NATIONAL INSTITUTE FOR HEALTH AND CARE EXCELLENCE

GUIDELINE

Older people with social care needs and multiple long-term conditions

October 2015

Update information **July 2020:** We have linked to the NICE guideline on supporting adult carers in recommendations about supporting carers. We have added the population (older people with social care needs and multiple long-term conditions) to the recommendation on helping carers administer personal budgets and direct payments. We have incorporated footnotes into the recommendations in line with accessibility requirements.

These changes can be seen in the [short version of the guideline](#).

Contents

Introduction

A long-term condition is one that generally lasts a year or longer and impacts on a person's life. Examples include arthritis, asthma, cancer, dementia, diabetes, heart disease, mental health conditions and stroke. Long-term conditions may also be known as 'chronic conditions'.

The prevalence of long-term conditions is strongly linked to ageing and the number of people with multiple (that is to say, 2 or more) long-term conditions in England is projected to rise to 2.9 million by 2018 ([Long term conditions compendium of information third edition](#) Department of Health). Prevention, delaying onset and slowing the progression of long-term conditions are all important outcomes for older people. Other important outcomes include quality of life and positive experience related to independence, choice, dignity and control.

Despite recent policy focusing on integrated health and social care services, some people are still being treated as a collection of conditions or symptoms, rather than as a whole person ([The mandate: a mandate from the government to the NHS Commissioning Board: April 2013 to March 2015](#) Department of Health). People with multiple long-term conditions want joined-up, coordinated services but often find they are hard to access and fragmented ([Integrated care and support: our shared commitment](#) Department of Health). Poor mental health can be associated with both social isolation and poor physical health, and can go unnoticed. The issue of delivering integrated support to people with long-term conditions who live in nursing and care homes has also been neglected ([A quest for quality in care homes](#) British Geriatrics Society; [Health care in care homes](#) Care Quality Commission).

The Department of Health asked NICE to develop an evidence-based guideline to help address these issues (see the [scope](#)). The guideline was developed by a Guideline Committee following a detailed review of the evidence. The guideline focuses on older people with multiple long-term conditions and their carers. Having multiple long-term conditions is likely to mean having complex care needs, that is to say, a wide range of needs, many

of which may be serious (Rosengard et al 2007). The guideline does not cover younger adults (although many of the recommendations may also be relevant to younger adults). This is because the largest group of people affected by multiple long-term conditions is older people and because older people can experience inequalities in terms of resource allocation which is in the context of decreasing resources available to them overall (Older people's vision for long term care Joseph Rowntree Foundation, What is social care, and how can health services better integrate with it? British Medical Association).

This guideline considers how person-centred social care and support for older people with multiple long-term conditions should be planned and delivered. It addresses how those responsible for commissioning, managing and providing care for people with multiple long-term conditions should work together to deliver safe, high-quality services that promote independence, choice and control.

Context

Legislation, policy and guidance

This guideline has been developed in the context of a complex and rapidly evolving landscape of guidance and legislation, most notably the [Care Act 2014](#) which has a significant impact on people with complex care needs and multiple long-term conditions and their carers. The majority of the Care Act took effect from April 2015, with specific financial provisions coming into force from April 2016. This legislation places a duty on local authorities to promote wellbeing and meet needs (rather than requiring them simply to provide services).

The Care Act also recognises the important role played by carers and the fact that many carers are themselves older people with complex social care needs. It requires local authorities to assess and offer support to address the needs of carers, independently of the person they care for. This is aligned with a range of other carer-specific policies. For example: Department of Health (2014) [Carers strategy: the second national action plan 2014-2016](#) and NHS England (2014) [NHS England's Commitment to Carers](#) which emphasise the value of carers, and the importance of enabling them to have 'a life alongside caring' ([Department of Health 2014 p40](#)).

Under the Act, local authorities have a duty to prevent, delay or reduce the development of people's social care needs, so far as possible, and to work in an integrated, person-centred way, with all other support agencies including those in the third sector. They also have a duty to provide information and advice for the whole population, not just those who are receiving services that they fund. This means that people funding their own care and support are entitled to guidance from the local authority, including on financial matters. The [Care Act 2014](#) requires local authorities to stimulate and manage their local market to benefit the whole population, again, not just those in receipt of local authority funded support.

While the Care Act and other legislation describes what organisations must do, this guideline is focused on 'what works' in terms of how they fulfil those

duties, and deliver support to older people with multiple long-term conditions and their carers.

In focusing on wider wellbeing and person-centred support, the Care Act also encourages more integrated working and coordinated engagement between clinical commissioning groups, local authorities, providers and national bodies, including voluntary and community sector organisations. This consolidates a shift towards more holistic, coherent provision of support which has been evident in health and social care policy for some time. For example, the 2013 NHS Mandate aims to focus on quality of life for people with long-term conditions and on 'the person as a whole, rather than on specific conditions' (Department of Health p11). The Mandate also aimed to improve people's self-management skills, functional ability and quality of life, as well as helping them to stay out of hospital and to address their emotional and mental health needs.

The 'whole person' approach in policy is supported by recognition of the association between long-term conditions and mental ill-health which can sometimes go unnoticed. The No Health without Mental Health strategy, for example links to Adult Social Care Outcomes Framework and aims to improve mental health outcomes and embed consideration of wellbeing into frontline social care practice.

Current practice

As the incidence of long-term conditions increases with age, many older people have a variety of physical, mental health and social care needs for which they require support. There is evidence that depression is 7 times higher in those with 2 or more long-term conditions or chronic health complaints (The Kings Fund 2012) and that these depressive symptoms can often go untreated and affect the abilities of older people to manage their own conditions (National Development Team for Inclusion 2011).

People with multiple long-term conditions want joined-up, coordinated services (National Voices 2012). The need to deliver integrated support to people with long-term conditions who live in nursing and care homes has

been particularly neglected (British Geriatrics Society 2011). Long-term conditions can produce a complex range of symptoms and may fluctuate over time. These complex changes can pose challenges for the workforce, especially for workers in the social care sector who may not be adequately trained or resourced to support people with complex or specialist health needs. There are also well-documented problems related to the sometimes limited amount of time care workers have to build relationships with older people, or to address their support needs fully. As well as training and resourcing issues the workforce is also challenged by a lack of joined up and integrated services, that can mean that services for older people with complex social care needs can become fragmented (National Collaboration for Integrated Care and Support 2013).

Older people with long-term conditions are vulnerable to hospital admission, sometimes for routine complaints. If social care staff were skilled up to detect problems early and manage conditions better, hospital admissions may be avoided (The Kings Fund 2010). Older people may have long-term conditions that need routine monitoring or they themselves may need regular practical support to manage their conditions.

Communication

A person-centred approach is one in which people are supported to communicate their needs and preferences, exercise control over their care and live the lives they choose, so far as possible. However, this can be particularly challenging for some older people. Older people are disproportionately affected by dementia and other conditions (Alzheimer's Disease International 2011) which can limit their capacity to make decisions about their care. Those affected by long-term multiple conditions may also have disabilities which impede communication, such as sensory impairments (Department of Health 2012). Lack of capacity can be compounded by having limited (or no) information about what services are available (Department of Health, Social Services and Public Safety 2012).

Funding and funding mechanisms

A significant proportion (70%) of government health and social care spending is attributed to the care of older people with long-term conditions (Department of Health 2012) and the costs per individual increase with the number of conditions the person has. The Department of Health Long Term Conditions Compendium of Information estimated in 2012 that the annual health and social care bill for a person with 1 long-term condition is £3000, 3 times the bill for a person without a long-term condition. This figure rises to £6000 for a person with 2 conditions and approximately £7800 for a person with 3 (Department of Health 2012). These figures need to be taken in the context of large cuts to the social care budget of local authorities over last 5 years (Local Government Association 2014). Older people may not know what care they are entitled to or what their funding options might be. It has been argued that this may lead to older people's needs being left unmet because they are not claiming support. Options for people who pay for their own care and individual budget holders can be complicated and people may not be aware how to fund residential care if their conditions worsen.

Person-centred care

This guideline assumes that the practitioners using it will read it alongside the Care Act 2014 and other relevant legislation and statutory guidance. It is also written to reflect the rights and responsibilities that people and practitioners have as set out in the NHS Constitution for England.

Care and support should take into account individual needs and preferences. People should have the opportunity to make informed decisions about their care, in partnership with health and social care practitioners. Practitioners should recognise that each person is an individual, with their own needs, wishes and priorities. They should treat everyone they care for with dignity, respect and sensitivity.

If someone does not have capacity to make decisions, health and social care practitioners should follow the code of practice that accompanies the Mental Capacity Act and the supplementary code of practice on deprivation of liberty safeguards.

If the person using the service agrees, families and carers should have the opportunity to be involved in decisions about care and support. Families and carers should also be given the information and support they need in their own right.

Terms used in this guideline

Local authority needs assessment

This is the process by which a local authority works with a person to identify what needs they may have and the outcomes they would like to achieve to maintain or improve their wellbeing. The local authority does this in order to determine how it should respond to meet the person's needs (Care and Support Statutory Guidance, Department of Health).

Multiple long-term conditions

In this guideline, a long-term condition is defined as one that generally lasts a year or longer and impacts on a person's life. Examples include arthritis, asthma, cancer, dementia, diabetes, heart disease, mental health conditions and stroke. Multiple means a person is living with more than 1 condition. The impact and symptoms of these conditions may fluctuate and people may or may not need to take medication for their conditions.

Named care coordinator

The named care coordinator is one of the people from among the group of workers providing care and support designated to take a coordinating role. This could be, for example, a social worker, practitioner working for a voluntary or community sector organisation, or lead nurse.

Social care needs

In this guideline, a person with identified social care needs is defined as: someone needing personal care and other practical assistance because of their age, illness, disability, pregnancy, childbirth, dependence on alcohol or drugs, or any other similar circumstances. This is based on the definition of social care in the Health and Social Care Act 2012 (Section 65).

Recommendation wording

The Guideline Committee makes recommendations based on an evaluation of the evidence, taking into account the quality of the evidence and cost effectiveness.

In general, recommendations that an action 'must' or 'must not' be taken are usually included only if there is a legal duty (for example, to comply with the Care Act or health and safety regulations), or if the consequences of not following it could be extremely serious or life threatening.

Recommendations for actions that should (or should not) be taken use directive language such as 'agree', 'offer' 'assess', 'record' and 'ensure'.

Recommendations for which the quality of the evidence is poorer, or where there is a closer balance between benefits and risks, use 'consider'.

1 Recommendations

The wording used in the recommendations in this guideline (for example words such as 'offer' and 'consider') denotes the certainty with which the recommendation is made (the strength of the recommendation). See 'recommendation wording' for details.

1.1 Identifying and assessing social care needs

1.1.1 Health and social care practitioners should consider referring older people with multiple long-term conditions to the local authority for a needs assessment as soon as it is identified that they may need social care and support.

1.1.2 Consider referral for a specialist clinical assessment by a geriatrician or old-age psychiatrist to guide social care planning for older people with social care needs and multiple long-term conditions:

- whose social care needs are likely to increase to the point where they are assessed as having a significant impact on the person's wellbeing
- who may need to go into a nursing or care home.

1.1.3 When planning and undertaking assessments for older people with social care needs and multiple long-term conditions, health and social care practitioners should:

- always involve the person and, if appropriate, their carer
- take into account the person's strengths, needs and preferences
- involve the relevant practitioners to address all of the person's needs, including their medical, psychological, emotional, social, personal, sexual, spiritual and cultural needs; sight, hearing and communication needs; and accommodation and environmental care needs

- ensure that if a person and their carer cannot attend an assessment meeting, they have the opportunity to be involved in another way, for example in a separate meeting or through an advocate[1]

- give people information about the services available to them, their cost and how they can be paid for.

