Summary of discussions at stakeholder engagement events
Introduction

The commission held four stakeholder engagement events attended by a total of 55 people from a range of national and local organisations involved in the planning, delivery and regulation of services. They took place on:

29 October  The King’s Fund (London)
30 October  The King’s Fund (London)
4 November  The King’s Fund (London)
12 November  Manchester

This paper summarises the discussions from those events.

Initially, these events were designed to gather additional evidence where it was felt there had been gaps in the call for evidence questionnaires (previously sent out to a range of stakeholders). However, after conversations with the project team and the commission representatives, it was decided that the focus of these events should be changed. Although there had been a high level of responses to the questionnaires, these responses had primarily focused on highlighting the problems that existed rather than generating solutions. Consequently, it was decided that these stakeholder events would focus specifically on exploring solutions.

Three broad themes were agreed for the discussions:

- funding
- entitlement
- organisation and delivery.

Using these themes, the following questions were constructed as initial discussion points:

- If the funding of social care were to be more generous, where would the additional finance come from and what changes would need to be made to the NHS to accommodate this?

- If all health and social care services were to be free at the point of need and based on entitlement, what criteria could be used for entitlement and what safety nets would need to be in place for those who did not meet eligibility?

- How could a more integrated approach to health and social care be delivered – eg, within existing structures, as a new national organisation, funded nationally but provided through local providers, etc? What would be the pros and cons of each approach?
Methodology

We used the following methods to gather evidence:

- round table discussion using a world café-style approach
- a facilitator to depict discussions graphically
- plenary discussion.

Questions were sent to participants in advance to allow them time to consider their responses.

