Making the Case for Extra Care: The PSSRU Evaluation

Robin Darton

PSSRU
University of Kent

Laing & Buisson Annual Extra Care Housing Conference
23 February 2012

Presentation

- The PSSRU evaluation
- Reasons for moving into extra care
- Characteristics of residents
- Outcomes for residents
- Cost-effectiveness
- Social well-being
- Summary and discussion

PSSRU Evaluation

- 5-year evaluation: 2006-2010
- 19 new build schemes supported by the DH Extra Care Housing Fund (2004-2006)
- 3 villages (770 dwellings), 16 smaller schemes (716 dwellings)
- Linked studies:
  - Social well-being and scheme costs & outcomes (JRF)
  - EVOLVE: Sheffield/PSSRU study of design (EPSRC)

Reasons for Moving

- ‘Push’ factors:
  - Physical health
  - Managing health tasks
  - Mobility in home
  - Lack of services
  - Managing home
- ‘Pull’ factors:
  - Tenancy rights/own front door
  - Flexible on-site care & support
  - Security
  - Accessibility
  - Size of accommodation
  - Social or leisure facilities

Entrants with Care Assessment: Require Help with IADLs

Entrants with Care Assessment & Entrants to Care Homes: Barthel Index
Entrants with Care Assessment & Entrants to Care Homes: MDS CPS

Entrants with Care Assessment: Location at End of Study

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Still in scheme</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moved</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Died in scheme</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Died elsewhere</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lost to follow-up</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Entrants with Care Assessment (2006-07): Mortality & Survival

- 374 residents in 11 schemes followed-up for 30 months
- 34% aged 65+ died in 30 months
- Median (50%) survival predicted by model:
  - Extra care: 32 months
  - Care home: 21 months
  - Nursing home: 10 months

Cost-Effectiveness

- JRF Rowanberries study: higher cost/person associated with improved social care outcomes and quality of life
- Comparisons of costs and outcomes with matched sample from 1995 care home survey over 6 months:
  - Lower costs: £374 vs £409 pw
  - Slight improvement in physical functioning and cognitive functioning stable for extra care
  - Slight deterioration in functioning for care homes
- Restricting comparisons to more dependent (2005 cases):  
  - Outcomes for extra care remain better
  - Less evidence of cost savings

PSSRU Social Well-Being Study

- Role of communal facilities in friendship development:
  - Smaller schemes: restaurants and shops - lunchtime
  - Villages: indoor street and role of resident volunteers
  - Villages well-suited to more active people
  - Poor health and receipt of care could hinder social involvement – importance of staff support
  - Links with local community valued – importance of location and transport
  - Attitudes to other residents’ frailty and community use of facilities

PSSRU Evaluation: Summary

- Average level of dependency lower than in care homes
- Substantial need for help with IADLs & mobility
- Very few with severe cognitive impairment
- Cost-effectiveness analysis demonstrates potential as alternative for proportion of care home residents
- Follow-ups demonstrate that can be home for life, but support for cognitively impaired less certain
- Relationships between fit and frail, social groups etc: importance of support and managing expectations, especially in villages
Discussion

- Diversity of models - comparisons difficult (data)
- Further investigation:
  - Support for more frail (ASSET Study)
  - Appeal for those contemplating downsizing
  - Timeliness of moving - are people leaving it too late?
- Sustainability under financial pressure:
  - Development of new schemes
  - Maintaining facilities (e.g. restaurants)
  - Balance of dependency (local authority nominations)

Contacts

- PSSRU publications on the evaluation:
  - www.pssru.ac.uk/projects/echi.htm
- Speaker:
  - R.A.Darton@kent.ac.uk