1.1.4 Recognise that many carers of older people with social care needs and multiple long-term conditions will also need support. If the person's carer has specific social care needs of their own, refer them to the local authority for a needs assessment in their own right.

1.1.5 Recognise that many older people with social care needs and multiple long-term conditions are also carers, but may not see themselves as such. Ask the person if they have caring responsibilities and, if so, ensure they are offered a carer's assessment.

Telecare to support older people with social care needs and multiple long-term conditions

1.1.6 The health or social care practitioner leading the assessment should discuss with the person any telecare options that may support them so that they can make informed choices about their usefulness to help them manage their conditions, as well as other potential benefits, risks and costs.

1.1.7 The lead practitioner should consider, in discussion with the person, whether a demonstration of telecare equipment would help them to make an informed decision about it.

---

[1] This is in addition to the statutory requirements placed on local authorities in relation to advocacy provision, set out in the Care Act 2014.

1.2   *Care planning*

Coordinating care

1.2.1   Ensure that older people with social care needs and multiple long-term conditions have a single, named care coordinator who acts as their first point of contact. Working within local arrangements, the named care coordinator should:

- play a lead role in the assessment process
- liaise and work with all health and social care services, including those provided by the voluntary and community sector
- ensure referrals are made and are actioned appropriately.

1.2.2   Offer the person the opportunity to:

- be involved in planning their care and support
- have a summary of their life story included in their care plan
- prioritise the support they need, recognising that people want to do different things with their lives at different times, and that the way that people's long-term conditions affect them can change over time.

1.2.3   Ensure the person, their carers or advocate and the care practitioners jointly own the care plan, sign it to indicate they agree with it and are given a copy.

1.2.4   Review and update care plans regularly and at least annually[2] to recognise the changing needs associated with multiple long-term conditions. Record the results of the review in the care plan, along with any changes made.

Planning care collaboratively

1.2.5   Ensure care plans are tailored to each person, giving them choice and control and recognising the inter-related nature of multiple long-term conditions. Offer the person the opportunity to:

---

[2] This is in line with the Care Act 2014.

- address a range of needs including medical, psychological, emotional, social, personal, sexual, spiritual and cultural needs, sight, hearing and communication needs and environmental care needs
- address palliative and end-of-life needs
- identify health problems, including continence needs and chronic pain and skin integrity, if appropriate, and the support needed to minimise their impact
- identify the help they need to look after their own care and support, manage their conditions, take part in preferred activities, hobbies and interests, and make contact with relevant support services (see also section 1.5)
- include leisure and social activities outside and inside the home, mobility and transport needs, adaptations to the home and any support needed to use them.

1.2.6   Discuss managing medicines with each person and their carer as part of care planning.

1.2.7   Write any requirements about managing medicines into the care plan including:

- the purpose of, and information on, medicines
- the importance of dosage and timing and implications of non-adherence[3]
- details of who to contact in the case of any concerns.

    For more information on managing medicines see the NICE guideline on medicines optimisation and managing medicines in care homes.

1.2.8   Develop care plans in collaboration with GPs and representatives from other agencies that will be providing support to the person in the care planning process.

---

[3] This recommendation is adapted from NICE's draft home care guideline.

1.2.9   With the person's agreement, involve their carers or advocate in the planning process. Recognise that carers are important partners in supporting older people with social care needs and multiple long-term conditions.

1.2.10   Ensure older people with social care needs and multiple long-term conditions are supported to make use of personal budgets, continuing healthcare budgets, individual service funds and direct payments (where they wish to) by:

- giving them and their carers information about different funding mechanisms they could use to manage the budget available to them, and any impact these may have on their carer
- supporting them to try out different mechanisms for managing their budget
- offering information, advice and support to people who pay for or arrange their own care, as well as to those whose care is publicly funded
- offering information about benefits entitlement
- ensuring that carers' needs are taken fully into account.

1.2.11   Ensure that care plans enable people with social care needs and multiple long-term conditions to participate in different aspects of daily life, as appropriate, including:

- self-care
- taking medicines
- learning
- volunteering
- maintaining a home
- financial management
- employment
- socialising with friends
- hobbies and interests.

1.2.12   Ensure that care plans include ordinary activities outside the home (whether that is a care home or the person's own home), for example shopping or visiting public spaces. Include activities that:

- reduce isolation because this can be particularly acute for older people with social care needs and multiple long-term conditions (see also section 1.6)
- build people's confidence by involving them in their wider community, as well as with family and friends.

1.3   Supporting carers

1.3.1   In line with the Care Act 2014 local authorities must offer carers an individual assessment of their needs. Ensure this assessment:

- recognises the complex nature of multiple long-term conditions and their impact on people's wellbeing
- takes into account carers' views about services that could help them maintain their caring role and live the life they choose
- involves cross-checking any assumptions the person has made about the support their carer will provide.

1.3.2   Check what impact the carer's assessment is likely to have on the person's care plan.

1.3.3   Support carers to explore the possible benefits of personal budgets and direct payments, and how they might be used for themselves and for the person they care for. Offer the carer help to administer their budget so that their ability to support the person's care or their own health problems are not undermined by anxiety about managing the process.

1.3.4   Consider helping carers access support services and interventions, such as carer breaks.

1.4   Integrating health and social care planning

1.4.1   Build into service specifications and contracts the need:

- to direct older people with social care needs and multiple long-term conditions to different services as needed
- for seamless referrals between practitioners, including the appropriate sharing of information
- to make links with appropriate professionals, for example geriatricians in acute care settings.

1.4.2   Ensure there is provision for community-based multidisciplinary support for older people with social care needs and multiple long-term conditions, recognising the progressive nature of many conditions. The health and social care practitioners involved in the team might include, for example, a community pharmacist, physiotherapist or occupational therapist, a mental health social worker or psychiatrist, and a community-based services liaison worker.

1.4.3   Health and social care practitioners should inform the named care coordinator if the person has needs that they cannot meet.

1.4.4   Named care coordinators should record any needs the person has that health and social care practitioners cannot meet. Discuss and agree a plan of action to address these needs with the person and their carer.

1.5   Delivering care

Providing support and information

1.5.1   Health and social care providers should ensure that care is person-centred and that the person is supported in a way that is respectful and promotes dignity and trust.

1.5.2   Named care coordinators should review people's information needs regularly, recognising that people with existing conditions may not take in information when they receive a new diagnosis.

1.5.3   Consider continuing to offer information and support to people and their carers even if they have declined it previously, recognising that long-term conditions can be changeable or progressive, and people's information needs may change.

1.5.4   Inform people about, and direct them to, advocacy services.

1.5.5   Health and social care practitioners should offer older people with social care needs and multiple long-term conditions:

- opportunities to interact with other people with similar conditions
- help to access one-to-one or group support, social media and other activities, such as dementia cafes, walking groups and specialist support groups, exercise and dance.

Supporting self-management

See also section 1.7.

1.5.6   Health and social care practitioners should review recorded information about medicines and therapies regularly and follow up any issues related to managing medicines. This includes making sure information on changes to medicines is made available to relevant agencies.

1.5.7   Social care practitioners should contact the person's healthcare practitioners with any concerns about prescribed medicines.

1.5.8   Social care practitioners should tell the named care coordinator if any prescribed medicines are affecting the person's wellbeing. This could include known side effects or reluctance to take medicines.

1.5.9   Health and social care providers should recognise incontinence as a symptom and ensure people have access to diagnosis and treatment. This should include meeting with a specialist continence nurse.

1.5.10   Health and social care providers should give people information and advice about continence. Make a range of continence products available, paying full attention to people's dignity and treating them with respect.

1.5.11   Health and social care providers should give people information about services that can help them manage their lives. This should be given:

- at the first point of contact and when new problems or issues arise
- in different formats which should be accessible, including through interpreters (see making information accessible).

Ensuring continuity of care and links with specialist services

1.5.12   Named care coordinators should take responsibility for:

- giving people and their carers information about what to do and who to contact in times of crisis, at any time of day or night
- ensuring an effective response in times of crisis
- ensuring there is continuity of care with familiar workers, so that wherever possible, personal care and support is carried out by workers known to the person and their family and carers
- engaging local community health and social care services, including those in the voluntary sector
- ensuring people and their carers have information about their particular conditions, and how to manage them
- knowing where to access specialist knowledge and support, about particular health conditions
- involving carers and advocates.

Care in care homes

These recommendations for care home providers are about ensuring that care and support addresses the specific needs of older people with social care needs and multiple long-term conditions in care homes.[4]

1.5.13   Identify ways to address particular nutritional and hydration requirements.

1.5.14   Ensure people have a choice of things to eat and drink and varied snacks throughout the day, including outside regular meal times.

1.5.15   Ensure the care home environment and layout are used in a way that encourages social interaction, activity and peer support, as well as providing privacy and personal space.

1.5.16   Ensure people are physically comfortable, for example by allowing them control over the heating in their rooms.

1.5.17   Encourage social contact and provide opportunities for education, entertainment and meaningful occupation by:

- making it easier for people to communicate and interact with others, for example by reducing background noise, providing face-to-face contact with other people, using accessible signage and lighting
- using a range of technologies such as IT platforms and Wi-Fi, hearing loops and TV listeners
- involving the wider community in the life of the care home through befriending schemes and intergenerational projects
- offering opportunities for movement.

1.5.18   Build links with local communities, including voluntary and community sector organisations that can support older people with social care needs and multiple long-term conditions, and

---

[4] Also see the NICE quality standard on mental wellbeing of older people in care homes. For recommendation about delivering care at home, see the NICE guideline on home care.

encourage interaction between residents and local people of all ages and backgrounds.

1.5.19 Make publicly available information about:

- tariffs for self-funded and publicly-funded care
- what residents are entitled to and whether this could change if their funding status or ability to pay changes.

Make available a statement for each person using services about what their funding pays for.

1.6 Preventing social isolation

1.6.1 All practitioners should recognise that social isolation can be a particular problem for older people with social care needs and multiple long-term conditions.

1.6.2 Health and social care practitioners should support older people with social care needs and multiple long-term conditions to maintain links with their friends, family and community, and identify if people are lonely or isolated.

1.6.3 Named care coordinators and advocates should provide information to help people who are going to live in a care home to choose the right care home for them, for example one where they have friends or links with the community already.

1.6.4 Health and social care practitioners should give people advice and information about social activities and opportunities that can help them maintain their social contacts, and build new contacts if they wish to.

1.6.5 Consider contracting with voluntary and community sector enterprises and services to help older people with social care needs and multiple long-term conditions to remain active in their home and engaged in their community, including when people are in care homes.

1.6.6   Voluntary and community sector providers should consider
         collaborating with local authorities to develop new ways to help
         people to remain active and engaged in their communities,
         including when people are in care homes.

1.7   Training health and social care practitioners

1.7.1   Those responsible for contracting and providing care services
         should ensure health and social care practitioners caring for older
         people with social care needs and multiple long-term conditions are
         assessed as having the necessary training and competencies in
         managing medicines.

1.7.2   Ensure health and social care practitioners are able to recognise,
         consider the impact of, and respond to:

- common conditions, such as dementia, hearing and sight loss,
  and
- common care needs, such as nutrition, hydration, chronic pain,
  falls and skin integrity, **and**
- common support needs, such as dealing with bereavement and
  end-of-life, **and**
- deterioration in someone's health or circumstances.[5]

1.7.3   Make provision for more specialist support to be available to people
         who need it – for example, in response to complex long-term health
         conditions – either by training practitioners directly involved in
         supporting people, or by ensuring partnerships are in place with
         specialist organisations.

---

[5] This recommendation is adapted from NICE's guideline on home care.

2 Research recommendations

The Guideline Committee made the following research recommendations in response to gaps and uncertainties in the evidence identified from the evidence reviews. The Guideline Committee selected the key research recommendations that they think will have the greatest impact on people's care and support.

2.1 Older people's experiences

Research question

What is the lived experience of older people with social care needs and multiple long-term conditions?