Attendance

In addition to commissioners and staff from The King’s Fund, the following participants attended each of the events.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Organisation/Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>29 October</td>
<td>Caroline Abrahams</td>
<td>Director</td>
<td>Age UK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Stephen Burke</td>
<td>Director</td>
<td>United for All Ages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Martin Green</td>
<td>Chief Executive</td>
<td>ECCA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Emer Harrington</td>
<td>Corporate Affairs Manager</td>
<td>Bupa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Oliver Henman</td>
<td>Head of Partnerships</td>
<td>NCVO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Heléna Herklots</td>
<td>Chief Executive</td>
<td>Carers UK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Paul Jenkins</td>
<td>Chief Executive</td>
<td>Rethink</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sally Light</td>
<td>Chief Executive</td>
<td>Motor Neurone Disease Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>John Middleton</td>
<td>Vice President</td>
<td>Faculty of Public Health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sean O’Sullivan</td>
<td>Head of Policy</td>
<td>Royal College of Midwives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>David Pearson</td>
<td>Vice President</td>
<td>ADASS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Richard Thompson</td>
<td>President</td>
<td>Royal College of Physicians</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bella Travis</td>
<td>Policy Lead</td>
<td>Mencap</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 October</td>
<td>Ruth Abuzaid</td>
<td>Deputy Head of Care Services</td>
<td>Huntington's Disease Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Helena Brice</td>
<td>Policy Officer</td>
<td>Centre for Mental Health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Helen Carter</td>
<td>Consultant in Public Health</td>
<td>Public Health England</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jane Collins</td>
<td>Chief Executive</td>
<td>Marie Curie Cancer Care</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gillian Connor</td>
<td>Acting Chief Executive</td>
<td>Hanover</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Andrew Cozens</td>
<td>Chair</td>
<td>Carers Trust</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chris Drinkwater</td>
<td>President</td>
<td>NHS Alliance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Geraldine Green</td>
<td>Senior Policy Officer (Interim)</td>
<td>Alzheimer’s Society</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>John Hughes</td>
<td>Medical Director</td>
<td>Sue Ryder</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Donal Hynes</td>
<td>Vice-chair</td>
<td>NHS Alliance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nick Kirwin</td>
<td>Director</td>
<td>ILC-UK Care Funding Advice Network</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Maria Lagos</td>
<td>Head of Sector Development and Innovation</td>
<td>Skills for Care</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>James Lloyd</td>
<td>Director</td>
<td>Strategic Society Centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ed Moses</td>
<td>Deputy Director, Strategic Partnerships</td>
<td>Public Health England</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ellie Rose</td>
<td>Public Affairs Manager</td>
<td>Macmillan Cancer Support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Merron Simpson</td>
<td>Special Adviser</td>
<td>NHS Alliance</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Organisation/Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4 November</td>
<td>Joanne Bosanquet</td>
<td>Deputy Director of Nursing</td>
<td>Public Health England</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Simon Chapman</td>
<td>Director of Public &amp; Parliamentary Engagement</td>
<td>The National Council for Palliative Care and Dying Matters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Angela Coulter</td>
<td>Senior Research Scientist</td>
<td>University of Oxford</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Karl Demain</td>
<td>Deputy Director Strategy and Impact</td>
<td>Royal Voluntary Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Anita Donley</td>
<td>Clinical Vice President</td>
<td>Royal College of Physicians</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Stephen Goulder</td>
<td>Director of Corporate Services</td>
<td>SCIE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ellen Graham</td>
<td>Policy Manager</td>
<td>Public Health England</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Caroline Hawkin</td>
<td>Senior Public Policy Adviser</td>
<td>Scope</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rea Mattock</td>
<td>Lay Adviser</td>
<td>Royal College of Ophthalmologists</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Robert Melnitschuk</td>
<td>Policy and Advocacy Manager</td>
<td>Help the Hospices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rachel Noble</td>
<td>Policy Manager</td>
<td>British Dental Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Helga Pile</td>
<td>National Officer (social care)</td>
<td>UNISON</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mark Platt</td>
<td>Policy Adviser</td>
<td>Royal College of Nursing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Monika Pieuss</td>
<td>Head of Strategy Unit</td>
<td>Public Health England</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ewe Richardson</td>
<td>Chief Executive</td>
<td>The National Council for Palliative Care and Dying Matters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Alan Rosenbach</td>
<td>Special Policy Lead</td>
<td>CQC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Julia Scott</td>
<td>Chief Executive</td>
<td>College of Occupational Therapists</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Zoe Wyrko</td>
<td>Consultant Geriatrician</td>
<td>British Geriatrics Society</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 November</td>
<td>Tracy Ellery</td>
<td>Deputy Chief Executive/ Director of Finance</td>
<td>Manchester Mental Health and Social Care Trust</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kayleigh Hartigan</td>
<td>Senior Strategy Manager</td>
<td>NHS England</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Liam Hughes</td>
<td>Chair</td>
<td>Oldham Health and Wellbeing Board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mark Leaver</td>
<td>Strategic Lead – Business Change</td>
<td>Manchester City Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Michelle Lee</td>
<td>Associate Director</td>
<td>Tameside and Glossop Community Healthcare, Stockport NHS Foundation Trust</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Neil Matthewman</td>
<td>Chief Executive</td>
<td>Community Integrated Care</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dave Nunns</td>
<td>Chief Executive</td>
<td>Healthwatch Wigan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>John Pantall</td>
<td>Executive Member, Health and Wellbeing</td>
<td>Stockport Borough Council</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key findings

These events stimulated a good level of debate and what appeared to be a genuine desire to explore ways forward. However, there seemed to be a reluctance to be radical in responding to the questions posed. At the initial events (29 and 30 October), participants seemed to be constrained by what they perceived to be politically acceptable solutions and were drawn into discussing the question rather than giving new and innovative ideas. At the later events we specifically encouraged participants to consider and allow themselves more radical thoughts.

The views expressed during the events were wide and varied. Consequently, drawing common themes has been difficult. Below we summarise the high-level views that were reflected across all four events. In the next section we provide more detail about the responses to each of the three questions.

- There was a widely held view that the issue was broader than just health and social care. Housing was specifically mentioned as an example of where public services needed to be more widely joined up. Understanding the systemic nature of health and social care existing across a range of areas including public health, education, housing, etc, was seen to be crucial.
Perceived political agendas often prevented participants from being creative with new ideas as it was felt they would not be politically palatable and consequently not worth discussing. A need to find a way of removing political point-scoring and finding political consensus appeared to be a strong driver to finding solutions and moving discussions forward.

