

## **Extra Care Housing Industry Forum**

**Notes** on the meeting at 89 Albert Embankment, London SE1 7TP, Monday 18<sup>th</sup> December 2006 1:30 pm - 4:30pm

Attended by all who had responded to the invitation (see list of participants - no apologies).

note: presentations and discussions were entirely focussed on the 'Raising the Stakes' project.

### **1. Welcome and introductions.**

**Steve Ongeri** (Housing Corporation) gave a brief overview of the Industry Forum and its aims: to help commissioners, providers and service users of extra care share a common understanding of extra care housing.

This meeting's particular focus is on the Raising the Stakes project which needs the help and involvement of the Industry.

### **2. Background and summary.**

**Paul Watson** (Hanover HA) recounted the history of the Extra Care Housing Industry Forum with which he has been involved from its inception when on secondment to the Department of Health.

2002: Department of Health sets up a working group of ECH providers with the task of developing an ECH Code of Practice

2003: The working group reports on the problems of regulation of ECH and of registration. There is still no full agreement on what is ECH and on what are its minimum standards

2004: The Industry Forum comes to 4 conclusions:

- a. Need for standard descriptive language
- b. Need for a set of minimum standards
- c. Concentrate on outcomes and their monitoring
- d. Create a Kitemark, self-managed and self-assessed by the industry

These conclusions raised key challenges for the industry:

1. The definitions and kite marking must be meaningful for older people and advisers
2. The set of standards should not constrain or restrict the development of new models
3. ECH is innovative and still evolving; avoid standardisation, do not constrain a dynamic market
4. No barriers to entry to ECH: create several levels within the kitemark including optional 'aspirational standards'. Acknowledge different housing and health perspectives.

Kite marking

- If self-managed, would it be trusted?
- How to organise it and assess it?
- Not static, but reflecting the evolution of the market
- Must reflect communities of interest
- Must evolve with the industry and become owned by it

### **Questions:**

Peter Fletcher (Peter Fletcher Associates): the kitemarking will bring the industry together. Are there barriers for entry, a bottom line?

Paul Watson (Hanover HA): there should be common core standards. Comparisons were made with driving licences: provisional or full. In this case there should be only one licence, based on common standards.

Bob Bessell (Retirement Security Ltd): there have to be some boundaries; there has to be a “guardian of the Kitemark”

Rebecca Mollart (CSHS): There is already a CSHS code of practice now extended to cover ECH. Could these be the basis of common standards? Why replicate them?

Paul Watson (Hanover HA): ECH need core standards with some flexibility.

Jeremy Porteus (CSIP – Housing LIN): a code of practice such as that of the ARHM could be helpful

Jane Minter (Housing 21): the core standards must reflect the vast variety of models in the sector. We must help communication between providers and their customers. We could learn from the Care & Repair Kitemark and from other Kitemarks in the sector.

Low level services are an important ingredient of ECH – it’s not just about personal care services.

### **3. ‘Raising the Stakes’ project overview**

**John Galvin** (EAC) (see ppt presentation)

John Galvin explained the background to the ‘project’: At previous Forum meetings it had been agreed that the group needed additional resources to help move its work forward, and as an independent member and a charity, EAC had been encouraged to lead grant applications first to ‘Invest to Save’ and then to the Housing Corporation. The ‘project’ format was a requirement of HC IGP funding rules; its formulation the outcome of negotiation and compromise on the way. But he hoped the bundle of work and outputs he was about to describe adequately met the Forum’s brief. The work would be done by EAC in partnership with PFA, IPC and Moyra Riseborough (RRCA) and in consultation with Forum members.

### **Questions:**

Sarah Vallely (Housing 21): there is a conflict of philosophies worth noting within ECH: independence versus terminal illness services. There is a need for mapping the services available

John Galvin (EAC): such a mapping can be made available electronically to the industry as well as to the public

John Mills (ARHM): is the Kitemark necessary when CSCI already regulate ECH?