Why this is important

While there was some evidence on the experiences of older people with social care needs and multiple long-term conditions, there were gaps in relation to people's lived experience of how such conditions impact on their life in their own words. Research could be qualitative, ethnographic or could use cross-sectional surveys using open-ended questions to gather views and experiences, in particular on:

- the experiences of older people in the UK living with multiple long-term conditions and how their conditions affect them over time and at different stages of their life
- how a person's multiple long-term conditions interact with each other and how this affects the person over time
- the priorities, meanings and preferences of older people living with multiple long-term conditions.

2.2   Service delivery models

Research question

Which models of service delivery are effective and cost-effective for older people with social care needs and multiple long-term conditions?

Why this is important

There was a lack of evidence about different models of support provision for older people with social care needs and multiple long-term conditions. There is a need for robust evaluations of different approaches to service delivery comparing, for example:

- models led by different practitioners
- different team structures
- the components and configurations of models
- barriers and facilitators to the implementation of models.

- Outcomes could include social care- and health-related quality of life, satisfaction, carer's health, number of unpaid care hours provided and health and social care resource use. Outcomes and service use should be measured over 1 or 2 years to enable assessment of the health and economic impact of different models of service delivery in the short and longer term.

2.3   Supporting people in care homes to stay active

Research question

What is the most effective and cost-effective way of supporting older people with social care needs and multiple long-term conditions in care homes to live as independently as possible?

Why this is important

There is a need for robust evaluation of different interventions for supporting older people with social care needs and multiple long-term conditions in care

homes. The Committee thought it particularly important to ensure that future studies evaluate how people living in care homes can best be supported to participate in social and leisure activities. This is important given that views data, Committee members' experiences and expert witness testimonies indicated that people living in care homes can feel particularly isolated and unable to take part in activities of their choice.

A range of study designs could be used, including randomised controlled trials, quantitative and qualitative evaluations of different packages of social and leisure activities, and their impact on social care- and health-related quality of life, satisfaction and participation in and experience of meaningful social and leisure activities.

2.4   Developing a 'risk positive' approach in care homes

Research question

What is the effectiveness and acceptability of different strategies to enable positive risk-taking in care homes?

Why this is important

The Committee noted that people take informed risks as part of normal everyday life, but for older people who need support, their ability to take these risks can be limited. Helping older people exercise choice and control, therefore, relies on a 'risk positive' approach. The Committee identified a gap in the literature about what works well in care homes in this respect. Studies are needed to explore different types of approaches to managing risk in care homes, for example looking at:

- organisational, operational and individual-level approaches to risk-taking in care homes
- the views and experiences of people using care home services and their carers
- barriers and facilitators to risk-positive approaches in care homes.

2.5   *Self-management*

Research question

What is the impact of different early intervention-focused approaches to self-management on outcomes for older people with social care needs and multiple long-term conditions?

Why this is important

The Guideline Committee highlighted a lack of evidence on the impact of different approaches to self-management, particularly those aimed at helping older people with social care needs and multiple long-term conditions to continue living independently for as long as possible. They highlighted the need to understand better the type of interventions and strategies available, and then to evaluate their effectiveness in terms of the impacts on outcomes for older people and their carers.

Future research should compare different approaches to self-management and their impact on social care-related quality of life and wellbeing in addition to physical health, acceptability and accessibility. It should also look at the views, experiences and potential impact on carers.

3   Evidence review and recommendations

Introduction

When this guideline was started, we used the methods and processes described in the [Social Care Guidance Manual](#) (2013). From January 2015 we used the methods and processes in [Developing NICE Guidelines: The Manual](#) (2014). The included studies were critically appraised using tools in the manuals and the results tabulated. (See Appendix B for evidence tables and Appendix C2 for economic evidence tables. Where studies included only economic evidence, their corresponding tables will be found only in Appendix C2). Minor amendments were made to some of the checklists to reflect the range of evidence and types of study design considered in the evidence reviews. Published evidence was identified by systematic searches of health, social care, social sciences and economic databases and organisations that produce empirical information. It was decided, with the Guideline Committee, to restrict the searches to studies published from 2004 onwards. This was to ensure that the number of outputs were manageable, while also being confident that important and relevant studies would be identified, and that retrieved evidence would be relevant to current practice. References submitted by Guideline Committee members and stakeholders were also considered.

As the main search was broad in nature and focused on the population of interest, rather than interventions, it was agreed with the Guideline Committee that, rather than re-running searches towards the end of the process, it was more appropriate to conduct forwards and backwards citation searching to identify evidence that cited the included references and backwards citation searching by scanning the reference lists of included studies for relevant articles that met the inclusion criteria. This was in order to maximise the relevance of the results, and is also standard practice in the production of systematic reviews. Websites and organisations were manually searched in order to identify empirical evidence that is not indexed on databases, and forwards and backwards citation searching was also carried out. For more

information on how this guideline was developed, including the search strategies, see Appendix A.

Given the complex and wide-ranging nature of the topic, many of the questions were necessarily broad. We therefore specified in the protocols that a relatively broad range of study designs that were likely to be relevant to each question, with the exception of effectiveness questions which require studies to include a control group. Rating the included studies was complex as the 'best available' evidence was often only of moderate quality. Studies were rated for internal and external validity using ++/+/- (meaning very good, good to moderate, and poor). Where there are 2 ratings (for example +/-), the first rating applies to internal validity (how convincing the findings of the study are in relation to its methodology and conduct). The second rating concerns external validity (whether it is likely that the findings can be applied to similar contexts elsewhere). Qualitative evidence is (largely) only rated for internal validity, given that it is typically context-specific and generalisability is highly limited, and some surveys with a relatively high response rate within a well-defined population (for example, DHSSPS 2010, a survey of providers in Northern Ireland) may also have a single rating for internal validity if it is unclear how well the context matches the English context. Hence some studies have a single rating (for example, ++) and others have 2 ratings (for example, +/+).

The quality of economic evaluations is described on the basis of their limitations and therefore applicability in answering whether the intervention is cost-effective from the NHS and personal social services perspective, described as having very serious, potentially serious, or minor limitations, accompanied with further detail. Methodological appraisal detailing the limitations of these studies is fully described in Appendix C1.

The critical appraisal of each study takes into account methodological factors such as:

- whether the method used is suitable to the aims of the study
- whether random allocation (if used) was carried out competently

- sample size and method of recruitment

- whether samples are representative of the population we are interested in

- transparency of reporting and limitations that are acknowledged by the research team.

Evidence rated as of only moderate or poor quality may be included in evidence statements, and taken into account in recommendations, because the Guideline Committee independently and by consensus supported its conclusions and thought a recommendation was needed. In the evidence statements, evidence from more than 1 study rated as good and poor may be described as 'moderate'. Where evidence is described as 'very good', it suggests that several well-conducted studies support the same or similar conclusions.

For full critical appraisal and findings tables see Appendix B.

In terms of how the evidence is presented, we grouped reviewed questions. This was because the review found only a limited number of studies relevant for inclusion and included studies often provided evidence for more than 1 question. Studies are alphabetised and clearly cross-referenced in this guideline, with full explanations of the link between evidence and recommendations provided in Section 3.7 Evidence to Recommendations.

During the development of the guideline, Guideline Committee (GC) members highlighted a need to strengthen the voice of older people within the guideline. Although groups representing this audience were registered as stakeholders, GC members were keen to hear directly from individuals as part of the consultation stage. In order to access these views, a targeted consultation to test the draft recommendations directly with people using services was agreed, as outlined in the manual (section 10.1 http://www.nice.org.uk/article/pmg20/chapter/10-The-validation-process-for-draft-guidelines-and-dealing-with-stakeholder-comments). The targeted consultation was undertaken by the NCCSC in partnership with Age UK (Sutton) and Bradstow Court (an Extra Care Housing unit, part of the Housing and Care 21 group).. The results of the targeted consultation were in line with

consultation comments received at stakeholder consultation. As such, where any changes made to the recommendations are noted as being based on consultation responses, that includes the results of this targeted consultation. The report can be found in Appendix E.

3.1   Assessment and care planning

Introduction to the review questions

The focus for these review questions was on personalised and integrated care planning and assessment for older people with multiple long-term conditions.

Review questions

Q.2.1.1   What are the effects (benefits and harms) of different types of assessment and planning of personalised care on outcomes for older people with multiple long-term conditions and their carers?

Q.1.1.1   What are the views and experiences of older people with multiple long-term conditions and their carers, of assessment and care planning?

Q.1.1.2   What do they think works well and what needs to change?

Q.1.2.1   What are the views and experiences of practitioners, managers and commissioners in health and social care who procure, manage or deliver care to older people with multiple long-term conditions, in community and care home settings of assessment and care planning?

Q.1.2.2   What do they think works well and what needs to change?

Summary of review protocols

The protocols sought to identify studies which would:

- identify models of care assessment and care planning, and associated outcomes

- identify and evaluate the effects of different models and processes for holistic assessment of (mental, physical and social) care needs and care planning
- identify and evaluate the support services, including information and advocacy, of people with multiple long-term conditions who use services and their carers, which will promote participation in care planning and review.

Population: Older people, aged 65 years and older, with multiple long-term conditions that use social care services, and their families, partners and carers. People who pay for and who organise their own care are included.

Intervention: Personalised and integrated assessment and care planning, including carer assessment where this is carried out simultaneously. Established and emerging models (which may show promise but are not well evidenced) may be considered.

Comparator: Different approaches to care planning, usual care.

Setting: Service users' homes, including sheltered housing accommodation; care (residential and nursing) homes (not hospital settings).

Outcomes: Includes service user focused outcomes such as: user satisfaction including quality and continuity of care; empowerment, choice and control; involvement in decision-making; dignity and independence; quality of life; health status; safety and safeguarding; preventative effects; impact on unplanned hospital admissions and delayed discharges, mortality. (4.4 Scope). Sub-group analysis (see EIA) may be of interest.

The study designs relevant to these questions were expected to include:

- systematic reviews of studies of different models of assessment and care planning
- RCTs of different approaches to assessment and care planning (for example, outcomes-focused vs task-focused)
- quantitative and qualitative evaluations of different approaches

- observational and descriptive studies of process

- cohort studies, case control and before and after studies

- mixed methods studies

- grey literature which includes the views of people who use services and their carers (possibly as part of an evaluation) may be identified

- findings from surveys undertaken by organisations representing service users, patients and carers which are not published in research journals may also be considered.

Full protocols can be found in Appendix A.

How the literature was searched

The evidence reviews used to develop the guideline recommendations were underpinned by systematic literature searches. The aim of the systematic searches was to comprehensively identify the published evidence to answer the review questions developed by the Guideline Committee and the NICE Collaborating Centre for Social Care.

The search strategies for the review questions (based on the Scope) were developed by the NICE Collaborating Centre for Social Care in order to identify empirical research. The search strategies are listed in Appendix A.

Searches were based upon retrieving items for the population groups 'older people', 'carers', 'long-term conditions', 'workforce/social care organisation' in the settings of 'residential care', 'nursing/care homes', 'intermediate care' or 'community care'. Searches were developed using subject heading and free text terms, aiming to balance sensitivity and precision, and the strategy was run across a number of databases. The searches limited results to studies published from 2004 onwards. The database searches were not restricted to specific geographical areas; however, in selecting the websites to search, research on people's views was focused on the UK. The sources searched are listed below. Forward and backwards citation searches using Google Scholar were undertaken in January 2015 for all of the included studies.

The Guideline Committee members were also asked to alert the NICE Collaborating Centre for Social Care to any additional evidence, published, unpublished or in press, that met the inclusion criteria.

Full details of the search can be found in Appendix A.

