

Report of Consultation Organised by



BOPA

*Bradford & District
Older People's Alliance*

“Shaping the Future Together”
Wednesday 28th October 2009.

The consultation was attended by 75 people who came from all areas of the Bradford Metropolitan District

The strongest statement to come from the event was a rejection of the three funding proposals of the green paper! The majority instead affirmed the need *for individuals to be at the centre of planning* but for all to pay the cost of this “universal” service through taxation.

David Stocks Empowerment Manager at RADAR presented the view from disability rights and illustrated this by stories from his personal experiences as someone with a diagnosis of Bi-Polar Condition

Dot Gibson General Secretary of National Pensioners Convention set out a challenging agenda of campaigning for a comprehensive welfare system funded through general taxation and a rejection of additional charges in particular the three funding proposals of the green paper.

The event used two adaptations of the popular executive toy game “jenga”™ to explore the ideas contained in the green paper.

The “jenga”™ towers being used to represent the ideas contained in the green paper proposals and the understandings of participants to the event.



“Single people did not have support of other household members - this was not recognised in lump sum payments systems which were akin to poll tax.” Participant 28th October 2009.



"Give people an opportunity to say what they need and/or want"



"Treat people as individuals and recognise their differences"



"Personalisation is a source of empowerment"



"Same care everywhere" if it works it'll be great - but it's very unrealistic - in fact there's a tension between this aspiration and the personalisation agenda because "what I want is not the same as what you want"



"Green paper wilfully set aside issues that were determinant of quality of care - e.g. care service staff conditions and wages, staff training, monitoring and inspection arrangements. Low wages and casualisation of care service labour meant de-professionalisation of this work."

The Table Discussion Notes

Building Blocks Activity 1- New Care Structure Key Elements

6 Key Elements that the government thinks should be included (green dots):

Positive points to be included in the new care structure (yellow dots):

1. Uniform application
2. User led
3. Respite for carers
4. Everyone to be fully funded. Not means tested.
5. Dual Care for couples
6. More carers in attendance
7. More communication between services
8. Do away with the postcode lottery of services

Negative points/concerns about the new care structure (red dots):

1. Means testing
2. Not enough help
3. Local authorities working in their best interests not the individuals.
4. Peoples savings being eaten up
5. Labour government
6. Where's the funding coming from. We're in a recession is this the time for another agenda?
7. Won't be universal
8. It needs to be the same for everyone

Points pulled out for discussion:

1. Green- Same Care Everywhere.

- No postcode lottery
- Same access across regional borders
- Is this achievable? Centralisation vs. devolution to local authorities is good for some reasons but not for others.
- currently we have NIACE guidelines at the moment but we have better services in some areas than others- this is discrimination

All agreed that this was a good thing and should be in the care structure.

2. Red-Where is the money coming from?

- A European fund?
- Concerns over the idea of medical insurance. Why can't we pay for it out of national insurance?
- Scandinavian countries have social care systems that work very well because they pay more tax

All agreed that this was a concern.

3. Yellow- Respite for carers

- This is essential
- If carers get help the people they are caring for would be in better health.
- If carers are not being paid then they should be getting support and breaks
- Having unpaid carers is exploitative
- People can choose what care they have if all their carers get paid and/or supported properly for e.g. a parent may be able to care for their disabled child if they receive the funding to do so.
- Residential homes are paid a great deal of money to look after people. If that money could be paid to family members then it's more likely that people could be cared for in their own homes.

All agreed that this was a good thing and should be in the care structure.

4 Red- Not enough help

- Concern that there won't be enough information for service users and carers to be able to make informed choices
- People might not know what they are entitled to

All agreed that this was a concern.

5. Yellow- More Communication needed between services

- Agreed that this was already covered by one of the 6 government essential criteria.
- Concern about confidentiality- this needs to be respected
- Feel that professionals give out information about a person that is not always necessary for others to know
- Data protection needs to be strengthened

6. Red- Labour government

- Is it the labour government who just keep changing things for no reason?
- Is this new Care Structure an electioneering campaign issue?
- A change of government could mean that this is all changed again.

*A consensus **was not** reached on this topic*

Summary of the Feedback session

Participants were given a brief explanation of the three alternative funding proposals offered in the green paper – insurance, partnerships and comprehensive.

A tower of blocks (giant Jenga) representing each proposal was built on the stage with a pyramid of wooden figures on top. The wooden figure that was placed on top represented a person to this tower of blocks.

Participants were invited to say which was their least favoured option but they had to say why. Each time a reason was given a wooden block was removed from that tower, the aim being to see which proposal toppled first.

Participants were unanimous in the view that taxation was the favoured proposal and there was frustration that this was not included as an option in the Green Paper.

Nonetheless, there was a good deal of comment from the floor. Most comments were applicable to all three proposals.

Participants were unanimous in the view that taxation was the favoured proposal and there was frustration that this was not included as an option in the Green Paper.

Nonetheless, there was a good deal of comment from the floor. Most comments were applicable to all three proposals.

Insurance was the least popular for the following reasons:

- It is seen as a money maker for insurance companies hence the powerful lobbying from insurance companies
- Claimants may be directed to a limited number of service providers
- Insurance companies clauses traditionally restrict claims
- Mistrust of insurance companies generally
- Insurance system for health in USA was seen as having failed
- Proviso from some participants – could be considered if it was a government insurance scheme

Partnerships

- Experience shows individuals are treated with mistrust as part of financial assessments so there was doubt as to the effectiveness of this method

The following comments applied to all three proposals:

- The proposals represent a change in ethos. We all care for every body and we are on the verge of losing this.
- Paid into national insurance and tax all working life – why should I pay again?
- Means-testing should not be applied – this avoids dishonest statements on finances
- If long-term disabled and been on low income or benefits for a long period then you will not have any funds when you retire so cannot contribute and will receive minimum service
- It is unfair to include houses as an asset. Why should some families inherit homes because their relatives didn't require long term care and others not?
- It is illogical and unconscionable that you pay only when you are old – the old paying for the old
- Concern for women who have been carers and mothers and not paid national insurance
- Will there be sufficient places in care homes anyway?

