

Feedback form

Caring for our future: shared ambitions
for care and support

Please send your responses by email to:

caringforourfuture@dh.gsi.gov.uk

or by post to:

**Engagement responses
Social Care Strategic policy team
Room 117, Wellington House
133–155 Waterloo Road
London, SE1 8UG**

Please submit your feedback by
2 December 2011.

Your name *

Organisation

Organisation type e.g. individual, Trust,
patient organisation etc

Email *

Telephone *

1. What are the priorities for promoting improved quality and developing the future workforce?

- a. Should there be a standard definition of quality in adult social care as quality can often be interpreted differently? What do we mean by it and how should it be defined? How could we use this definition to drive improvements in quality?
- b. How could the approach to quality need to change as individuals increasingly fund or take responsibility for commissioning their own care? How could users themselves play a stronger role in determining the outcomes that they experience and designing quality services that are integrated around their personal preferences?
- c. How could we make quality the guiding principle for adult social care? Who is responsible and accountable for driving continuous quality improvement within a more integrated health and care system?
- d. What is the right balance between a national and local approach to improving quality and developing the workforce? Which areas are best delivered at a national level?
- e. How could we equip the workforce, volunteers and carers to respond to the challenges of improving quality and responding to growth in demand? How could we develop social care leadership capable of steering and delivering this?
- f. How could we improve the mechanisms for users, carers and staff to raise concerns about the quality of care? How could we ensure that these concerns are addressed appropriately?

2. What are the priorities for promoting increased personalisation and choice?

- a. How could we change cultures, attitudes and behaviour among the social care workforce to ensure the benefits of personal budgets, including direct payments, are made available to everyone in receipt of community based social care? Are there particular client groups missing out on opportunities at the moment?
- b. What support or information do people need to become informed users and consumers of care, including brokerage services? How could people be helped to choose the service they want, which meets their needs and is safe too? How could better information be made available for people supported by public funds as well as those funding their own care?
- c. How could the principles of greater personalisation be applied to people in residential care? Should this include, as the Law Commission recommends, direct payments being extended to people [supported by the State] living in residential accommodation? What are the opportunities, challenges and risks around this?
- d. How could better progress be made in achieving a truly personalised approach which places outcomes that matter to people, their families and carers at its heart? What are the barriers? Who has responsibility and what needs to change (including legislative)?



3. How can we take advantage of the Health and Social Care modernisation programme to ensure services are better integrated around people's needs?

- a. What does good look like? Where are there good practice-based examples of integrated services that support and enable better outcomes?
- b. Where should services be better integrated around patients, service users and carers – both within the NHS, and between the NHS and local government services, in particular social care (for example, better management of long term conditions, better care of older people, more effective handover of a person's care from one part of the system to another, etc)?
- c. How can integrated services achieve better health, better care and better value for money?
- d. What, if any, barriers to integration should be removed, and how can we incentivise better integration of services at all levels?
- e. Who needs to do what next to enable integration to be progressed in a pragmatic and achievable way?
- f. How can innovation in integrated care be identified and nurtured?

4. What are the priorities for supporting greater prevention and early intervention?

- a. What do good outcomes look like? Where is there practice-based evidence of interventions that support/enable these outcomes?
- b. How could organisations across the NHS and Local Government, communities, social enterprises and other providers be encouraged and incentivised to work together and invest in prevention and early intervention including promoting health and wellbeing?
- c. How could we change cultures and behaviour so that investment in prevention and early intervention is mainstream practice rather than relying on intervention at the point of crisis? How could we create mechanisms that pay by results/outcomes?
- d. How could individuals, families and communities be encouraged to take more responsibility for their health and wellbeing and to take action earlier in their lives to prevent or delay illness and loss of independence? How could we promote better health and wellbeing in society?
- e. How could innovation in prevention be encouraged, identified and nurtured?

5. What are the priorities for creating a more diverse and responsive care market?

- a. How would you define the social care market? What are the different dimensions we need to consider when assessing the market (e.g. type of provision, client group, size of provider, market share)?
- b. How could we make the market work more effectively including promoting growth, better information for commissioners (local authorities and individuals), improved quality and choice and innovation?
- c. Does there need to be further oversight of the care market, including measures to address provider failure? If so, what elements should this approach include, and who should do it?
- d. Looking to the future, what could be the impacts of wider reforms on the market? What possible effects would the following have on the market: the recommendations of the Dilnot Commission's report, the roll out of personal budgets and direct payments, and the drive to improve quality and the workforce?

6. What role could the financial services market play in supporting users, carers and their families?

- a. In the current system, what are the main barriers to the development of financial products that help people to plan for and meet the costs of social care?
- b. To what extent would the reforms recommended by the Commission on Funding of Care and Support overcome these barriers? What kinds of products could we see under such a system that would be attractive to individuals and the industry?
- c. What else could Government do to make it easier for people to plan financially for social care costs?
- d. Would a more consistent system with nationally consistent eligibility criteria, portability of assessments and a more objective assessment process support the development of financial products? If so, how?
- e. Would the reforms recommended by the Commission on Funding of Care and Support lead to an overall expansion of the financial services market in this area? How would this affect the wider economy?
- f. What wider roles could the financial services industry play in, eg:
 - raising awareness of the care and support system
 - providing information and advice around social care and financial planning
 - encouraging prevention and early intervention
 - helping people to purchase care, or purchasing it on their behalf
 - helping to increase the liquidity of personal assets?

7. Do you have any other comments on social care reform, including the recommendations of the Commission on Funding of Care and Support?

- a. What are the strengths and weaknesses of the Commission's proposals in addressing the problems of the current system? What are the priorities for action coming out of the Commission's report, including in relation to other priorities for improvement in the system?
- b. What are the implications of the Commission's proposals on other areas of care and support reform?
- c. The Commission presented a range of options in relation to some of their recommendations, which would affect the balance between the financial cost to the individual and the taxpayer. These include:
 - the level of the cap
 - the contribution that people make to their living costs in residential care

What would be the implications of different options on the outcomes that the Commission hoped to achieve?