Giving individual patients/service users more power and autonomy to say where, what and how services should be provided was raised as a theme in a number of the events. These discussions also focused on giving individuals more financial responsibility and using this as a basis for building services around patients’ needs and wishes.

A need to engage the wider community at a local level was seen as a way to address local issues from a variety of perspectives (financial, workforce/capacity, empowerment). Giving more autonomy and power to currently established groups such as health and wellbeing boards was seen as one way of doing this.

A number of conversations focused on commissioning. Considering how services should be commissioned and where commissioning should be located was seen as an area that needed further thought. Locating joint commissioning within a body such as the health and wellbeing boards appeared to be one way of bridging the health and social care divide.

There was a view that change will not happen simply by attempting to change systems; there needs to be a cultural change.

There was no appetite to undertake significant structural changes to the system. However, ideas were suggested for changing how money moves through the system:
- joint commissioning through health and wellbeing boards
- funding health and social care through a per capita system, which might negate the need for commissioning
- personal budgets (already implemented in social care but not so common in the health economy), which would drive different priorities from an individual perspective.

There was felt to be a need to have an outcomes framework that extended across health and social care and was driven nationally but delivered locally.

Summary of responses to questions

The following summary reflects the solutions to the questions posed, bringing together similar views from different groups and events.

**Question 1: Funding**

If the funding of social care were to be more generous where would the additional finance come from and what changes would need to be made to the NHS to accommodate this?

- Raise finances through taxation
- Better use of existing money
- Re-prioritisation of departmental allocation between health and social care or from other government budgets or top-slice all departments (1 per cent)
- Means test NHS care for long-term care
Find money within the two systems, by integrating/aligning them better
- at a local level through health and wellbeing boards
- shared outcomes

Charge living costs when in hospital (as have in social care)

Charging for avoidable illness/injury, eg, smoking-related, sports

Allow GPs to prescribe social care

Encourage individuals to save for social care
- co-payments and insurance as options
- fully funded NHS with patient-commissioned care
- auto-enrolment into insurance scheme
- direct payments

Tackle unmet need – those who can pay for social care but currently use unpaid carers
- on basis that this will release money into the economy through more jobs

Save money through improved housing strategy
- older people have housing wealth
- warm, affordable, appropriate housing would reduce health and social care costs
- specialist housing geared to people with mental health needs
- collaboration with construction industry and changes to rules around making housing more appropriate for disabled and older people
- community-based housing prevents isolation and reduces care needs

Social care needs to be redefined. How to make people independent
- taking a whole services view, built around the individual
- single point of contact
- redefine/create a single ‘wellbeing service’
- taking in and prioritising prevention
- pool budgets and make it easier to do so

Prevention is implicit if savings are to be realised

Hospital hotels

Using personalised budgets/direct payments or adaptation of these
- could use Scottish model

Re-prioritisation of departmental spending (eg, from defence, Trident) to enlarge the pot for health and social care

Keep the pot the same but make the link between national insurance payments and spending more explicit to the public, to make future conversations about increasing/decreasing the pot easier

Finding funds elsewhere
- rebalancing financial priorities – ‘away from fighting wars’
- chasing taxes from global corporations

Charging
- worried well pay for services that others can’t – enabling you to do more of the preventive work with those that wouldn’t otherwise have accessed it, eg, to prevent falls
- where services are currently delivered alongside each other and makes no sense/unclear to tell difference, eg, mental health, community nursing
- outpatient visits or GP visits (if service and access improved)
- in-hospital charging – hotel costs, meals, prescription charges
Shifting money out of acute care to social care, community and preventive

Could increase national insurance and take it back to what it was originally intended to be (ie, if you put in, you get out), but with the choice to opt out

Mandatory private insurance scheme

Reducing waste in current health and social care system to release more money for social care and preventive
  – the tariff (Payment by Results) is seen as a problem

Encourage greater personal responsibility/manage expectations about what is available
  – encourage planning/saving
  – equity release… but will this work in 30/40 years when current cohort without housing assets get older?