Jeremy Porteus (CSIP – Housing LIN): CSCI is a registration of the domiciliary care services provided in ECH.

Anne Bailey (Wolverhampton City Council): from the point of view of a commissioner of ECH, CSCI registration is not sufficient at all. There is still a need of ECH standards

#### **4. Measuring Extra Care Housing outcomes**

**Deborah Clogg** (IPC) (see ppt presentation)

##### **Questions:**

Bob Bessell (Retirement Security Ltd): (on the presentation's statement that evidence is lacking on financial return for investors in private leasehold ECH) Company annual reports and accounts provide that information readily. In many cases they will show a return of 20% on investment.

John Mills (ARHM): (ditto) Retirement Villages keep statistics of % return on capital which show that investment in this sector is successful.

Richard Redmond (Swindon BC): ECH industry needs to educate local authorities on its value. If CSCI were to be involved in regulate the industry, ECH costs would soar.

Bob Bessell (Retirement Security Ltd): when CSCI published a protocol for the registration of close care schemes, it became a minefield and some close care providers decided to get rid of their care services.

Anne-Marie Nicolson (PRP Architects): on the matter of design of ECH, the importance of a viable environment is crucial

#### **5. Towards a Code and Kitemarking**

**Moyra Riseborough** (RRCA) and **Peter Fletcher** (PFA) (see ppt presentation)

#### **6. Discussion**

There followed a 50 minutes general discussion (recorded on mini disk).

The text below is an edited transcript of the discussion.

Bob Bessell (Retirement Security Ltd): who will be responsible for controlling and checking the Kitemarking?

Moyra Riseborough (RRCA): the Kitemarking will be by voluntary self-regulation by the industry.

Peter Fletcher (PFA): we do not want CSCI to regulate ECH as a quasi-residential care product. The public sector is certainly not going to pay for a kitemarking system. Up to the industry to work this out for itself if the industry wants to pay for an independent kitemarking system. Starting point is to find that common language. Let's describe first, maybe just 10 points, as suggested by Paul Watson earlier on.

Bob Bessell (Retirement Security Ltd): Kitemarking would be worth a great deal of money to the industry. Obtaining a Kitemark would become a necessary requisite. It will become incredibly important for the private sector.

Moyra Riseborough (RRCA): This is why we need to let providers describe what they have got well, regardless of whether or not they achieve the full standards.

Steve Onger (Housing Corporation): First we need more information about what people are producing. So we (HC, DH) could use a range of indicators if you tell us what they are. This could allow for a kitemark at various levels. This would allow the HC to commission an ECH development saying "this is the product that we want to buy, you could tick the boxes to show whether you are providing that product or not". But what is good for consumers is that Kitemarking puts pressure on providers; they will have a vested interest to provide the necessary information which is needed by the public. It's essentially about having more information, and the industry are the only people who can provide us with that information. You have a vested interest in getting our (HC) money by providing accurate information.

Jane Minter (Housing 21): the debate over Kitemarking is not at present involving the consumer. Proposed appraisal tools are only for the providers and the industry. Why?

Moyra Riseborough (RRCA): we are aiming at producing a plain language which will be understandable to the consumer

Peter Fletcher (PFA): There is indeed an issue of transparency for the customer, and that's most important. Perhaps a model to follow could borrow from EAC's Care Options tool, to begin to draw out the provider ethos, gets the providers to describe the underlining characteristics of their scheme. That is really useful for people thinking of going into residential care. To begin to get this ethos out is very important. Hence a need for clear descriptions and basic standards. Paul Watson was saying we need to describe, but there is a bottom line, and there are some schemes which do not even have the basics of ECH and should not be described as that.

Moyra Riseborough (RRCA): a standard way of describing is also a standard. People will either sign up describing everything in a standard way, or they won't.

John Mills (ARHM): yet are there not sufficient regulations of the sector with the standards demanded by CSCI and by Supported People? CSCI regulates domiciliary care.

