - Yes	29	100%
2 - No		0%
Total who responded	29	100%
No response	1	

### 2) Do you agree with the retention of the 5 Core Needs based payments?

1 - Yes	24	86%
2 - No	4	14%
Total who responded	28	100%
No response	2	

#### Q3 a) Do you agree with 1% on all placements?

1 - Yes	11	41%
2 - No	16	59%
Total who responded	27	100%
No response	3	

## Q3 b) Do you agree with an approximate £10 payment for new placements in compliant rooms?

1 - Yes	6	23%
2 - No	20	77%
Total who responded	26	100%
No response	4	

#### Q3 c) Do you agree with all new placements to be paid at the equivalent band 1 rate?

1 - Yes	15	54%
2 - No	13	46%
Total who responded	28	100%
No response	2	

## Common Themes from Consultation on the Proposed New Fees Framework for Older People Residential and Nursing Home Care Questionnaire sent March 2015

	Band 1	Band 2	Band 3
Number of Homes	21	5	2

This table shows the amount of replies from homes by band rating. The total here is 28 because one home was out-of-borough therefore not banded, there were two replies that the home sending was unknown and one reply that was on behalf of two homes which

had two different bandings

Question	Themes
a) Do you agree with incentivising and	Majority support with caveats:
rewarding investment in care homes?	Not based on room size as favours larger
	providers – does not support smaller
	independent homes unable to reconfigure
	internal space
	Proposals favour big providers
	<ul> <li>incentive should be linked to quality</li> </ul>
	<ul> <li>Shouldn't be all about room sizes</li> </ul>
	Fees not high enough to invest
	Room size not important factor to residents
1 b) Do you agree with creating a simple,	Unanimous support with caveats:
clear, and affordable fee structure based on	Individual assessor not LCC assessor
evels of assessed individual need and	Concerns about the term "affordable"
dependency?	Concerns about big increase for lower bands
1 c) Do you agree with incentivising and	Unanimous support with caveats:
rewarding the quality of care?	Rewards will keep high standards
	• How will it be measured - leave to experts, i.e
	CQC, IIP
	Criteria should be realistic
	Stick to one system
2) Do you agree with the retention of the 5	Criteria not representative of all
Core Needs based payments?	Needs to be higher nursing rate
	May make providers register differently to gain
	higher fees
	No alternative given
	Higher nursing rate
	<ul> <li>Assessment should be transparent and</li> </ul>
	consistent
3 a) Do you agree with 1% on all	1% too low compared to increase in minimum
placements?	wage, cost of fuel
	Should be based on quality of care
3 b) Do you agree with an approximate £10	Too little for amount of investment
payment for new placements in compliant	Preferential treatment to those with purpose
rooms?	built homes
	Should be on quality of care
3 c) Do you agree with all new placements to	Encourage acceptance of LCC clients
be paid at the equivalent band 1 rate?	<ul> <li>high increase for those homes currently on band</li> </ul>
· ·	3&4
	A flat rate is unfair
	No incentive to maintain band 1 standards
Other Comments	Fees should link to CQC rating
	May push small homes out of business