Truly joined-up funding of health and social care

Need a long-term trajectory for the Better Care Fund

Consider the wider determinants of health and social care needs in the round

A focus on public health, prevention and healthy life expectancy

Question 2: Entitlement

If all health and social care services were to be free at the point of need and based on entitlement, what criteria could be used for entitlement and what safety nets would need to be in place for those who did not meet eligibility?

Ideas around different criteria included:
  – charges for situations when people had some individual responsibility, eg, smoking, drinking, dangerous sports, obesity
  – urgency of need
  – co-payments and introducing payments for some things (meals when in hospital was the most frequently suggested)
  – scoring points or accumulating some spending power through being a ‘good citizen’ that could be later cashed in for health and social care
  – make lower end services free and higher end services paid for

Increase community cohesion
  – make use of the assets that existed within individuals or the community
  – make much more use of voluntary organisations as brokers between people and services

The system should support, incentivise and enable people to stay well

Keeping whatever eligibility criteria was decided low to catch people before their needs became acute

Widening GP prescribing (or others’ prescribing) to include things like exercise classes, library membership, etc

Ideas about using other facilities, eg, hotels are often cheaper than hospitals and provide a more customer-focused service

Tax rebates on leisure club membership
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- Wetherspoons and Sainsbury’s cafés provide good cheap food as well as somewhere social and warm to sit and be
- There were some redistribution ideas – why don’t people in prisons have to sell their homes or make a financial contribution to their keep like others do in order to pay for social care
- There was considerable support for it all coming from the existing national budget
- There was some thinking that the current original principles were OK but that their application and interpretations had changed over the years and perhaps were no longer helpful
- Work being done around dementia-friendly communities was cited as having some potential mileage for other areas
- Contributory principle was discussed which could be in cash or kind – insurance-based system but using a time bank type idea
- All those over 85 or under 18 have free services
- All those over 85 forfeit their right to anything other than palliative care
- Call for increased role of voluntary sector, especially as brokers
- A need for a single gateway into all services
- Need a single outcome framework for health and social care
- Need a National Institute for Health and Care Excellence (NICE) equivalent for social care
- A time-share scheme, looking after others’ relatives in different parts of the country
- GP practice with a link-worker focused on older people
- Health and wellbeing boards are a possible way forward bringing together professionals from different backgrounds
- A primary care model is good, as it involves no structural change
- A key-worker system (Scotland)
- Use of community navigators
- Care organised around the needs of the person based on their NI contributions
- Everyone has a personal budget of, eg, £500,000
- Social care insurance
- Micro commissioning where groups of people with the same condition are supported to commission care appropriate for their needs
- More needs to be done on upstream prevention
- Integration needs to be wider than just health and social care and needs to include other agencies such as housing
**Question 3: Organisation and delivery**

How could a more integrated approach to health and social care be delivered – eg, within existing structures, as a new national organisation, funded nationally but provided through local providers, etc? What would be the pros and cons of each approach?

- There was generally a sense that there was lack of clarity about what people are entitled to.
- There needs to be more clarity regarding what people were entitled to from the current systems and who delivers what.
- There needs to be a nationally agreed but locally delivered set of entitlements and criteria.
- Need to look at how we meet people’s needs more holistically across health and social care.
- Have a key worker who works across health and social care.
- Need to make sure that the right services are in place.
- Need to think about integrating commissioning (100 per cent), at a local level. Health and wellbeing boards could be a place for this to start.
- Integrate health and social care within the health system overseen by local boards (could be health and wellbeing boards but not based in the local authorities).
- Funding across the system could be calculated on a per capita basis.
- Be prescriptive about the outcome but not the means.
- Sharing of information.
- Do we need to assess people around wellbeing and what part does housing play in this?
- Accommodation costs could be charged for people in long-term care within the NHS (nursing homes).
- Cultural change needs to happen before thinking about structural change. The NHS needs to change. There needs to be a culture where people and organisations are able to make tough decisions.
- The NHS needs to recognise that social care is becoming more prominent in the 21st century.
- Need to move away from social care being about services and more about how people live their lives.
- There needs to be a national outcomes framework with local responses to how this is delivered.
- Need to find ways of funding social care in a way that saves money from health.