How studies were selected

Search outputs (title and abstract only) were stored in EPPI Reviewer 4 – a software programme developed for systematic review of large search outputs – and screened against an exclusion tool informed by the parameters of the scope. Formal exclusion criteria were developed and applied to each item in the search output, as follows:

- language (must be in English)
- population (must be older people with multiple long-term conditions, with a social care need)
- intervention (must be identification/assessment of social care needs; personalised care planning; support to self-manage; integration of social and healthcare; training of staff to recognise/manage common long-term conditions; support for carers to care; interventions to support involvement and participation, including information for users and carers
- setting (must be in the person's home or care home)
- workforce (must involve people who work in social care, who are integrated with social care or act as gatekeepers to social care)
- country (must be UK, European Union, Denmark, Norway, Sweden, Canada, USA, Australia and New Zealand)
- date (not published before 2004)
- type of evidence (must be research)
- relevance to (1 or more) review questions.

Title and abstract of all research outputs were screened against these exclusion criteria. Those included at this stage were marked for relevance to particular review questions and retrieved as full texts.

Full texts were again reviewed for relevance and research design. If still included, critical appraisal (against NICE tools) and data extraction (against a coding set developed to reflect the review questions) was carried out. The coding was all conducted within EPPI Reviewer 4, and formed the basis of the analysis and evidence tables. All processes were quality assured by double coding of queries, and of a random sample of 10%.

In our initial screen (on title and abstract), we found 75 studies which appeared relevant to the review questions. We ordered full texts of 23 papers, prioritising views and experiences studies from the UK, and those that were of acceptable methodological quality. On receiving and reviewing the full texts, we identified 11 which fulfilled these criteria (see included studies below). Of these, 4 were qualitative views research studies, and 7 were quantitative impact studies. The included studies (see below) were critically appraised using NICE tools for appraising different study types, and the results tabulated. Further information on critical appraisal is given in the introduction at the beginning of Section 3. Study findings were extracted into findings tables. For full critical appraisal and findings tables, see Appendix B.

Narrative summary of the evidence: implementation of multidisciplinary single assessment

Only 1 mixed methods UK study directly considered the assessment processes (Challis et al, 2010a +/+), and it was based on material from 2005–2006. The purpose of the survey was to consider whether and how single assessment processes (SAPs) with real multidisciplinary input were being implemented by staff, in the wake of policy, guidance and implementation tools published by the Department of Health in 2002. Four types of assessment are identified in the SAP guidance (contact, overview, specialist and comprehensive), each being triggered by the specific circumstances and needs of an individual.

The policy recommendation is more prescriptive for people being considered for residential and nursing care: a comprehensive assessment should have involved the input of a range of professionals, with geriatricians, old-age psychiatrists, other consultants working with older people, registered nurses,

social workers and therapists playing a prominent role. Medical consultants were most frequently involved (but only in 40% of the authorities) in assessments for placement in a care-home-with-nursing. Occupational therapists were most likely to be involved in assessments for intermediate care (25%). Social workers/care managers were involved in the majority of local authorities for placements in care homes or care homes-with-nursing and for intensive domiciliary care, but less so for intermediate care. If multidisciplinary is defined (as the authors do) as 3 or more professionals involved in an assessment, it is notable that it occurred in only 1 sector: placements in care home, with nursing.

There was little evidence of multidisciplinary team working; rather, single, then 2-person assessments were most common. A feature of this survey is that respondents seemed to anticipate the outcome of the assessment, which seems to support a service user comment (Granville 2010, +) about choice being constrained when others thought residential care was the appropriate intervention.

Record sharing

A qualitative UK study of high (++) quality (King 2012) considered the issues of information boundaries between health and social care agencies and personnel, and the extent to which they impact on the feasibility of implementing a single shared assessment across health and social care. Progress in effectively sharing electronic data was found to be slow and uneven.

One cause was the presence of established structural boundaries which led to competing priorities, incompatible IT systems and infrastructure, and poor cooperation. A second cause was the presence of established professional boundaries, which affect staff understanding and acceptance of data sharing and their information requirements. Geographical boundaries featured, but less prominently than agency boundaries. Successful integration needs practices such as good project management and governance, ensuring system interoperability, leadership, good training and support, together with

clear efforts to improve working relations across professional boundaries and communication of a clear project vision.

Assessment functions within case management

Reilly et al (2010; (-/+) was a systematic review that focused on the implementation of case management which, as is common in populations with major health conditions, was predominantly nurse led, selecting (using uncertain criteria) citations from previous research papers. All 29 studies identify assessment, planning and implementation of care plans as core tasks of case management. Some studies specified the importance of assessment including professionals with training in geriatric care, shared assessment documentation and joint visits (by different, mainly health professionals). Almost 50% of the studies did not report information about the continuity of assessment with other tasks of case management through the same professional taking responsibility.

Case managers in many programmes relied on making referrals to other services, so the availability of services would affect what was delivered, and the continuity of assessment with service provision would be very limited. In such cases, the case manager is merely a broker, with no role in ensuring the quality of delivery. Nurses adopting the community matron role without community training were likely to underestimate the impact of social and environmental factors in improving the health of patients, and case managers were also found to be constrained by the shortage of services to deliver personal care and household support (social care services). In just 3 of the 29 studies, social workers could also be case managers, and there was evidence of financial and benefits advice being part of the assessment in these contexts.

Models of interdisciplinary working

The systematic review of literature on inter-professional working (IPW) by Trivedi et al (2013 +/-, linked to Goodman et al, 2011 +/+) found that none of the models of IPW identified (case management, collaboration and integrated team working) were shown by the literature to be more effective than any other. There was weak evidence from the 37 included RCTs of effectiveness

and cost-effectiveness for IPW as a whole, although well integrated and shared care models improved processes of care and have the potential to reduce acute and hospital services or nursing/care home use. The material is relatively old, not focused on care planning and assessment, and the professionals working together are not health and social care professionals, but clinical care providers. The range of interventions (for example, palliative care and discharge planning services) is very broad, and the outcomes for patients are inconsistently measured and very variable. The origin (largely US), context (largely clinical) and age of the studies suggest that this review is not generalisable to UK settings.

Goodman et al (2011) was a UK study of moderate quality (+/+) using a multi-method approach (in this case, a literature review, survey of professionals, interviews with older people and consensus events). The focus was on Inter-Professional Working (IPW) at all stages of care planning and delivery. The study concluded that older people and their carers define effectiveness in IPW through the processes of care and delivery as much as through outcomes: timeliness, completion of actions as promised and perceived expertise, as well as the quality of relationships were considered important. The accompanying literature review on IPW (Trivedi 2013 +/-, discussed above) included studies that measured some patient related outcomes, but the interventions (case management, collaboration and integrated team working in clinical settings), quality of the studies, and outcomes measured were too varied to draw general conclusions about what works for service users.

Aspects of the care and support process that are important to older people and carers: what older people want from care and support

One selected UK qualitative study of moderate (+) quality and relevance to care planning (Granville, 2010, +) highlighted the concerns of older people living either in the community or in care homes. As with Goodman et al (2011 +/+), data were not collected on specific processes such as assessment and planning so much as on the issues which mattered to people, and how these related to personalised care. Older people in both settings identified the importance of living a 'normal' life, maintaining social contact with people of all

generations, having money and knowing their rights, and the ability to choose meaningful activities.

Older people's experience of choice and control in care homes and carers: what older people want from care and support

One selected UK qualitative study of moderate (+) quality and relevance to care planning (Granville, 2010. +) showed that older people living in care homes felt that 'the need to fit in' could compromise their agency and ability to maintain personal identity, while those in the community felt they lacked choice and control over the amount and content of home care services they could have, particularly when other stakeholders clearly felt that the residential option was preferable.

Areas of support that older people and carers think need improving: importance of continuity of care to older people and carers

Goodman et al (2011, +/+) (also discussed above), a UK mixed methods study, found that older people wanted continuity of care through having a named key person; relationship styles which fostered co-production with the older person, for instance in planning; ongoing shared review; functioning links across the wider primary care network (regarded as the foundation of care for this group); and evidence that the system can respond effectively at times of crisis.

Importance of support that extends beyond personal care

Challis (2010b, +/-), a UK mixed methods study, found that older people emphasised the importance of practical help with housework, shopping and banking: 'There are all sorts of basic needs that aren't being met for people who live by themselves' (interviewee 1, p180).

Health and social care inputs into health care assessment and planning

There is 1 well-designed, non-UK RCT (reporting on 2 different outcomes) (Keeler 1999; Reuben 1999, +/+) focusing on community dwelling older people above age 65 (mean age 76, SD=6) at risk of decline in 1 of 4 conditions (falls, urinary incontinence, depressive symptoms, functional impairment) and are at risk for functional or health related decline. The sample

was predominantly female (80%), the proportion living alone was 60%, and it was not reported whether individuals had informal care and whether they had multiple long-term conditions.

The intervention comprised the integration of health and social care professional input through a one-off comprehensive geriatric assessment from an external geriatric team (social worker, gerontology nurse practitioner/geriatric team – plus physical therapist – when indicated by falls or impaired mobility) to advise the GP on healthcare planning coupled with a patient education intervention from a health educator plus an information booklet 'How to talk to your GP', prior to the individual's GP appointment. This study was identified through additional searches of the literature by the NCCSC economist.

Findings from the evaluation indicate that older people showed improvements at 64 weeks follow-up. Statistically significant improvements were found favouring the intervention group in physical functioning, mortality and health-related quality of life summary scales for physical and mental health and measures of restricted activity days and bed days. All other outcomes were not statistically different for patient satisfaction in general or satisfaction with their GP or patients' perceived self-efficacy in interacting with their GP.

Changes in service-level outcomes included a statistically significant increase in the intervention's use of community health care services (the addition of 1 extra visit to the psychologist and physical therapist), however there were no statistically significant differences in use of A&E visits or inpatient stays. The authors did not measure the impact on admissions to nursing or care homes.

This economic evaluation has potentially serious limitations in the collection of resource use as only healthcare and not social care services were measured. However, the quality of reporting of results and calculations was good. Whether this intervention is cost-effective in the UK context is unclear without further analysis due to differences in institutional context and unit costs, and there are issues of relevancy as findings are based on older data. The authors report that the intervention costs an average of $237 per person and is

associated with an additional average health care cost of $184 per person (standard error = $98) as measured over a 64-week follow-up period. Price year is not clearly reported, but may be between 1997 and 1998.

The applicability of the economic evaluation to the UK context is partially limited due to differences in institutional context (baseline patterns of service use) and differences in unit costs. For this reason, relying on the findings of changes in net costs from non-UK studies (assuming that all relevant health and social care resource use is included) cannot completely answer whether the intervention is cost-effective in the UK context but can provide an indication of likely cost-effectiveness. Furthermore, some studies are further limited if they do not comprehensively measure all relevant health and social care resource use, and therefore cost-effectiveness may be based on incomplete information. For both reasons, we present a summary of the findings in terms of net costs and in terms of the impact on the change of community and institutional health and social care resource use in order to make the findings more useful to the UK perspective. Overall, the results indicate that, from the perspective of community and acute health care services, the intervention is associated with additional costs and additional benefits. From the perspective of community and institutional personal social care services, impact is unclear.

Health and social care inputs into social care assessment and planning: community-dwelling older adults

There is 1 good quality UK mixed methods study (Challis 2004, +/++) focusing on older people living in the community, over age 60 (mean age 82, SD=7.2) who may have 'substantial' or 'critical' social care needs or be at risk of nursing or care home placement, as identified by a social care manager. It is unclear whether individuals had multiple long-term conditions although it is known that they had at least 1 chronic condition. The intervention consists of a one-time assessment by a geriatrician or old age psychiatrist to guide social care managers in social care planning. Standard care was defined as standard GP and social care services. This study was identified through additional searches of the literature by the NCCSC economist.

