## **Consultation on Carers Legislation**



RESPONDENT INFORMATION FORM

**Please Note** this form **must** be returned with your response to ensure that we handle your response appropriately

| 1. Name/Organisation Organisation Name  |  |  |  |
|---|--|--|--|
| MS Society  |  |  |  |
| About the MS Society  |  |  |  |
| The MS Society is the UK's largest charity for over 38,000 members and more than 300 be Scotland the MS Society has around 4,000 mer currently 32 local branches. There are approximately with a confirmed diagnosis of MS in the UK and  | ranches across the UK. In mbers to date and there are nately 100,000 people living                             |  |  |
| The MS Society is the UK's largest charitable we are committed to bringing high quality star care within reach of everyone affected by MS. Conservices cover all aspects of improving the liver from information and support to improving standard through research, education, campaigning and research. | ndards of health and social Our comprehensive range of s of people affected by MS, dards of treatment and care |  |  |
| CONSULTATION QUESTIONS  |  |  |  |
| The Carer's Assessment: Carer's Support Plan  |  |  |  |
| Question 1: Should we change the name of the carer's assessment to the Carer's Support Plan?  |  |  |  |
| ⊠ Yes   | □ No   |  |  |
| Comments: Support Plan has more positive connotations than the term assessment, and renaming it reflects the intended outcome (support) rather than the process itself.   |  |  |  |
| Question 2: Should we remove the substantial and regular test so that all carers will be eligible for the Carer's Support Plan?   |  |  |  |
| ⊠ Yes   | □ No   |  |  |

Comments: 'Substantial and regular' is interpreted differently within different local

authority boundaries, resulting in inconsistent and inequitable access to support. It has also presented a barrier for some carers of people with MS. MS is unpredictable and episodic; relapses and changes in condition can present carers with changing and irregular support requirements. Carers tell us that sometimes even a subtle change can be the difference between coping and not being able to sustain increased caring responsibilities. Removing the 'substantial and regular' test would make support more accessible to those caring for people with MS and other fluctuating conditions. It also enables, as proposed in the consultation, different types of personalised support plans to be developed, including lighter touch where appropriate.

| ٧ | Question 3: Should we remove that part of the existing whereby the cared-for person is a person for whom to provide community care services/children's services  | the local authority must or may  |
|---|--|--|
| 2 | ⊠ Yes □  | ] No   |
|   | Comments: Even if the person they care for is not services, carers can still be under considerable pre responsibilities alongside providing care and support carers of people who do not themselves have form authority are much less likely to expect any support   | essure to balance life and work ort. Our evidence suggests that hal care packages with the local   |
|   | Question 4: Should we introduce two routes through at the carer's request and by the local authority maki  | • •  |
|   | ⊠ Yes □  | ] No   |
|   | Comments: Yes. This should be introduced in legis local authority must explain what it is and why it mit and / or statutory guidance should also ensure that Carer's Support Plan they should be able to requestate. We would also like to see it stipulated that located the CSPs they offer and undertake. Cur assess the number of people being offered or under Scotland and whether policy and practice development. This legislation and statutory guidant this. | ight be beneficial. The legislation to should an individual decline a st or be re-offered one at a later cal authorities must keep rently there is no way to robustly ertaking Carer's Assessments in ments are making any |
|   | Question 5: Should we remove from statute the word provide care?   | ding about the carer's ability to  |
|   | ∑ Yes □  | ] No   |
|   | Comments: The term 'ability to care' can be interpreted the carer's competence or skills. We agree with the based approach for setting out a range of issues (\text{\text{Statutory Guidance}}. The Statutory Guidance should  | e principles for an outcomes-<br>with examples) within the   |

CSP enables greater consistency and quality, as well as create personalised support planning. These outcomes should also include employment and personal development goals, social and leisure activities, respite and financial wellbeing.

|   | duty for local authorities to inform the carer of the ceive the Carer's Support Plan and if it exceeds ns?  |
|---|---|
| ⊠ Yes   | □ No  |
| timeframes and how they are mee<br>preferable for the Scottish Govern<br>timeframes within the statutory gu | be collected from each authority about local eting this obligation. We also believe it is ment to set out a standard for reasonable idance. Local authorities can be held to account hould fall within the nationally recommended |
| Question 7: How significant an issu and carers?   | e is portability of assessment for service users  |
| be replicated in another. While in  | provided in one local authority should be able to practice there will always be some service level / ure plans should be portable. Currently carers tell  |
|   | vernment and COSLA with relevant interests vements to the portability of assessment?  |
| ⊠ Yes   | □ No  |
| Comments:   |   |
| Information and Advice  |   |
|   | duty for local authorities to establish and maintain aformation and advice relating to the Carer's and young carers?  |
| ⊠ Yes   | □ No  |
| consistency of information about of   | observed wide variation in the availability and carers' entitlements. Having a standard of service all authority would improve consistency of e of carers support plans.  |