Additional Comments

- Acknowledgement that a change of government is likely. Although it was noted all political parties are minded to revise the social care system.
- Acknowledgment that tax revenues have decreased so how could the government afford to introduce free social care
- Prevention – if more funding was put in to preventative care this may reduce demand on residential social care

- There is insufficient detail within the Green Paper on how individuals will be affected, particularly on changes on Disability Living Allowance and Attendance Allowance
- Staff terms and conditions of employment have not been addressed within the paper
- Monitoring and Inspection has not been addressed within the paper

The Thank you:

Help the Aged/Age Concern for their support in part funding the consultation

Promenade Promotions for the “jenga towers” and creative input

To all participants for their thoughts and suggestions

Bradford Alliance on Community Care (BACC)

Unit 37 Carlisle Business Centre

60 Carlisle Road

Bradford BD8 8BD

Admin@bacc.uk.com

www.bacc.uk.com

Tel 01274 481590

Fax 01274 487595

Text 07909530646

What people had written on “jenga” blocks as positives about proposals

The “jenga towers included the statements in green

1 Independence (Prevention Services)	2 Same care Everywhere (National Assessment)	3 Working Together (Joined-Up Service)	4 Informatio n & Advice	5 Personalisation (Personalised Care & Support)	6 Fair Funding
Enough Support	Standard Care in all towns	More communicatio n between services	Better direction to find services	Consumer choice	My own money
More Services	Uniform application	Linking services	Informatio n accessibili ty to easy language or pictures	Individual support	Everyone fully funded not means tested
To keep people as individuals & recognize differences	Do away with postcode lottery	Having a joined up service	Sign posting to individual needs	User Led	Not too expensive for the individual
Continuity in services & care wherever you live	Quality Support	Continuous support	Awarenes s, informatio n	Choice	Central gov't funding
Disabled Children	Better quality of life	Help improve our services	Good informatio n	Dual care for couples	
Family should be included in care	Equality	Having a joined up service	Benefits & advice on where to go	Should ask the person what they need	
More services from voluntary sector	People being treated as individual – no cookie- cutter approach	Different services “talking” to each other	Specialist info	Considering individual needs	
Care available to all (in theory)	Extra controls More Choice Better Service	Overlap & inter- connected		Sign posting to individual needs	
Local Authority Care	Feedback	No generalisation.		Having wider choice	

Homes		Consultation with service users			
Early intervention				Personalised care support would allow people to be recognized beyond their disabilities	
Helping people to live in the community				Extra controls More Choice Better Service	
All the same interpretation of the guidance would be good				Listening	
Centres of independent living				Maintaining a persons dignity	
Respite for carers				Empowerment	
Creative, caring efficient work				Will give more choice and control for individual	
Realisation of need				Good support	
Improve safety				Freedom to choose	
Good health					
Understanding					
More carers in attendance					

Appendix 2 Negative statements written on “Jenga” Blocks

1 Independence (Prevention Services)	2 Same care Everywhere (National Assessment)	3 Working Together (Joined-Up Service)	4 Information & Advice	5 Personalisation (Personalised Care & Support)	6 Fair Funding
Making information accessible to all – will it be equal to all?	Small cog in a big machine	Not many social workers to assess people’s needs urgently	Some people have difficulty understanding what they can do	Where is the dignity in care?	Seen as a “tax on older people”
Too much red tape	Not getting the right support for the individual	Lines of communication	Spell out rights	Look at the person	Chance for entrepreneurs to make a ‘killing’ on innocent people
Continuing should automatically follow through	Prescriptive for all	Good assessment essential	Ignorance	Lack of training and understanding of the needs of the service user	Not enough money to do it properly
People who are institutionalised will not get proper support	Assessment of patient by qualified staff not the care home	Stop the mass of form filling	Not accessible to all	One solution	Fair funding might be difficult to achieve
Families/carers overburdened with care management	It to be the same		Not enough help/information	Does it cover being part of a community	Care should not be discriminated because of lack of funding
I am a statistic not a person	Post code lottery		Not clear information telling patients what they are entitled to		Closures of local elderly care homes
Discrimination	More help required		Very poor exchange of info on individual’s symptoms and		Lack of resources

			circumstances		
Bureaucracy	Not universal		Don't talk to you		Paid when working – now have to pay again
Insufficient consultation			To spend more time visiting and talking to individuals		Always controlled by too small a budget
Lack of service provision			Lack of understanding		Create a system which is under-resourced
Institutional inertia					Is means testing to be ignored
The support is a shambles					People's savings being eaten up
Being told what to do					Not getting in money
Not enough services					The means testing system
Does it take into account carers?					Tight budget and too many choices
Change in government					Who decides fair funding
Indecisive					Economic downturn
Hijacked by new government					No up front payment required
No jargon					Not for profit

					orgs!! Rubbish... they employ staff
Labour government					Do not allow local authorities to interpret in their best interests rather than yours
The carer may be forgotten not consulted, not counted					Lack of funding
					Not going on holidays
					Where is the money coming from?
					All public services are going to be cut so where is all the funding coming from.