The evaluation found statistically significant improvements favouring the intervention in individuals' functioning and social network scores and carers experienced reductions in stress. When considering service-level outcomes, the intervention was also associated with statistically significant lower mean usage of Accident & Emergency (A&E) visits (p=0.02) and nursing home admissions (p=0.005). For all other community and social care services, net costs were not different between groups as measured at the end of a 6-month follow up.

This was a very good quality economic evaluation with a high level of reporting. It collected a comprehensive range of costs (health and social care perspective and individual private costs) and included individual and carer outcomes. The results were presented as a cost-consequence analysis (presenting changes in costs alongside changes in outcomes). The intervention is cost-effective from the perspective of the NHS and Personal Social Services and also from the perspective of individual private costs as measured over a 6-month period as it produces improvements in patient and carer outcomes with no differences in net costs (lower use of services in the intervention group offset increased costs of the intervention). Total mean weekly costs for the intervention and control groups were, respectively, £359 and £368 (p-value, not statistically different, using prices from 2000/2001).

Of total costs, mean weekly NHS costs were lower for the intervention group compared to the control group, (£73 vs £83, p=0.03). When looking at net costs from the view of personal social services, while there was a significant reduction in nursing home admissions (p=0.05), this did not result in significant differences in total social care costs (intervention vs control, £175 vs £190) and these costs were not different from the view of private costs (intervention vs control, £110 vs £95). There is some concern about the relevance of these results as a whole and whether they may be less relevant today since the study seems to have been conducted between 1998 and 2000.

Health and social care inputs into social care assessment and planning: older adults in residential care

One high quality Dutch RCT focused on the assessment of older people in residential care for depression and anxiety (Dozeman, 2012, ++/++), followed by a cluster randomised trial of stepped care for depression. Participants did not meet the diagnostic threshold for depressive or anxiety disorder, but met a minimum score of 8 on the Centre for Epidemiological Studies Depression Scale, suggesting they were at risk of developing depression, which is commonly associated with anxiety. The assessment was followed in the intervention group by a stepped care approach in which participants sequentially underwent watchful waiting, a self-help intervention, life review and a consultation with a GP. The primary outcome measure was the incidence of a major depressive disorder or anxiety disorder during a period of 1 year. The intervention group showed improvement in depressive symptoms, but 30% of them showed more anxiety disorders at follow up than did those in the control group. The rate of attrition was also higher in the treatment group which could indicate the intervention was not acceptable to the participants. Due to the mixed, potentially harmful results from this evaluation, no evidence statements could be determined.

Evidence statements

ES1	**Implementation of multidisciplinary single assessment**
	A good quality survey study (Challis, 2010a, +/+) concluded that, despite policy recommendations, a multidisciplinary single assessment of health and social care needs undertaken by 1 or more persons has not been widely implemented. A more comprehensive assessment involving at least a social worker, in the case of transfer to residential care or intensive domiciliary care was more common. A geriatrician was more likely to be involved if the person at the centre was being considered for nursing home care.
ES2	**Record sharing**
	A high quality qualitative study drawing on the views and experiences of UK health and social care practitioners (King, 2012, ++) concluded that integrated working between health and social care and other professionals required shared records. Currently records were separate and accessed through different IT systems. Staff understanding and acceptance of data sharing requirements was shown to be important.
ES3	**Assessment functions within case management**
	There is good qualitative and survey evidence (Challis 2010b +/+; King 2012 ++), and evidence of uncertain quality (secondary evidence) (Reilly et al 2010, uncertain selection of studies) that assessment functions within case management might involve little continuity with care delivery and review of care plans; that nurses are

	overwhelmingly likely to be case managers, with little support from social workers; and that nurses without community training were likely to underestimate the impact of social and environmental factors in improving the health of patients, and be constrained by the shortage of services to support social care needs. Assessment records were unlikely to detail the contribution and responsibilities of different practitioners. Nurse case managers were likely to act as brokers, but found it difficult to refer people on to social care services.
ES4	**Models of interdisciplinary working**
	There is moderate quality evidence from systematic review and mixed methods papers (Goodman, 2012 +/+; Trivedi 2013 +/-) that IPW may be cost-effective but does not show clearly that any particular model (e.g. care management, collaborative working or integrated teams) delivers better outcomes. Users and carers consistently value aspects of integrated service delivery which foster confidence in the reliability of services, continuity of paid carers, user and carer involvement in planning and reviewing care, services to support carers and the ability of services to respond effectively at times of crisis. There is also qualitative evidence that IPW can reduce carer burden.
ES5	**Aspects of the care and support process that are important to older people and carers**
	There is good evidence from 2 studies, 1 mixed methods and 1 qualitative (Goodman et al 2012 +/+; Granville et al 2010 +) that, for older people and their carers, the process of care is as important as the outcomes. Older people want continuity of care in order to develop relationships with paid carers, a named key person to coordinate care, co-production of care with users and carers, and good links with the wider system of health and social care, allowing effective response at times of crisis.
ES6	**What older people want from care and support**
	There is good evidence from 1 qualitative study (Granville et al, 2010,+) that older people value the importance of living a 'normal' life, maintaining social contact with people of all generations, having money and knowing their rights, and the ability to choose meaningful activities.
ES7	**Older people's experience of choice and control in care homes**
	There is good evidence from 1 qualitative study (Granville et al, 2010,+) that older people living in care homes feel they are required to 'fit in' at the expense of their choice and control, personal identity and preferences, while those in the community felt they lacked choice and control over the amount and content of homecare services they could have, particularly when other stakeholders clearly felt that the residential option was preferable.
ES8	**Areas of support that older people and carers think need improving**
	There is good evidence from a mixed methods study (Goodman, 2012, +/+) that service users and carers want improvement in areas of care assessment and delivery that concern the integration of health and social care practitioners, including discharge planning, GP involvement in the care delivery team and the inability and/or unwillingness of health and social care assessors and providers to access or refer into these complementary care agencies.

ES9	**Importance of continuity of care to older people and carers**
	There is good evidence from a mixed methods study (Goodman, 2012, +/+) that service users and carers want more continuity of staff, as they are otherwise liable to experience care of a lower quality, plus embarrassment and loss of dignity in receiving personal care. They also want a designated person with a remit across all care services who is accessible in a crisis.
ES10	**Importance of support that extends beyond personal care**
	There is moderately good evidence from a mixed methods study (Challis, 2010b, +/-) that service users, especially those living alone without an unpaid carer, want services, whether organised by care management or not, to deliver different types of essential support, prioritising the basic needs for shopping, laundry, housework and other practical needs over personal care.
ES11	**Health and social care inputs into health care assessment and planning**
	There is 1 good quality [+/+] US study (Keeler 1999; Reuben 1999) that community dwelling older people at risk of functional or health related decline may benefit from the integration of health and social care professional input through a one-off comprehensive geriatric assessment from an external geriatric team (social worker, gerontological nurse practitioner/geriatric team, plus physical therapist when indicated by falls or impaired mobility) to advise the GP on healthcare planning coupled with a patient education intervention and pre-appointment information. The study is limited by its non-UK context, and limited collection of resource use data (only healthcare data were captured), however, the quality of reporting of results and calculations was good. Whether this intervention is cost-effective in the UK context is unclear without further analysis.
ES12	**Health and social care inputs into social care assessment and planning**
	This evidence statement is based on 1 good quality mixed methods UK study measured over a 6-month period (Challis 2004) [+/++]. Findings from this study indicate that from the perspective of the NHS, personal social services, and individuals' private costs, the intervention is cost-effective for community-dwelling older people who may have 'substantial' or 'critical' social care needs or be at risk of nursing or care home placement. The intervention is a one-time healthcare assessment by a geriatrician or old age psychiatrist to guide the social care manager in social care planning.

Included studies for these review questions

Challis DJ, Clarkson P, Williamson J, et al (2004). The value of specialist clinical assessment of older people prior to entry to care homes. Age and Ageing 33: 25-34

Challis D, Abendstern M, Clarkson P et al (2010a) comprehensive assessment of older people with complex care needs: The multi-discipliniarity of the Single Assessment Process in England. Ageing and Society 30 (7): 1115-34

Challis D, Hughes J, Berzins K, et al (2010b) Self-care and Case Management in Long-term Conditions: The Effective Management of Critical Interfaces. Report for the National Institute for Health Research Service Delivery and Organisation programme. : Personal Social Services Research Unit. University of York. http://www.pssru.ac.uk/pdf/MCpdfs/SCCMfr.pdf

Dozeman E, van Marwijk H, van Schaik DJF, et al (2012) Contradictory effects for prevention of depression and anxiety in residents in homes for the elderly: a pragmatic randomized controlled trial. International Psychogeriatrics 24(8): 1242-51

Goodman C, Drennan V, Manthorpe J, et al (2012) A study of the effectiveness of interprofessional working for community-dwelling older people – Final Report. National Institute for Health Research (NIHR).

Granville G, Runnicles J, Barker S, et al (2010) Increasing the Voice, Choice and Control of Older People with High Support Needs: A Research Findings Paper from the South East Regional Initiative (SERI). National Development Team for Inclusion. HM Government Office for Disability Issues

Keeler EB, Robalino DA, Frank JC, et al (1999). Cost-Effectiveness of Outpatient Geriatric Assessment with an Intervention to Increase Adherence. Medical Care 37 (12) (Dec): 1199-206

King G, O'Donnell C, Boddy D, et al (2012) Boundaries and e-health implementation in health and social care, BMC Medical Informatics and Decision Making. 12: 100

Reilly S, Hughes J, Challis D (2010) Case management for long-term conditions: implementation and processes, Ageing and Society 30(1): 125-55

Reuben DB, Frank JC, Hirsch SH, et al (1999). A randomized clinical trial of outpatient comprehensive geriatric assessment coupled with an intervention to increase adherence to recommendations. Journal of American Geriatric Society 47: 269-76

Trivedi D, Goodman C, Gage H, et al (2013). The effectiveness of inter-professional working for older people living in the community: a systematic review. Health & Social Care in the Community 21(2): 113-28

3.2   Service delivery models and frameworks

Introduction to the review question

The purpose of the review questions on service delivery models and frameworks was to seek evidence which would guide recommendations about the different ways in which services for older people with multiple long-term conditions can be delivered. The reviews sought evidence from effectiveness studies and views and experiences of service users and their families and/or carers as well as views and experiences of service practitioners.

Review question(s)

Q.2.1.2 What are the existing frameworks, models and components of care packages for managing multiple long-term conditions and what outcomes do they deliver?

Q.1.1.1 What are the views and experiences of older people with multiple long-term conditions and their carers, of the social care services they receive?

Q.1.1.2 Do service users and carers consider that their care is (a) personalised; (b) integrated or coordinated with healthcare?

Q.1.1.2 What do they think works well and what needs to change?

Q.1.2.1 What are the views and experiences of practitioners, managers and commissioners in health and social care who procure, manage or deliver care

to older people with multiple long-term conditions, in community and care home settings?

Q.1.2.2 What do they think works well, and what needs to change?

Q 2.1.3 What are the barriers to the delivery of effective, personalised, integrated care for people with multiple long-term conditions in community settings; in care home settings?

Q 2.1.4 What are the facilitators to the delivery of effective, personalised, integrated care for people with multiple long-term conditions in community settings; in care home settings?

Summary of review protocols

The protocols sought to identify studies which would:

- identify frameworks and models of care delivery and associated outcomes
- identify the components of effective care for people with long-term conditions, including those relating to structure and culture, with reference to the specific community and residential settings involved
- consider the outcomes of care organised and delivered outside the statutory sector.

Population: Older people, age 65 years and over, with multiple long-term conditions who use social care services, and their families, partners and carers. People who pay for and people who organise their own care are included.

Intervention: Different frameworks, models and approaches for managing and delivering personalised and integrated care for older people with multiple long-term conditions.

Comparator: Comparative studies could compare different service delivery models, or before/after designs.

Outcomes: Effective and safe management of multiple long-term conditions; measures of choice, control and independence; service user and carer

satisfaction and quality of life; reduced emergency hospital admissions; reduction in inappropriate admissions to residential care; mortality.

