

## CALL FOR PROPOSALS

### ***A Better Life for older people with high support needs: Affordability, choices and quality of life in housing with care (Code HWC1)***

#### **Summary**

**Deadline for receipt of both email and hard copies:** Tuesday 5 October 2010 at 2.00pm. Late applications will not be accepted

**Timescale:** up to 21 months (end date no later than 30 September 2012)

**Budget:** up to £80K (including VAT) - one project only

**Contact:** Christine Appleton, Research Administrator, Policy and Research Department: [christine.appleton@jrf.org.uk](mailto:christine.appleton@jrf.org.uk)

This call is part of the Joseph Rowntree Foundation's programme, 'A Better Life', which focuses on quality of life for older people with high support needs.

The aim of this call is to fund a project which will examine how affordability considerations affect the choices older people make who develop care needs, or whose care needs increase, about the level of care, and other services they pay for in housing with care. What effect do these choices have on their quality of life?

#### **1. Background: the programme**

What needs to change so that older people, especially those with high support needs, can have 'a better life'? JRF's five year programme 'A Better Life' <http://www.jrf.org.uk/work/workarea/better-life> (2009-2013) is focusing on a significant modern-day challenge: how to ensure quality of life for the growing number of older people with high support needs in the UK. We are commissioning a range of work to inform and produce clear, costed recommendations for policy and practice that can help older people with high support needs now and in the future. By gathering evidence, and using it to influence policies and practice, we aim to

achieve sustainable changes to services and support so older people who need a lot of support can enjoy a better life and greater choice.

This research project relates to the **housing with care** strand of the Better Life programme. The strand aims to influence policy and practice development on how Housing with Care schemes can *support and sustain* diverse older people who have/develop high support needs. However, the research will also need to make links with other parts of the programme focusing on residential care and community settings so that the relevant learning is shared throughout.

Housing with care is a relatively new housing concept and does not have a single definition. Broadly speaking, the schemes offer care if needed, alongside a varying range of leisure and other on-site services and facilities. A wide variety of housing with care schemes exist, from large retirement villages to small schemes designed to offer a substantial level of care. Some, but not all, will also have care homes on site. In some schemes, the housing provider also runs care and support services, whereas in others, care services are provided by one or more separate organisations. Despite this diversity, housing with care schemes should be seen as distinct from both care homes and from sheltered housing, neither of which are the primary focus of this research.

## **2. The project we want to commission**

The affordability of suitable housing and care is increasingly becoming a key issue for the older population. It is, however, a particularly salient issue for those living in housing with care schemes. Whilst 'affordability' is relevant to many aspects of housing with care (the prime example being the initial decision of whether or not to move into a scheme), in this research, we want to focus on those people who already live in such schemes. Affordability issues can vary significantly, depending for example on whether the individual is funded by the local authority or whether they fund themselves. Given that an increasing number of people will be expected to fund themselves, we want to keep the focus of this research on those who either fund their own housing and personal care costs in full, or are required to make a contribution towards the latter – as opposed to those who are fully funded by the local authority. A third group of people who make their own choices are those who hold individual budgets, and for this reason, they are also of interest in this research.

As housing with care schemes are often conceived of as places capable of offering a home for life, it is important to investigate what happens when people living in schemes begin to develop care needs, or to require significantly more care. This research should consider these issues from the individual's point of view, and that of their families and carers: how do they make their choice about paying for more care? Perceptions of independence/self-sufficiency versus needing care, cultural factors, charging structures, changing eligibility criteria, personalisation and individual budgets, and possibly a range of other issues may all play a part in the choices and decisions people make.

A recent project funded by JRF<sup>1</sup> found that part of the additional costs of living in housing with care was associated with meeting previously unmet care needs among those local authority-funded people who had moved into a scheme. However, affordability issues could have the opposite effect, whereby people who are required to pay decide to go without care that they may need, or they choose not to use, or opt out of facilities that are available. As regards the latter, there are already signs that this is happening. These issues could have a significant effect on the future of housing with care schemes, and their ultimate viability, as well as on the quality of the life of those who live there.