Peter Fletcher (PFA): yes: it is not regulating ECH.

John Mills (ARHM): so you are proposing another set of regulators.

Peter Fletcher (PFA): it is not regulation: it is voluntary agreement to standards

Rachel Kirkland (Department of Health): it is actually clarifying the regulation of standards of personal care, and separating them from the standards of quality of the scheme and the housing within that and what that offers to the individual, which is very different from personal care.

Anne Bailey (Wolverhampton City Council): Kitemarking would be of great help to the commissioners of ECH, as well as to the providers themselves. It will help the

process of commissioning which at present, for us, is absolutely dire. If kitemarking could be treated as accreditation, it will make it easier for commissioners and for providers, because they can clearly identify what the schemes are offering, what they do and what they don't do. It will make the whole process of commissioning much easier.

Ann Hughes (Anchor Trust): Anchor's service philosophy is shaped between care providers and commissioners; ECH providers sometimes have no control over the care providers. The ethos is provided by the relationship between the care provider and the commissioners who have little control over how that care contract is administered. It will be difficult for us to say we have responsibility for the kitemark when we have no control over the way care is delivered.

Jeremy Porteus (CSIP Housing LIN): perhaps you would prefer a model where from the outset there is a promise of what an older resident could expect to receive from the services provider. The kitemark will then reflect that and help the provider to be self-regulated or self-assessed, but the promise to provide can be monitored. Split the product into two.

Steve Onger (Housing Corporation): In designing this kitemark we are aware that individual budgets are driving what we want to do. We need a coherent system which allows housing support, care and everything else to be clearly identifiable, to make certain that we can look at housing product as an independent part of that. How can we do this?

Jane Minter (Housing 21): Statements of purpose are key, whether regarding in- or out-house services.

Jeremy Porteus (CSIP – Housing LIN): we have to consider the expectations of older people. Kitemarking is self-assessed by those who manage the premises. There is a division between housing (kitemarking), Supporting People and care services.

Rebecca Mollart (CSHS): A lot of what you are talking about is already in the CSHS Code of Practice, although I know it does not cover the private sector. Is the CSHS code of practice inadequate for ECH? It seems we could develop it. The code of practice with its 12-18 months assessment process, monitoring, assessors reviewed by the industry and a 3-times a year review? Does that not meet some of the kitemarking requirements?

Steve Onger (Housing Corporation): Kitemarking is different; the intention is not to have a code of practice, but to have a consumer-driven product, where we don't have to have that assessment.

Rebecca Mollart (CSHS): I understand that, but you are also talking about techniques by which you can measure outcomes.

Moyra Riseborough (RRCA): We have to be able to do that to put up a self-validating system. How do we measure outcomes is the question.

Jane Minter (Housing 21): I do like the idea of statement of fit for purpose

Jeremy Porteus (CSIP Housing LIN): Peter Fletcher was talking about moving from an on-site care team to in-reach service. That is a fundamental difference: what Peter proposes actually changes the product which is now being promoted by the Department of Health. It seems that we are moving to a model of enhanced sheltered

housing product. When we are looking at descriptors, we have to be very clear about the relationship of the care and the housing services, especially if it is non-waking night service. These are tricky issues that we need to address.

Peter Fletcher (PFA): : we were deliberately trying to be provocative

Anne Bailey (Wolverhampton City Council):: if 24 hour care service is provided, we have a real alternative to residential care. We may have to cover different provision with different names.

Jon Head (Hanover HA): It is a legitimate question but ought to be asked in the perspective of technological advancement. 24 hour on site service is not a prerequisite, bearing in mind the rapid advance of technology. That raises the question of what falls into the remit of the kitemarking system. Is it discreet features, or a building, or a collection of buildings? Are we prepared to see the definition of ECH extending to something more amorphous than that? Is it a virtual scheme where services are provided within a geographical area? This begins to dissolve the issue of what ECH might be. It cannot be an alternative to residential care without that.