Setting: Service users' homes, including sheltered housing accommodation; care (residential and nursing) homes (not hospital settings).

The study designs relevant to these questions were expected to include:

- systematic reviews of studies which evaluate different models, frameworks and components of care

- RCTs of different approaches

- quantitative and qualitative evaluations of different approaches

- observational and descriptive studies of process

- cohort studies, case control and before and after studies

- mixed methods studies.

Full protocols can be found in Appendix A.

How the literature was searched

The evidence reviews used to develop the guideline recommendations were underpinned by systematic literature searches. The aim of the systematic searches was to comprehensively identify the published evidence to answer the review questions developed by the Guideline Committee and NICE Collaborating Centre for Social Care.

The search strategies for the review questions (based on the scope) were developed by the NICE Collaborating Centre for Social Care in order to identify empirical research. The search strategies are listed in Appendix A.

Searches were based upon retrieving items for the population groups: 'older people', 'carers', 'long-term conditions', 'workforce/social care organisation' in the settings of 'residential care', 'nursing/care homes', 'intermediate care' or 'community care'. Searches were developed using subject heading and free

text terms, aiming to balance sensitivity and precision, and the strategy was run across a number of databases. The searches limited results to studies published from 2004 onwards. The database searches were not restricted to specific geographical areas; however, in selecting the websites to search, research on people's views was focused on the UK. The sources searched are listed below. Forward and backwards citation searches using Google Scholar were undertaken in January 2015 for all of the included studies.

The Guideline Committee members were also asked to alert the NICE Collaborating Centre for Social Care to any additional evidence, published, unpublished or in press, that met the inclusion criteria.

Full details of the search can be found in Appendix A.

How studies were selected

Search outputs (title and abstract only) were stored in EPPI Reviewer 4 – a software programme developed for systematic review of large search outputs – and screened against an exclusion tool informed by the parameters of the scope. Formal exclusion criteria were developed and applied to each item in the search output, as follows:

- language (must be in English).
- population (must be older people with multiple long-term conditions, with a social care need)
- intervention (must be identification/assessment of social care needs; personalised care planning; support to self-manage; integration of social and healthcare; training of staff to recognise/manage common long-term conditions; support for carers to care; interventions to support involvement and participation, including information for users and carers
- setting (must be in the person's home or care home)
- workforce (must involve people who work in social care, are integrated with social care or act as gatekeepers to social care)
- country (must be UK, European Union, Denmark, Norway, Sweden, Canada, USA, Australia and New Zealand)
- date (not published before 2004)

- type of evidence (must be research)
- relevance to (1 or more) review questions.

Title and abstract of all research outputs were screened against these exclusion criteria. Those included at this stage were marked for relevance to particular review questions and retrieved as full texts.

Full texts were again reviewed for relevance and research design. If still included, critical appraisal (against NICE tools) and data extraction (against a coding set developed to reflect the review questions) was carried out. The coding was all conducted within EPPI Reviewer 4, and formed the basis of the analysis and evidence tables. All processes were quality assured by double coding of queries, and of a random sample of 10%.

From 46 studies which appeared relevant (by title and abstract), we ordered full texts of those which appeared to concern either evaluations of service delivery models and frameworks (prioritising systematic reviews and controlled studies) or which reported older people's and/or their carers' views on service delivery models and frameworks. On receiving and reviewing the full texts, we identified 13 which fulfilled these criteria (4 RCTs, 2 comparison evaluations, 4 qualitative studies and 3 mixed methods papers). These were numbered according to appearance in the accompanying tables. We divided them according to whether they primarily reported views of users and carers, or primarily concerned effectiveness and outcomes. Where applicable, the evidence statements reflect the findings from both views and impact studies.

The included studies were critically appraised using NICE tools for appraising different study types, and the results tabulated. Further information on critical appraisal is given in the introduction at the beginning of Section 3. Study findings were extracted into findings tables. For full critical appraisal and findings tables, see Appendix B.

Narrative summary

Primary care practitioners' perceptions of the impact of complex health needs on older people's social care needs

Keefe (2009 ++) is a small exploratory study using focus groups to explore the views of non-UK primary care physicians (n=13), nurses (n=11) and a nurse practitioner on the challenges of providing integrated care to older patients, and the potential benefits of introducing a social worker into the practice. Grounded theory was used to identify and extract themes from the group discussions.

Problems reported included social isolation and depression, poor access to community resources, including transport (which limited access to healthcare appointments), and inability to deal with financial pressures. Healthcare staff found that limited consultation time was taken up with issues they could not address, although they were aware that patients probably did not divulge the extent of these social problems, in case they might be forced into residential care.

It was thought that a social worker could help address these psychosocial problems, and investigate home circumstances. However, there was disagreement between physicians about the merits of hosting the social worker in the practice, with some concerned that they would be expected to take part in time-consuming discussions and briefings, while others, including one with experience of co-location, felt that having the social worker integrated in the team would be essential.

This is a relatively small study from the USA, but the model of placing a social worker in a primary care practice is not widespread in the UK, and we did not find any similar material focused on the needs of older people.

User and practitioner perspectives on community-based case management

Challis (2010b +/-) is a UK mixed methods study on case management, with separate sections on self-management. The study is not very clearly reported.

The study is about case management in primary care by nurses. It is only assessed here for that part which is relevant to case management for older people with multiple long-term conditions (as it concerns all adults with long-term conditions). Methods included a survey of case managers (with a poor response rate of 56), qualitative 'case studies' with practitioners and a 'focus group consultation' with users and carers. The aims of the study are very broad, and findings – which do not concern impact – are not clearly related to different methodologies.

As a scoping study, it has some use in defining the problems of integrated services in case management which is itself a poorly defined construct. These problems include the domination of case management by healthcare practitioners (mostly primary care nurses in community settings); inability of these case managers to access social services except by referral (and then often with very slow response rates); and ineffective case funding where patients were 'allocated on the basis of staff qualification or the predicted intensity of involvement' (p187), so that they ended up in disease specific care – rather than holistic care – services.

Service users and carers involved in the focus groups recognised the gaps in care, many of which related to help with housework, finances and day-to-day living, i.e. those services that might be addressed through social services involvement. The authors conclude that: 'Participants felt the key priorities for a case management service should be to improve the range of services available to care for people at home and to provide more intensive long-term support. Service users clearly placed more import on the meeting of basic needs first, before self-care could be supported' (p181).

Older people's perceptions of the Community Matron Service

Sargent (2007 +) explored patient and carer perceptions of case management for (mostly older) people with long-term conditions, implemented through the introduction of community matrons in the UK. In-depth interviews were conducted with a 'purposive' sample of 72 patients receiving case management through a community matron, and 52 carers, across 6 Primary Care Trusts. This is a relatively large sample for a qualitative study, but

participants were recruited by the community matrons (which may introduce bias to the sample). The role of community matrons combines clinical care, care coordination, education, advocacy and psychosocial support, and is targeted at people with complex social care needs. Unfortunately, this is not a comparative study, so the impact of the community matron Service is not entirely clear.

In general, service users reported that their health and practical needs were well monitored and addressed, and they reported improvements in mood and wellbeing. They felt better 'cared for', reassured because they had regular reviews of blood pressure and other vital signs, and particularly welcomed the matron's ability to manage and advise on complex medication regimes. As case managers, the matrons could advocate effectively with other services, for example organising the provision of necessary equipment and repeat prescriptions.

Carers in the sample felt that the matrons 'took the pressure off' them, by providing a welcome source of 'advice, practical and emotional support' (p517), thereby reducing their sense of isolation. Both service users and carers appreciated the social aspect of the matrons' visits, and felt confident that they could access advice and support. While the authors comment that the 'psychosocial' impact of the community matrons was not anticipated, there was little evidence from this paper that users and carers had been referred to other community services for practical (for example, financial) or social support.

Brown (2008 +) is a similar UK qualitative study, interviewing a 'purposive' sample of 24 people with complex social care.

Matrons are described as: 'Highly trained nurses, able to diagnose, prescribe and manage patients with long-term conditions within primary care' (p409). As in Sargent (2007 +), patients commented on the impact of the matron as a friend, as a provider of personal care and clinical skills, and on the specific outcomes for themselves and other service users. Although 1 user felt initially that they had been offered the service as a lesser substitute for the GP, others

were also aware that they had less need of GP services (which they perceived as overloaded), and some felt that the support of the matron had been more effective in keeping them out of hospital or residential care.

Patients reported an improved quality of life and better medication and self-management skills as a result of the service, and that it had reduced their need for social and psychological support, and given better support to family carers. The matrons were said to be a reliable and flexible source of medical and social support. Participants felt that they filled a gap where GPs could no longer give support.

Potential benefits of multidisciplinary working, and potential barriers to implementation

Johansson (2010 ++/+) is a systematic review (of international studies) that explores the literature concerning multidisciplinary teams that work with elderly persons living in the community. The review included a wide range of study designs including randomised controlled studies, qualitative designs, non-experimental designs and examples of practice. Studies were too heterogeneous for a meta-analysis and a narrative synthesis was presented. Few of the included studies were within our date range and only 1 study explicitly targeted older people with multiple long-term conditions (Nikolaus 2003).

This review found that the responsibility to develop teamwork lies with the individual team member, the team as a group and with the management, organisation or society within which the team works. Teamwork requires more than the simple organization of professionals and naming them as a 'team' (p108). Obstacles to teamwork included differences in attitudes, knowledge, documentation and management. Implementation of change was affected by power, culture and structure. Professionals acted to enhance or defend their own interests and perspectives. On the other hand, client involvement, and opportunities to discuss the needs of elderly persons within a group of different professionals, was conducive to greater understanding of the potential of teamwork to deliver good outcomes.

Clinical outcomes cited in the review were comprehensive multidisciplinary geriatric assessment combined with appropriate interventions: these were reported as beneficial in promoting improved capacity. Other outcomes widely used were those relating to service use: change in hospital admission rates, plus reduced readmissions and reduced length of hospital stay.

Models and impact of inter-professional working

Trivedi (2013 +/-) is a systematic review of international evidence on the effectiveness of IPW for community dwelling older people with multiple health and social care needs. (Note that Beland 2006, see below, is also included in this review.) This study is the systematic review part of a larger study that also included a survey of UK practitioners and service provision and a study of the views of UK service users, carers and their representatives (see Goodman 2012 +/+). The reviewers classified included studies into 3 categories: case management, collaboration and integrated teams.

- **Case management:** No evidence of reduced mortality was found; poor quality studies showed no significant health outcomes or reduced depression in the Geriatric Care Management model. Two low quality studies delivered case management with integrated care and included participants recently discharged from hospital with good social support. The SWING (South Winnipeg Integrated Programme) showed no overall improvement in ADL/EADL but improved MMSE scores. Increased prescriptions and did not add to caregiver strain.
- **Collaboration model:** Leaving aside acute care, 1 high quality study showed reduced admissions and improved physical functioning, but no cost reduction. Discharge planning improved patient satisfaction, quality of care and collaboration.
- **Integrated teams:** Evidence about service use and costs was mixed but around half the studies showed reduced hospital or nursing/care home use. Two studies reported a significant reduction in caregiver strain with most participants' co-resident with caregivers.

The authors concluded there was weak evidence of effectiveness and cost-effectiveness for IPW, although well-integrated and shared care models

improved processes of care and have the potential to reduce hospital or nursing/care home use. One study in the review (Reeves et al 2010a) observed that IPW is too often represented as the outcome without discriminating between the process of IPW and its effectiveness. Study quality varied considerably and high quality evaluations as well as observational studies are needed to identify the key components of effective IPW in relation to user-defined outcomes. Differences in local contexts raise questions about the applicability of the findings and their implications for practice.