**The main research question** the project is expected to answer is: *How do affordability considerations affect the choices made by older people in housing with care who develop care needs, or whose care needs increase, about the level of care, and other services they pay for; and what effect do these choices have on people's quality of life?*

Within this, we have identified a series of additional questions which we believe will lead to insights that are timely, important and relevant. Applicants are invited to prioritise and/or refine these in submitting their bid, providing a rationale for the proposed focus:

- At what point do people with no previous care needs tend to decide that they now require paid care? What are the key factors in making this decision (e.g. different perceptions of needing care, cultural background, family influence, other financial commitments?)
- What is the process of making these decisions (for example who tends to initiate a discussion of potential care needs?) and who makes them? What is the role of families and carers in decision-

---

<sup>1</sup> <http://www.jrf.org.uk/publications/costs-and-outcomes-extra-care-housing-scheme-bradford>

making? To what extent do people with high support needs tend to exercise voice, choice and control over these decisions?

- How does this contrast with the decision-making process of those people who already had care needs upon arrival at the scheme, but these needs subsequently increased?
- What level of care are self-funders prepared to pay for? Does it tend to be enough to meet their needs? How does the need to pay for care affect take-up of other services and facilities?
- What are the consequences of not taking up or opting out of services and facilities for other people living in the schemes, for staff, for providers of housing and other services, and for the local community? What responses are emerging as a result, and how do these differ among different housing providers?
- What are the main issues regarding, and differences between, the choices made by those who are wholly self-funders, those who pay a contribution, and those who hold individual budgets?
- How do choices about paying for care and other services and facilities affect older people's overall quality of life, and particularly of those who develop high support needs?
- What are the perspectives of people who need to pay for care on what is affordable in their particular scheme, and what do they consider as value for money? What are their families' and carers' perspectives on the same issues?
- How do affordability issues affect the ability of housing with care schemes to provide a home for life for those older people with high support needs who are fully or partly self-funders? For example, is there a point when the matter of cost becomes so critical that it makes them consider moving into a residential home?

Applicants will be aware that part of the forthcoming evaluation of several new schemes by the Personal Social Services Research Unit is expected to provide a cost-benefit analysis.<sup>2</sup> We do not therefore expect this research to undertake a cost-benefit analysis of housing with care

---

<sup>2</sup> [http://www.pssru.ac.uk/pdf/dp2506\\_2.pdf](http://www.pssru.ac.uk/pdf/dp2506_2.pdf)

schemes in the context of self-funding as such, although this research should reflect on the findings of the PSSRU evaluation.

### 3. Approach and methods

Underpinning the Better Life programme is a social (as distinct from a medical) model of ageing, health, and disability, as well as a commitment to sustainable, rights-based approaches to increasing the quality of life for older people with high support needs, and to listen to their voices and ask them to define their lives, particularly the things they want and value in life, on their own terms. The body of work JRF has commissioned over the years suggests that perceptions about the lives of older people with high support needs are often characterised by low aspirations set by older people themselves and others, amounting to 'dignity' at the most. Assumptions made by other people are also rife, mostly framed in terms of the limitations of what older people can do. For this reason, we see it as critical that applicants explain *in a concise manner* the **theoretical grounding** of their proposed work, and how this informs their overall approach and chosen methodology.

We expect the research to be theoretically sound and based on robust evidence, and we want to ensure that the findings are relevant and accessible to, and address key concerns of, a **wide-ranging audience**. Whilst we wish to engage policy makers and key organisations that are 'agents for change', it is important that the research also speaks to housing and care providers, practitioners in housing with care schemes, older people with and without high support needs living in, or thinking of moving into, schemes, their families and carers, as well as the research community and the general public.

As already outlined among the research questions, the **perspectives** of individuals (as well as of others, for example housing, care and other service providers) are expected to form the core of this work. We encourage applicants to break through the boundaries of viewing older people with high support needs as passive recipients of services whose views and wishes should be articulated by others. We will expect proposals to set out how the perspectives of older people are appropriately gathered in the course of the fieldwork. We would welcome imaginative, sensitive and ethically sound approaches that include older people with high support needs, for example, in setting directions for and advising this research project.