Anne Bailey (Wolverhampton City Council): your are then moving into something different. If we can provide services within a building, can we also do this in the neighbourhood? You are actually then moving into something different which is no longer ECH. It is more like supported housing.

John Galvin (EAC): having analysed quite a lot of sites, we find retirement villages where the distance from the care base to a dwelling is probably greater than in the local service delivery network. There is no doubt that there are a lot of these things that we are going to agonise over in order to be able to get down the road of any hard and fast 'in or out of the club' approach to kitemarking.

Ann Hughes (Anchor Trust): do not create dinosaurs by stifling innovations.

Peter Fletcher (PFA): : there is a real difficulty in marrying the private and public sectors within a common language and kitemarking. I would like to hear the private sector on this. A kitemark will only work if we actually marry the two. We are trying something that is potentially universal without being a cop-out. Bob: you don't have care staff on-site, you have housekeepers who provide so many hours per week. If people want domiciliary care, they have to get it in, don't they?

Bob Bessell (Retirement Security Ltd): They don't. It's an integrated model. By its regulations CSCI had the effect of driving out care internal care packages from Retirement Security Ltd, because of fear of registration.

The Kitemarking success will depend on how it affects the industry. The private sector reaction to kitemarking will be entirely based on how it will affect profit. It will be dealt with by the marketing departments. It would need to be effectively policed. It will depend on the credibility of the authorising body. This body will be under a lot of pressure to grant kitemarking, therefore would need to very tight. The private sector seems to me to be entirely driven by profit and the kitemark will be seen in that respect.

John Mills (ARHM): the move to a common language will be very useful. It will be a basis for discussion for the private sector. Common language, but not descriptors with which I have problems. The kitemark must have the lightest touch because there are already so many layers of regulations. If the slightest things goes wrong in an

ECH scheme, people will go straight to CSCI and all the kitemarking good work would be undone

Anne Bailey (Wolverhampton City Council): ECH must be considered in its own right, and not as an alternative to residential care. CSCI's tendency is to want to change ECH to residential care home.

Rachel Kirkland (Department of Health): This is not the case. The guidance at the moment is very clear. From consultations between the Department of Health and CSCI on when to register and when not to. Some care home providers think it is very clear; some domiciliary care providers think it is very clear, but the housing providers are less clear.

There is an opportunity for all of you to take part in the consultation process, to make the guidance clearer. There was the Alternative Futures high court decision and that is a driver for updating the guidance. We want to make the guidance as clear as possible. We had an interesting meeting with CSCI, it is clear that CSCI do not wish at all to extend registration to ECH. But there are some schemes that are borderline. Safeguarding the individual is what CSCI is about. You are invited to submit your views to the CSCI consultation panel (email [rachel.kirkland@dh.gsi.gov.uk](mailto:rachel.kirkland@dh.gsi.gov.uk)) We need your input.

Should there be in the guidance a section on tenancies? If you look at the Alternative Futures case, tenancy was at the centre of the dispute.

Jon Head (Hanover HA): let's remember however that CSCI respond differently in different regions; looked for a briefing from DH/CSCI on which schemes come close to needing registration. It would be interesting to learn from these ECH schemes that interest CSCI, what it is that concerns CSCI about them, that they should be so close to needing registration.

Anne Bailey (Wolverhampton City Council): CSCI registration applies only to 24/7 on site care services. That is where the choice appears to be difficult.

Steve Onger (Housing Corporation): Let's terminate this particular discussion at this point. I would like to hear directly from you what you think of the project Raising the Stakes as it has been presented to you; whether this is a reasonable base for work forward?

This is a starting point, not a finishing point. Tell us how you would like my colleagues to work towards a final project that is acceptable to you. Note that the workshop that will be a fundamental part of the work that they do.

Basically: is this a complete non-starter? Is it worthwhile progressing it? Do you want something different?

It is important to get your views to the project group, because they are going to work on it before we next meet.