The review says little about social care organisation and delivery in relation to IPW. The material is largely not contemporary, and not from UK settings. Some of the populations included are very specific to particular circumstances for example, rehabilitation after hospital discharge, palliative care at end of life) and others may be targeted at a mixed population, while only some of that population will benefit. Insufficient evidence on context is available. Not all of the studies' quality ratings were used in the narrative synthesis, so the strength of the evidence in the review findings was at times unclear.

Goodman (2012 +/+) is a mixed methods study, which included the systematic review outlined above (Trivedi 2013 +/-). It aimed to identify the effectiveness of IPW in primary and community care for older people with multiple health and social care needs. It aimed to identify appropriate measures of effectiveness from user, professional and organisational perspectives for IPW and to investigate the extent to which contextual factors influence the sustainability and effectiveness of IPW and patient, carer and professional outcomes.

Exploratory interviews with older people, carers and health and social care providers were undertaken; a national survey of how IPW is structured was held; along with a consensus event with stakeholders that reviewed key findings. The second phase of the project involved analysis that focused on the older person's experience of IPW and comparison of the processes of care, resource use and outcomes in 3 case studies.

Conclusions are credible, and come from a service user perspective. However, they are also somewhat limited, as no evidence was found to support organisational effectiveness, which was one aim of the study.

The social care outcomes specified by users and carers as important outcomes of good IPW were:

- service recipient is relaxed and is not made more anxious by the services or service personnel
- users and carers are involved in decision making and specific requests are met (for example, ability to die at home)
- carers are acknowledged and supported by services, and their needs are assessed and provided for.

The study concluded that older people and their carers define effectiveness of IPW through the processes of assessment, care and delivery as much as through outcomes. Timeliness, completion of actions as promised and perceived expertise, as well as quality of relationships are important. No model of IPW was identified as being more effective (see also Trivedi 2013 – a systematic review – for detail).

Effectiveness in relation to processes of assessment, planning and care was agreed by service users and carers to be that which promoted: continuity of care through a named key person; relationship styles which fostered co-production with the older person (for example, in planning); and evidence that the system can respond effectively at times of crisis. These values do not relate specifically to care assessment and planning, but to the whole process of care planning and delivery.

Outpatient geriatric multidisciplinary evaluation and management plus case management

Beland (2006 ++/+) is a non-UK trial of the 'SIPA'[6] model of integrated care, including 1230 frail elderly participants living in the community with 'a complex mixture of service needs' (p27). The purpose of the trial was to evaluate the impact of the service on admissions to hospital or other forms of institutional care. This included hospital admission, potentially going into a nursing home or receiving intensive home bed services. Another expected outcome was increased use of community services for those using the SIPA intervention. The evaluation aimed to demonstrate that cost savings could be achieved by improved integrated and IPW, and this explicitly included social and personal services such as home care. The integrated service model in the SIPA is based on 'community services, a multidisciplinary team, case management that retains clinical responsibility for all the health and social service required and the capacity to mobilise resources as required' (abstract).

Overall the SIPA achieved its expected outcomes: '$4,000 of institutional based services per person was transferred to community based services (p38), although the intervention was also successful in reducing the use of institution-based services. A&E visits and permanent nursing home admission were reduced by 10%, and there was a reduction in waiting times for hospital admission or nursing home placement. SIPA had different impacts on individuals with different levels of need, so although this is an encouraging outcome for a model of IPW, sub-group analysis would be helpful, as would more information on the views of and quality of life impacts on participants.

Counsell (2009 ++/+) is a cluster randomised trial of older (65+, mean age 72) patients of 164 primary care physician practices in Indiana, USA to test the effectiveness of a geriatric care management model (GRACE) on improving the quality of care for low-income seniors in primary care. Participating physicians were randomised, so that all eligible patients in each practice had either the intervention (474 patients, 78 physicians) or usual care (477

---

[6] SIPA is an abbreviation for the French language title of the programme: 'Système de soins Intégrés pour Personnes Âgées fragiles' translated as 'integrated care system for frail older people'.

patients, 86 physicians). Nearly 1 in 4 study participants were at high risk of hospitalisation and the whole sample (n=951), which includes the sub-group of individuals with lower risk of hospital admissions (n=725) had an average of 2+ multiple long-term conditions, and for the sub-group with higher risk of hospitalisation (n=224), the average was 3.5 multiple long-term conditions (Counsell et al 2009).

The intervention comprised home-based care management for 2 years by a nurse practitioner and social worker who collaborated with the primary care physician and a geriatrics interdisciplinary team and were guided by 12 care protocols for common geriatric conditions (described in Counsell 2006 ++/+: advance care planning; health maintenance; medication management; difficulty walking/falls; chronic pain; urinary incontinence; depression; visual impairment; hearing impairment; malnutrition/weight loss; dementia; and caregiver burden). These protocols are included here as important aspects of care for older people with long-term conditions, which might also be relevant to social care.

Features of the model included: 'In-home assessment and care management provided by a nurse practitioner and social worker team; extensive use of specific care protocols for evaluation and management of common geriatric conditions; utilisation of an integrated electronic medical record and a Web-based care management tracking tool; and integration with affiliated pharmacy, mental health, home health, and community-based and inpatient geriatric care services' (p2624).

The GRACE patients made significant improvements compared with usual care patients at 24 months in 4 of 8 SF-36 scales: general health, vitality, social functioning and mental health. No group differences were found for activities of daily living or death, and although A&E service usage was lower in the intervention group, admissions did not vary. No significant differences were found between patient satisfaction at 24 months, and mortality and time to death were not significantly different.

Mortality at 24 months – 33 intervention patients vs 37 usual care patients – and time to death were similar between groups (2628). In sub-group analysis of a predefined group at high risk of hospitalisation (comprising 112 intervention and 114 usual-care patients), emergency department visits and hospital admission rates were lower for intervention patients in the second year.

Conclusions from this study suggest that integrated care, planned by a nurse and social worker, may have positive impacts on general health, vitality, social functioning and mental health.

Economic studies narrative summaries statements

We found 6 non-UK economic evaluations of mixed quality. Of these 6 studies, 2 came from the systematic search – 2 excellent quality controlled trials from Canada (Beland 2006 ++/+) (n=1270) and the US (Counsell 2007 ++,/+) (n=951). The other 4 were identified through additional searches carried out by the NCCSC economist (3 good quality controlled trials (+/+) 2 of which were from the US (Boult 2001) (n=568) and Toseland (1997) (n=160) and 1 from Italy (Bernabei 1998) (n=226), along with 1 low quality (-/+) before and after cohort study from Italy (Landi 1999) (n=115). A possible limitation of these 4 studies is the age of the research and whether the results are relevant and generalisable to inform current practice.

These studies were broadly similar in the intervention model: outpatient geriatric multidisciplinary evaluation and management plus case management. They were compared to some variation of 'usual care', which might be considered as some degree of fragmented healthcare services. The population covered community-dwelling individuals over the age of 65 years with the exception of 1 study focusing on US military veterans over the age of 55; and the range of mean ages across all studies was between 72 to 82 years old. Mean chronic conditions ranged from 1+ to 5 chronic conditions. The proportion of individuals living alone was not reported in half of the studies, although in the other studies, the range was 44 to 58%: Counsell (2007 ++/+) (n=951); Bernabei (1998 +/+) (n=226); Beland (2006 ++/+) (n=1270). Likewise, the proportion with an informal carer was not reported in 3

studies, but in the other studies the range was 25 to 76%: Counsell (2007, ++,/+) (n=951); Landi (1999 -/+); (n=115); Bernabei (1998 +/+) (n=226).

Findings from all economic evaluations were presented as cost-consequence analyses (costs were presented alongside changes in outcomes). The applicability of the economic evaluations to the UK context is partially limited due to differences in institutional context (baseline patterns of service use) and differences in unit costs. For this reason, relying on the findings of changes in net costs from international studies (assuming that all relevant health and social care resource use is included) cannot completely answer whether the intervention is cost-effective in the UK context but can provide an indication of likely cost-effectiveness. Furthermore, some studies are further limited if they do not comprehensively measure all relevant health and social care resource use. For both reasons, we present a summary of the findings not in terms of net costs, but in terms of the impact on the change of community and institutional health and social care resource use.

Taken together, these studies found improvements in a range of patient health and social care outcomes. It is important to note that not all of the same outcomes were measured, and where there were overlaps, in some cases, findings were mixed (improvements or no differences) but none of the findings indicated worse outcomes. These individual-level outcomes are listed further below.

With respect to service-level outcomes, the consistency of evidence regarding the use of acute health care services (A&E or inpatient stays) indicates that, across a range of countries (Canada, USA and Italy) there were significant decreases (5 studies: Beland 2006 ++/+; Bernabei 1998 +/+; Counsell 2007 ++/+; Landi 1999 +/-; Toseland 1996, 1997 +/+) and no difference in 1 study (Boult 2001 +/+). The consistency of the evidence in the use of community and healthcare services was mixed (no differences, increases or decreases). One particular limitation is that the impact on nursing home or care home admission was only measured in 3 studies, and these found no differences between groups, measured over a 12-, 22- and 24-month follow up period:

Bernabei (1998 +/+) (n=226); Beland (2006 ++/+) (n=1,270); Toseland (1997 +/+) (n=160).

Improvements in social care related outcomes include vitality and social function at 24 months (Counsell 2007 ++/+); improvements in depression at 12 months (Bernabei 1998 +/+), at 6, 8, and 12 months (Boult 2001 +/+) and at 24 months (Counsell 2007 ++/+).

Health-related outcomes also improved in 2 studies: Boult (2001 +/+ at 6, 8, and 12 months); Counsell (2007 ++/+ at 24 months), while in 1 study it was no different (Toseland 1996, 1997 +/+ at 8 and 24 months). Physical function improved in 3 studies: Boult (2001, +/+ at 6, 8, and 12 months); Bernabei (1998 +/+ at 12 months); Counsell (2007 ++/+ at 24 months) and was no different in 1 study (Toseland 1996, 1997 +/+, at 8 and 24 months). Mortality was no different in 3 studies: Boult (2001 +/+, at 6, 8, and 12 months); Bernabei (1998 +/+ at 12 months); Counsell (2007 ++/+ at 24 months), while in 1 study mortality was reduced early in the study but was no different towards the end (Toseland 1996, 1997 +/+, reductions at 8 months but no different at 24 months). For a sub-group of patients reporting no pain on the SF-20 sub-scale, mortality was reduced at 24 months (Toseland 1996, 1997 +/+). The number of medications in 1 study was reduced at 12 months (Bernabei 1998 +/+).

In relation to satisfaction, process and continuity of services, 2 studies measuring these outcomes found improvements in the process and continuity of health and social care at 8 months (Toseland 1996, 1997 +/+,) and at 24 months (Counsell 2007 ++/+). In the same studies, 1 had greater satisfaction with services at 8 months (Toseland 1996, 1997 +/+,) while the other found no differences in satisfaction at 24 months (Counsell 2007 ++/+).

In terms of carer outcomes, there is limited evidence from 1 good quality non-UK RCT (Boult 2001 +/+) that carer satisfaction and burden improved compared to the control group. It is not explicitly clear what mechanism or intervention led to improvements in carer outcomes, but it could be inferred that these changes occurred as a result of the social worker addressing the

patient's psychosocial and financial needs, and that both social worker and nurse provided health education, self-care management and the creation of advance directives, and also due to improved patient outcomes in the areas of depression, physical health and physical function.

Personalised approaches to assessment, care planning and service delivery

Glendinning (2009 +) is a UK mixed methods study which aimed to identify the impact and outcomes of independent budgets (IBs) within the IBSEN study on (hitherto) unpaid relatives and other informal carers. The study focused on the '2 largest groups of carers likely to be affected by IBs: carers of older people and carers of people with learning disabilities' (p12) so it is not clear what proportion of these are likely to be older people with multiple long-term conditions.