Naturally, we as commissioners want to ensure that the project is **worthwhile**, both from the perspective of older people with high support needs, and as a source of learning, practice development and 'cross-fertilisation' across various settings where older people with high support needs live. Therefore, applicants are asked to outline in their proposals, in specific terms, their thinking on feedback and payback to older people, and how they, perhaps in partnership with us and/or others, will encourage the use of the findings for wider learning and for policy and practice change.

As regards the use of specific **methods**, we are open to considering suggestions by applicants. Our main concern is to ensure that the selected methods are capable of answering the main research question. Please note that applicants will be required to set out their intended **methodology and schedule of work** in specific terms. Applicants will also need to detail the **risks** and potential challenges they foresee to successfully completing the project, and how they are proposing to respond to these.

#### **4. Additional considerations**

##### **Older people with high support needs – a diverse group**

The project should have a clear focus on older people with high support needs (as opposed to other groups/life stages, or younger-old people who are relatively active and do not require much, if any, support). By this we mean older people of any age who need a lot of support due to physical frailty, chronic conditions and/or multiple impairments (including dementia). Most will be over 85 years old. A minority will be younger, perhaps reflecting the impact of other factors linked to poverty, disadvantage, nationality, ethnicity or lifestyle.

Initial work in the programme has identified a number of particularly marginalised groups amongst older people with high support needs. These include people who are lesbian, gay, bisexual or transgender (LGBT); who have learning disabilities; those from BME communities; those with strong religious beliefs; who are living in poverty; who are living with HIV; who have dementia; and who are travellers. We wish the research team to consider how far new approaches do, or could, meet the needs of these groups, even though we recognise that the extent to which this can be addressed as part of the present research may be limited.

## **What older people want and value**

A research team from the Open University is currently considering the evidence about what older people with high support needs have said about their wishes and aspirations, and also what might be inferred from other evidence. Although work is ongoing in validating these findings with individuals and user-led organisations, key themes emerging include: meaningful relationships; self-esteem; optimised health; appropriate and respectful support; consultation in decision-making; information; roles, activities and pursuits; getting out and about; adequate income; security; independence, interdependence and control.

The research we are commissioning should use these (still developing) criteria to guide the design and operational stage, and also to assess services and/or models that it draws upon. The validated criteria should be available early in 2011. Further, the findings and recommendations of the Better Life programme research projects will be tested out against these criteria by JRF and also by older people with high support needs.

## **Countries of the UK**

The Foundation's remit is UK-wide and it seeks to fund research and development that reflects experience across England, Scotland, Wales and Northern Ireland. It is important that this project considers both the learning from, and the policy/practice relevance to, all four countries. However, we acknowledge that there may be limits to what can be achieved in terms of full geographical coverage.

## **Ethical issues**

If your proposal raises particular ethical issues, please indicate what they are and what your strategy for addressing them is in specific terms. If your proposal requires consideration by an ethics committee, please specify this in the proposal, together with any additional information, for example the expected timescale required for this.

## **Advisory and collaborative arrangements**

A **collaborative approach** to working with JRF is essential. It is expected that there will be regular one-to-one discussions, either face-to-face or over the telephone, with the Programme Manager regarding project progress and milestones. Your proposal should reflect these requirements.

Please note that JRF no longer automatically sets up Project Advisory Groups for every project we fund, and advisory arrangements will be discussed with the successful contractors when the decisions on who to fund have been made. You will not need to budget for venue charges and refreshments within your proposal should we set up such a group.

The team will also be expected to have some involvement in the broader Better Life Programme, for example by presenting interim or final findings to the Programme Advisory Group or at other events to be agreed with the Programme Manager (including possibly to groups of older people with high support needs). We will also expect project teams working within the same programme to liaise with each other, if and where appropriate, to minimise any overlap and support mutual learning.

Regarding this particular project, a potential area for joint working will be with the project team of the 'Boundaries of roles and responsibilities' project, which is expected to start at the same time as this project. One of the questions the 'boundaries' research is expected to address is: "what are the boundaries of responsibilities, and the existing mechanisms for fulfilling these, in terms of ensuring that people who had no prior care needs (or had a lower level of needs) receive the care they need, without housing (and care) providers overstepping their mandate?"

