

CALL FOR PROPOSALS

A Better Life for older people with high support needs: Living together, getting along (Code HWC3)

Summary

Deadline: Tuesday 5 October 2010 at 2.00pm. Late applications will not be accepted

Timescale: up to 18 months (end date no later than 29 June 2012)

Budget: up to £65K (including VAT) - one project only

Contact: Christine Appleton, Research Administrator, Policy and Research Department: 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 map out existing approaches and initiatives, as well as identify those that work best to promote supportive communities and positive dynamics between older people with and without high support needs in housing with care schemes.

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 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

A growing body of research evidence from our previous work¹ suggests that tensions can occur between various groups of people living together in housing with care schemes. These groups often come from diverse backgrounds and different age ranges, and may have different tenure arrangements, interests, levels of ability and care needs. Although some gaps in knowledge still exist in this area, it is important that we go beyond exploring the roots and manifestations of tensions and begin to look at emerging responses, in order to identify approaches that can make a difference.

We recognise that there is considerable diversity among older people living in housing with care schemes, and that frictions may occur for a whole range of reasons. However, in line with the Better Life programme and the resources available for this particular project, proposals will be required to concentrate on approaches that **promote positive, supportive relationships between people with and without high support needs**. (This is often described in shorthand as being about

¹ For example: [The development of social well-being in new extra care housing schemes](#) (Callaghan *et al* 2009), [Telling the story of Hartfields: A new retirement village for the twenty-first century](#) (Croucher and Bevan 2010).

relationships between ‘the fit and the frail’ in housing with care schemes). Our understanding of older people with high support needs is described in section 3 below (Additional considerations).

We are interested in relationships, frictions and tensions between groups as well as individuals. Some of the successful approaches may have originated in approaches tailored to specific individuals, but they may have resulted in wider learning points for a scheme which could also be used elsewhere. An example could be an approach that arose from dealing with a particular behavioural issue that was causing tensions between two neighbours living in a scheme.

The main questions the project is expected to answer are:

What approaches exist to promote supportive communities and help minimise frictions and tensions between groups of people and individuals with and without high support needs living in housing with care schemes? Which of these approaches are the best in delivering what older people with high support needs want and value in life²?

The project will be expected to:

- Gather and assess evidence on relevant practical approaches and initiatives which do, or show strong potential to, help minimise frictions and tensions, and promote supportive communities and better understanding between groups and individuals with and without high support needs.

The research would review a range of approaches, ideally from a range of schemes. The research will, as far as possible, provide concise details of each approach, together with: an assessment of its overall success, key success factors and barriers that had to be overcome; the role of older people; the role of staff (and learning in relation to training and development needs); associated costs and the way the costs relate to realised or potential benefits.

- From among the identified approaches, the research should highlight and discuss those that are assessed as the best at delivering benefits for older people with high support needs, where it can be demonstrated that older people value what the approach has to offer.

² Although various interpretations exist as to what constitutes a community, when we refer to ‘community’ in this document we mean the people living and working in a housing with care scheme, together with the relationships and resources commonly associated with a ‘community’. ‘Local community’ in this context means the wider community of which a housing with care scheme is a part.

- What are the benefits for and effects on other people, such as the families and carers of older people with high support needs, people *without* high support needs who live in the schemes, the staff who work there, and the wider local community? It is possible that some approaches make different levels of demands on one group or individual compared to another, and this could apply to benefits as well, to the extent that for some people an approach may not bring any benefits (or indeed the effects could be negative).
- What are the broader issues/conditions that can help ensure that people ‘live together and get along’ in housing with care schemes? As schemes are different, approaches will not automatically be transferable. The research would assess the potential for successful approaches to be adopted/adapted by different housing with care schemes and in different settings (such as residential care or the community).
- As far as the collected evidence allows, the research should attempt to address the question of how, and to what extent, the identified approaches can contribute to the ability of housing with care schemes to provide a home for life for older people with high support needs in a community that can provide things that they want and value (for example, having meaningful relationships and opportunities to participate in and contribute to the community).

Researchers are strongly encouraged to think of ‘approaches’ in a broad sense, to include formal and informal approaches and practices, and also initiatives that have developed organically. Whilst the research should include approaches developed by housing and care providers involved in running schemes, and by ‘outside’ organisations with a link to the schemes (e.g. voluntary organisations), it should also consider other actions, behaviours and initiatives by individuals or groups who are living in, or are otherwise associated with, the scheme. Successful approaches used in other settings such as care homes and sheltered housing may also provide useful learning. Approaches that have proved unsuccessful but provide useful learning are also of interest (but should not be given primary importance in the allocation of project resources).

If the research is only able to identify a limited number of approaches in general, or only in respect of particular issues, it will be valuable to provide an assessment as to why this may be and what might help overcome the barriers.

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.

In mapping out existing approaches to minimise tensions, we would strongly encourage applicants to include a range of **perspectives**, including those of older people with high support needs, as well as those of their families and friends. We also 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 the perspectives of older people on the value and effectiveness of approaches that are around, and what else might help. In particular, the proposal will need to demonstrate that initiatives **led by older people** find their way into the research.

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 on 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 they are capable of fulfilling the primary purpose of the research and the specific requirements described in the previous section. In addition, applicants will 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.

Whilst we encourage the research team to identify any issues in relation to all these marginalised groups, we recognise that the project will need to prioritise in terms of its breadth and focus. For this reason, approaches focusing on **minority ethnic groups** and **LGBT people** should be paid particular attention (especially since there might only be a very limited number of approaches focusing on these groups), as well as people living with **dementia**.

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 the project considers practical examples from all four countries, ensuring that attention is paid to the particular policy/practice context. We acknowledge there may be limits to what can be achieved in terms full of geographical coverage. We are open to relevant international examples but it is not a core expectation.

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.

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.

Your proposal should reflect these requirements. Please allow up to 6 days in your budget 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 four 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 online resources or events in different formats). 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 £65,000.00; 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 up to 18 months, with the final report submitted no later than 29 June 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
Progress report	29 April 2011
Submission of draft final report	31 May 2012
Submission of final report	29 June 2012

6. 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: HWC3.

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

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, 01904 615911). Please note

that we are not able to discuss the substance of proposals, including proposed research sites, approaches, methodologies etc.

END