Bob Bessell (Retirement Security Ltd): In my opinion I think it is a great idea, but there has to be an awarding body; whoever it is, and it will have to be properly administrated. I actually do not know any one single forum for the industry as a whole - there is the House Builders Federation, the NatFed, the Housing Corporation - possibly it will have to be a newly created body . Do not underestimate the difficulty of administrating it.

Steve Ongeri (Housing Corporation): Is the Kitemark the right term

Bob Bessell (Retirement Security Ltd): I think it is the right term. "Kitemark" is the right term. It is a mark of quality and would be very much valued. Do it.

Paul Watson (Hanover HA): I see this as being a very exciting prospect. The path described by Peter Fletcher and Moyra Riseborough is safe and secure for us to develop, starting off with developing a universal language, the descriptors next, then moving on to standards, and possibly to the kitemark. This is a very clear process, a sound proposition. At each stage the Industry Forum will be guiding it.

Steve Ongeri (Housing Corporation): This is a funded project, but money will run out at the end of summer 2007; We have got till next autumn to get this into a state which will allow us to run with it. This is not a lot of time. So we need to keep working as a group. If we fall apart during those 6 months, we will get nothing.

Any other view? Are we going in the right direction?

Rachel Kirkland (Department of Health): I think you are.

Peter Fletcher (PFA): : we will turn towards descriptors that cross differences between the sectors, and out of these will begin to think which are the things we should bring out of that as the basic standards. And we can test some of those out. The workshops will be probably in March. If anybody is interested in that, let John Galvin know. EAC will be the post box (([john.galvin@eac.org.uk](mailto:john.galvin@eac.org.uk); [alex.billeter@eac.org.uk](mailto:alex.billeter@eac.org.uk)). Contact them rather than each of us.

The workshops are the next step of direct consultations, during which we will work through our 'Quality of Life' domains in a structured way and try to pin down what we think after that could be the basis for those key standards

Jane Minter (Housing 21): caveat: domains and descriptors belong to an academic language which does not speak to a wider audience. We need to engage the users, if we want to produce something which is a kitemark that is consumer-driven. We need to think about how to engage the consumers through that process.,

Jeremy Porteus; the DCLG are preparing a new Housing Strategy for Older People; kitemarking could be at the centre of it. In a year's time there is likely to be an announcement by the department in which the kitemark could play a part. So in terms of who hosts it and how it is done, the timing is critical.

Steve Ongeri (Housing Corporation): earlier on in a parallel process for the Older People Inspectorate project, we involved older people and consumers organisations who had an interesting take on it. Unfortunately we never finished that project because we run out of money. We do not intend to do that on this project, but it may be worthwhile bringing in those people later on, perhaps in the workshops.

Peter Fletcher (PFA): : a lot of work that we have done so far is based on what older people have been saying.

Jane Minter (Housing 21): we should check existing kitemarking by other organisations first. We could invite people that administer a kitemark to the workshop, to find what is out there in terms of kitemarks, the National Consumers Council or such.

Steve Onger (Housing Corporation): yes we need to update our knowledge of these.

John Mills (ARHM): involve CSCI and Supporting People. Would it be right to invite them to the workshop? They are relevant to the kitemark. They may agree to wave some of their regulatory standards if the kitemark is developed.

Steve Onger (Housing Corporation): the HC have 51 people on this group. We don't expect all to turn up at the same time. This is the first meeting that David Walden (CSCI) actually missed. Perhaps we can invite them.

John Galvin (EAC): We certainly can.

I would like to clear something with the forum today: We recognise that it is impossible to consult within the forum setting, with more than 20 or 25 organisations. I hope that you are happy that we consult with a few representative organisations, and that we get a PR, News feed and feedback system, so that the background to this discussion gets shared.

EAC will make sure that communication continues between the project group and the Industry Forum. The project needs to consult more widely, not an easy task with over 300 ECH providers who need to share in this discussion. We need to increase the number of representatives from the private sector in the project, so that from being a HC DH sponsored project it can represent the whole industry.