Your proposal should reflect these requirements. Please allow up to 6 days in your budget and schedule for these activities.

## **5. Outputs, budget and timescale**

We envisage the following **main outputs** from the project:

- We will require a *progress report* (approx 3,000-5,000 words) at the end of the first six months of the project. This report will summarise the work undertaken so far, the key issues associated with the research topic and further work to be undertaken.
- The main output required is a *final report* of approximately 15,000-20,000 words. In addition, a *summary Findings in JRF style* (up to 2,300 words) will be required. You will not need to budget for the publication of these outputs.

As part of the main output, we will look for short case studies/examples illustrating particular issues, and testimonials representing the perspectives of those who participated in the research (for example in the form of short audio or video clips), which can be used by us and by the research team to disseminate the findings. We would particularly welcome contributions by older people with high support needs. Please factor these costs into your project budget.

Applicants may also wish to propose additional approaches to support effective dissemination, influencing and learning (such as the provision of online resources or events in different formats). Please indicate the estimated cost of these approaches, however you will not need to include these costs in your proposed budget. We will consider additional ideas for dissemination and supporting policy or practice change at a later stage in the project and wider programme.

The **budget** for the commissioned work is up to £80,000.00; including VAT if applicable. Applicants will need to include in their budget all expenses associated with undertaking the work.

The **duration** of the project is expected to be 21 months, beginning in January 2011 and ending no later than 30 September 2012.

The anticipated timescale is as follows:

Call for proposals sent out	19 August 2010
Deadline for receipt of proposals	2.00pm 5 October 2010
Notification of decision	By 10 December 2010
Start of project	4 January 2011
Initial report	30 June 2011
Submission of draft final report	31 August 2012
Submission of final report	30 September 2012

## 7. Submitting a proposal

Applicants are advised to read the **Funding** section of our website before submitting a proposal. The **Application guidelines** contain the necessary forms for completing a proposal. **IMPORTANT:** On the front page of the proposal registration form, in the project title box, please prefix the title of your proposal with the code: HWC1.

Two unbound hard copies of all documents are required. Please also email a Word version of the complete proposal and summary forms and also the Excel budget form to:

Christine Appleton  
Policy and Research Department  
Joseph Rowntree Foundation  
The Homestead  
40 Water End  
YORK  
YO30 6WP  
[christine.appleton@jrf.org.uk](mailto:christine.appleton@jrf.org.uk)

Both email and hard copy versions need to reach us by 2.00pm on **Tuesday 5 October 2010**. No late applications will be considered.

Proposals will be assessed against the following main criteria (not in order of importance):

- Demonstration of understanding of, and commitment to, the questions/issues to be addressed and of appropriate theoretical grounding
- Relevance of the proposed approach, including methods and analytical framework
- Demonstration of ability to draw appropriate conclusions from a broad evidence base, to build on it to develop ideas and to promote practice change
- Demonstration of ability to understand and appropriately address risks, ethical issues, feedback and payback issues for older people, UK coverage
- Evidence of knowledge, experience and credentials in relation to the area and type of work
- Track record of actively involving the target group(s) of your research in the research process
- Value for money
- Demonstration of capacity to carry out the work to a high standard within timescale and budget.

Where partnership bids are submitted, we will be looking for clarity on the roles and responsibilities of each party and clear arrangements for coordination and project management.

Judgments about proposals are made on the basis of what is written down, and proposals are most often rejected because insufficient information has been provided about key aspects of the research methods, a lack of clarity about what is planned, or a mismatch between aims and methods. Applicants are advised to be clear about their proposed approach and to ensure that they respond fully to the criteria.

The proposals will be reviewed by JRF staff and an independent expert reviewer. JRF reserves the right to ask for further clarification on any aspect of the proposal.

If you have administrative or budget queries, please contact Christine Appleton ([christine.appleton@jrf.org.uk](mailto:christine.appleton@jrf.org.uk), 01904 615911). Please note that we are not able to discuss the substance of proposals, including proposed research sites, approaches, methodologies etc.

END