Question 10: Should we repeal section 12 of the Community Care and Health (Scotland) Act 2002 about the submission of Carer information Strategies to Scottish

| Ministers, subject to reassurances, which are subject in turn to Spending Review decisions, about the continuation of funding to Health Boards for support to carers and young carers?   |   |
|--|---|
| ⊠ Yes  | □ No  |
| Comments: However, we would like to see prov to cover the reporting and review of carer inform   |   |
| Support to Carers (other than information and  | advice)   |
| Question 11: Should we introduce a duty to supple to an eligibility framework?   | ort carers and young carers, linked   |
| ⊠ Yes  | □ No  |
| Comments: We are aware that not all carers what able to access the support to meet those needs believe that this duty should be introduced in or access to services, and are keen for carers organized developing this eligibility framework.              | , and this is a major concern. We<br>der to improve consistency in and  |
| Question 12: Alternatively, should we retain the e support carers and young carers?  | existing discretionary power to   |
| ☐ Yes  | □ No  |
| Comments:  |   |
| Question 13: Should we introduce a duty to provide short breaks?   |   |
| ⊠ Yes  | □ No  |
| Comments: Yes. As recognised in the consultat valued intervention to support carers and the perexceeds supply and this is unlikely to change in in and development of the market. Any process need to ensure that the most vulnerable and in intervention. | eople they care for, but demand far<br>the short term without investment<br>es to determine eligibility would |

## **Stages and Transitions**

| will include guidance for those undertaking the stages of caring? This would apply to adult car guidance will be developed to support manager stages of caring).  | ers only. (For young carers, practice   |
|---|---|
| ⊠ Yes   | □ No  |
| Comments: It is fundamental for people caring consideration given to how their caring role at response to the fluctuating nature of the conditional managing stages – or changes – in caring with better enable local authorities to respond in a circumstance. | nd own support needs may change in lition. Including provisions on thin the statutory guidance should |
| Question 15: Should new carers' legislation pro<br>Carer's Support Plan if they seem likely to beco<br>support recorded in the Carer's Support Plan w<br>carer becomes a (young) adult carer.   | ome an adult carer? Any agreed  |
| ⊠ Yes   | □ No  |
| Comments: It can be particularly challenging from being a young carer to adult services. So pre-empt potential crises or breakdown of the relationship.   | upport plans need to look ahead and   |
| Carer Involvement   |   |
| Question 16: Should there be carer involvement delivery of services for the people they care for outwith the scope of integration?  |   |
| ⊠ Yes   | □ No  |
| Comments:   |   |
| Question 17: Should we make provision for the in the planning, shaping and delivery of services scope of integration?   |   |
| ⊠ Yes   | □ No  |
| Comments:   |   |

Question 14: Should we issue statutory guidance on the Carer's Support Plan which

Question 18: Should we establish a principle about carer and young carer involvement in care planning for service users (subject to consent) and support for themselves in areas not covered in existing legislation?

| ⊠ Yes  | □ No   |
|--|--|
| -  | oung carers should have significant input at policy and els and be involved as equal partners in the individual  |
|  |  |
| •  | ur views on making provision for young carer involvement ad delivery of services for cared-for people and support for  |
| Comments:  |  |
| Planning and Delivery  |  |
| authority and each relevan-  | troduce statutory provision to the effect that a local through the Health Board must collaborate and involve relevant the development of local carers strategies which must be ated every three years? |
| ⊠ Yes  | □No  |
|  | al for identifying local needs, reviewing progress and nonitoring outcomes against the strategy.   |
| Question 21: Should we introduce statutory provision to the effect that local authorities with Health Boards must take steps to ensure, in so far as is reasonably practicable, that a sufficient range of services is available for meeting the needs for support to carers and young carers in the area? |  |
| ⊠ Yes  | □ No   |
| , .  | islation offers an important opportunity for local authorities velop and enhance their service provision for carers.   |
| Identification   |  |
|  | e be no legislative provision for GPs or local authorities to in order to support the identification of carers?  |
| ⊠ Yes  | □No  |
|  | jority of carers will visit their GP in any given year, atekeepers for carers to access appropriate support. The   |

Comments: The vast majority of carers will visit their GP in any given year, therefore GPs are key gatekeepers for carers to access appropriate support. The MS Society considers that guidance will not be sufficient to incentivise all GPs to identify carers and signpost to support and that it would not address the current inconsistency. There should be statutory incentives to establish the registers and for each practice to evidence the number of carers they support.

| Question 23: Should the Scottish Government ensure that good practice is widely spread amongst Health Boards about the proactive use of Registers of Carers within GP practices? |  |  |
|--|--|--|
| ⊠ Yes  | □No  |  |
| Comments:  |  |  |
|  | ttish Government ask Health Boards to monitor tractual elements of the GP contract?  |  |
| ⊠ Yes  | □ No   |  |
| Comments: Please see ans   | wer to question 22.  |  |
| Carer and Cared-for Person   | (s) in Different Local Authority Areas   |  |
| undertaking the Carer's Supp   | ews of respondents on the lead local authority for ort Plan and agreeing support to the carer where the authority area to the cared-for person(s)?   |  |
| danger that carers in these  | nsible. Without a lead authority arrangement there is a circumstances could slip through the net. It needs to be e (if not a statutory provision) about responsibilities in es not happen. |  |
|  | ews of respondents on which local authority should he carer in these circumstances?  |  |
| Comments:  |  |  |
| Question 27: Should the Scolocal authorities?  | ttish Government with COSLA produce guidance for   |  |
| ⊠ Yes  | □ No   |  |
| Comments:  |  |  |