Deborah Clogg (IPC): to progress we need to talk to independent providers to find out how their outcomes are achieved and measured. We need to talk to a range of different types of providers including independent providers

Steve Onger (Housing Corporation):: any more messages for the team?

Ray Keane (LB of Camden): coming from an inner London Borough (of Camden) we need a common language and an understanding of the fantastic things that you can do in Suffolk (with Housing 21 and PRP) and that we would never be able to do in a million years in Camden or in any urban area. Bear that in mind as well as a common language.

Another difficulty is the vacuum that this is in depending on the admission criteria (FACS) that are applicable in a local area. If you have 'critical only', you will not get your mixed community; if you have 'critical and substantial' you can just get it, and if you are in Suffolk it is wonderful, because they have 4 hours access criteria. When you have the kitemark it will be hard to apply it across the whole country.

Peter Fletcher (PFA): . There is a view that if you take on only people with critical or substantial needs, this is not an ECH scheme. There may be stuff at either end of the spectrum: if one of the key statements is for a vibrant community; can you actually deliver that?

Steve Onger (Housing Corporation): This is true, but still does not invalidate the process, because what a scheme is called does not matter that much, it is the outcomes that matter, what is achieved. I hope that in this project they will all come within the definition of ECH, no matter how broad

Jane Minter (Housing 21): we must 'future-proof' ECH (the kitemark) by recognising that we will need to deal with people with higher needs than ECH or residential care can handle: there will be a lot of older people with dementia. We could make services for them 'housing-based'.

Steve Onger (Housing Corporation): at the other end of the spectrum they are people with housing aspirations.

Andy Staniford (Brighton & Hove Council): the Welhops Design Guide could be incorporated within the kitemarking system. The whole environment domain which interests the project is what the Design Guide is about. It is talking about the urban context around the building and the flats themselves. Bringing them all together is actually based on a self-assessment process. This bit of work has been done for you, which might make things easier. We are consulting on this document till March. The Design Guide will be ready in August September. If you are doing the kitemark on a similar timetable, there is possibility for this to fit in this process. (distribution of copies of the consultation document on design Guide to participants) "Do scribble on it and send it back".

Steve Onger (Housing Corporation): we will have a good look at this Any last ideas that you wish to express?

Clare Skidmore (CSCI Housing LIN – Kent CC): There should be more input on the cultural needs of a diverse population including BME groups.

Steve Onger (Housing Corporation): The HC is researching this and there are interesting findings. It is in the work plan but will have to be addressed more fully.

Peter Fletcher (PFA): we have tried to incorporate diversity in the customer base, but I am not sure that we have followed it through.

Steve Onger (Housing Corporation): this raises questions about how to involve these particular groups of customers.

The project is an opportunity to improve what commissioners and providers do. It is also an opportunity for the private sector to maintain profit.

The Housing Corporation should finance more mixed-tenure provision and do this in partnership with the private sector.

Steve Onger (Housing Corporation): what is good about this project is that it brings the public and private sectors together. There are many things that the public sector can learn from the private sector about customer interface in particular. We have an opportunity to fundamentally change the way in which housing works for older people, but also to improve what we do on the provider side between maintaining an increased profit for the private sector and some surpluses for the public sector. What is of particular interest to the HC is having more mixed tenure provision. We do not see why some public sector providers cannot provide more buildings for sale alongside shared ownership and flexible tenure, in partnership with private sector providers. This is a good team of people; it is up to you to tell them what you want them to do

John Galvin (EAC): voiced the Forum's appreciation of the work Steve Onger had contributed to the Forum since its inception, and explained that although Steve would be leaving the Housing Corporation shortly, he had every confidence that he would continue his involvement in the project.

## **Conclusions**

**Despite the various points raised and noted above, there was unanimous support for the 'Raising the Stakes' work programme and to moving forward through it towards a kitemarking system for ECH. EAC and project partners should continue to liaise with Forum members individually, and report regularly. The idea of an extended workshop session in March was welcomed.**