Validity is limited by failure to recruit, and delay in implementing the intervention. In relation to quality of life measures, 'Carers of IB users scored higher than carers of people using standard social care services; the difference between the 2 groups of carers was statistically significant in relation to carers' quality of life' (p89). It appeared that expenditure on services that could provide respite for carers was higher in the IB group than in the comparison group. The study showed that some IB sites struggled to integrate the interests of carers but they did improve. The sites varied in their consideration of carer needs. Carers sometimes felt that the focus was too much on the service users and not enough on carers' needs. Team leaders agreed that the pressure of implementation meant that carers' needs were excluded.

IB group carers were significantly more likely to have planned support together with the service user than comparison group carers. None of the carers taking part in the semi-structured interviews had had a separate assessment of their own needs. Nevertheless they reported that in the service user's IB assessment, their own needs and circumstances were more likely to be recognised and taken into account (p71). However, 'For many carers, the IB had created more paperwork and management responsibilities' (p71).

These problems related to a 'lack of clarity over how the IB could be used; or to support plans that failed to materialise' (p71).

Economic evidence relating to use of individual budgets

The evidence on individual budgets (Glendinning et al 2008 +/+) has very serious limitations and is only partially applicable to the review question because of problems with delayed implementation. This meant that a very small proportion of the intervention group actually had a care plan in place by the end of the study period (6 months follow up).Therefore the results of the cost-effectiveness analysis reported at 6 months should not be taken at face value.

The economic analysis took the perspective of the NHS and PSS and was evaluated over a 6-month follow up period using prices from 2007/2008. Results from the cost-effectiveness analysis indicate that standard care dominates when using the mental wellbeing outcome; but there is no dominance when using the ASCOT, quality of life or self-perceived health outcomes. Social care service use was similar for both groups (£227/£228 per week). It was reported that the intervention group had higher healthcare costs compared to standard care, although precise estimates and statistical significance were not presented.

Link between primary care and social work practitioners

The non-UK Keefe study (++) described above also found that the health practitioners felt that patients presented with 'social' problems, which they had neither time nor expertise to address, and many did not have a consistent family or other caregiver to support them. Challis (2010b +/-) is a mixed methods study on case management, with separate sections on self-management. The study is not very clearly reported. This study is about case management in primary care by nurses. It is only assessed here for that part which is relevant to case management for older people with multiple long-term conditions (as it concerns all adults with long-term conditions). Methods included a survey of case managers (with a poor response rate of 56), qualitative 'case studies' with practitioners and a 'focus group consultation' with users and carers.

The aims of the study are very broad, and the findings – which do not concern impact – are not clearly related to different methodologies. As a scoping study, it has some use in defining the problems of integrated services in case management – itself a poorly defined construct. These are the domination of case management by healthcare practitioners (mostly primary care nurses in community settings); inability of these case managers to access social services except by referral (and then often with very slow response rates); and ineffective case funding where patients were 'allocated on the basis of staff qualification or the predicted intensity of involvement' (p187), so that they ended up in disease specific care – rather than holistic care – services. Service users and carers involved in the focus groups recognised the gaps in care, many of which related to help with housework, finances and day-to-day living, i.e. those services that might be addressed through social services' involvement.

The authors conclude that: 'Participants felt the key priorities for a case management service should be to improve the range of services available to care for people at home and to provide more intensive long-term support. Service users clearly placed more import on the meeting of basic needs first, before self-care could be supported' (p181).

GP-centred models for service delivery (without case management)

One low quality non-UK study (Sommers 2000 -/+) (n=543) tested the addition of a nurse and social worker to a GP practice to assist in health and social care assessment (through a comprehensive assessment) and care planning plus the provision of other service components (disease self-management, education on self-care and referring patients to community health and social care services), compared to usual GP care. This study was identified through additional searches of the literature conducted by the NCCSC economist.

The study focused on community-dwelling older adults over aged 65 with at least 2 chronic conditions (stable or unstable) with few restrictions in activities of daily living (bathing and/or dressing only) and at least 1 restriction in instrumental activities of daily living. Between 42 and 55% of the sample lived alone.

The economic evaluation was presented as a cost–consequence analysis (presenting changes in costs alongside changes in outcomes). This economic evaluation is only partially applicable in determining whether the intervention is cost-effective in the UK context due to differences in institutional context, unit costs and additional issues of relevance as findings are based on older data. Altogether though, the quality of the economic evaluation was moderate due to some issues of unclear reporting in the calculation of net costs but had good reporting quality in changes in all relevant health and social care resource use. Taken together, the findings indicate that the intervention leads to improvements in outcomes alongside reductions in the use of acute care services, small increases in community healthcare services, and no changes in use of nursing or care home services.

The findings indicate that the intervention can improve some individual-level outcomes at the end of an 18-month follow-up period. Improved outcomes include patient higher social activities count, reduced symptoms and higher self-rated health. There were no differences in physical health (as measured by the Health Activities Questionnaire), emotional state (as assessed by the Geriatric Depression Scale), nutritional status or number of medications.

In relation to service-level outcomes, there is evidence of reduced hospitalisation (p=0.03) at 12 and 18 months follow up; reduced readmission rates at 12 months follow up; and reduced admissions related to a chronic condition (13% compared to 22% of admissions (no statistical significance figure provided) at 12 and 18 months follow up. However, when looking at the post-intervention period (18–24 months afterwards), these reductions in admissions were not sustained (were not statistically different between groups).

With regards to A&E and admissions to nursing homes, there were not statistically significant differences between groups at 18 months. With respect to the use of community healthcare services, there were significant reductions in specialist visits (p=0.003) but no differences in home care visits or GP visits. It is not possible to present estimates of total costs per person for the intervention and control groups, as there was poor reporting of net cost

information. The authors do report that the intervention group produced a saving of $90 per person but estimates of statistical significance were not provided and price year was also not reported.

GP-centred models for service delivery (with case management)

One good quality multi-site non-UK study (Battersby 2007 +/+) tested the addition of service coordinators (a social worker, allied health professional or nurse) to GP working, in combination with patient-directed goals in the health and social care assessment and care planning process. The intervention was also coupled with changes in funding mechanisms by switching from fee-for-service to a 12-month care plan funded by pooling resources across acute and community health and social care services.

The sample covered community-dwelling older adults over the age of 60, with a range mean age between 61 and 74 years across the 4 study sites and varying numbers of chronic conditions. Approximately 58% of the sample was at risk of at least 1 hospital admission. No information was reported as to the proportion of individuals living alone or with an informal carer.

Findings from the study indicate that the intervention can lead to improved patient health and social care outcomes, including, vitality, mental health and physical health on the SF-36 sub-scale and on the work and social adjustment scale (WSAS) for the sub-scales of home, social, private and total WSAS scores over an average intervention period of 16 to 20 months. In terms of service-level outcomes, measured over a 24-month follow up period, there were mixed impacts on acute care service use – in some areas there were no differences in acute care services, while in others there were reductions in inpatient stay but increases in A&E visits, and some sites had increased elective inpatient admissions. From the view of community social care services the authors report that the intervention was associated with higher use of home care services.

Admission to nursing or care homes was not measured. However the authors note several limitations that may underestimate potential benefits of the intervention. They believe that the time horizon was not long enough to

capture improvements in patients' health that may lead to longer-term reductions in hospital use (Battersby 2007 +/+ p60). The authors also believe that the intervention was not fully implemented in the early stages of the study period, for example, GPs needed to be reminded to order services as prescribed in the care plan (p62). Furthermore, the authors believe that the intervention might have better results by targeting patients most likely to benefit – for example, focusing on individuals needing care coordination the most and those with higher risk of hospitalisation (Battersby 2005 +/+ p664).

Taken together, the results indicate improvements in outcomes and increases in costs from the perspective of health and social care services, however, the applicability of findings (Battersby 2007 +/+) has potentially serious limitations due to some issues of comprehensiveness in the collection of resource use (due to issues with administrative databases). Furthermore, there are issues due to differences in institutional contexts, unit costs and issues of relevance as findings are based on older data.

Economic evidence on good care models in care homes

This review found no research evidence to address the question of barriers and facilitators to good care models in care homes.

Evidence statements

ES4	**Models of interdisciplinary working**
	There is moderate quality evidence from systematic review and mixed methods studies (Goodman 2012 +/+; Trivedi 2013 +/-) that IPW may be cost-effective but does not show clearly that any particular model (e.g. care management, collaborative working or integrated teams) delivers better outcomes. Users and carers consistently value aspects of integrated service delivery which foster confidence in the reliability of services, continuity of paid carers, user and carer involvement in planning and reviewing care, services to support carers and the ability of services to respond effectively at times of crisis. There is also

	qualitative evidence that IPW can reduce carer burden.	
ES13	**Primary care practitioners' perceptions of the impact of complex health needs on older people's social care needs**	
	One qualitative study of good quality (Keefe 2009 ++) reported from the perspective of primary care practitioners (albeit from the USA) that older patients with complex healthcare needs are adversely affected by loneliness and have emotional and practical needs which could not be addressed by primary care physicians and nurses, and might be addressed by having a social worker in the practice.	
ES14	**User and practitioner perspectives on community-based case management**	
	One survey study of moderate quality (Challis 2010b +/-) suggested – largely on the basis of healthcare practitioner views, supplemented by those of users and carers – that case management in the community is undertaken mostly by nurses, who have difficulty in assessing for or referring into social services, and that consequently, as flagged up by user and carer comments, the basic and personal care needs of people with long-term conditions (not particularly older people) are not assessed or provided for.	
ES15	**Older people's perceptions of the Community Matron Service**	
	Two qualitative studies of moderate quality (Brown 2008 +; Sargent 2007 +) suggested that older people with complex long-term conditions and their carers highly valued the Community Matron Service. They reported enhanced confidence, improved quality of life and improved ability to manage their conditions and medication with less support from other health services. They valued direct access to advice and clinical care in their own homes. They also reported that the matron was 'a friend' and a social and psychological support to themselves and their carers. However, the stated impact of the matron on social isolation may indicate that the role is less effective in directing patients to other possible social or community sources of support.	
ES16	**Potential benefits of multidisciplinary working, and potential barriers to implementation**	
	There is generalisable evidence from a systematic review of moderate quality (Johansson 2010 ++/+) that multidisciplinary team working may involve the processes of caring for older people with complex social care needs in the community, and that this may reduce hospital admissions. The development of 'teams' relied on the individual and the management or organisation, and had the potential to increase capacity. However, the development of teams is not a simple process. Involving clients and discussing individual needs may provide the hub around which teams can develop.	
	Multidisciplinary geriatric assessments, combined with appropriate interventions could improve on clinical outcomes such as hospital admissions and reduced length of stay.	
ES17	**Outpatient geriatric multidisciplinary evaluation and management plus case management**	
	This evidence statement is based on the findings of 2 studies of excellent quality controlled trials from Canada (Beland 2006 ++/+) and the USA (Counsell 2007 ++/+), 3 good quality controlled trials (+/+), 2 of which were from the USA (Boult 2001; Toseland 1997) and 1 from Italy (Bernabei 1998), and 1 low quality before and after study from Italy	

		(Landi 1999 -/+). Taken together, there is moderate evidence from 6 international studies of mixed quality that the coordination of health and social care services through the use of case management plus outpatient multidisciplinary health and social care geriatric teams can improve a range of service user health and social care outcomes while reducing or having no changes on the use of acute care services with mixed impacts on community health and social care services. It is important to note that not all of the same outcomes were measured but where they were, findings were equivocal (improvements or no differences) but none of the findings indicated worse outcomes.
ES18	**Personalised approaches to assessment, care planning and service delivery**	
	There is moderate quality evidence from a mixed methods and structured outcome (Glendinning 2008 +/-, 2009 +/+) studies, published by the Individual Budgets Evaluation Network (Ibsen) that the introduction of individual budgets for older people (at the time of the study) did not benefit older people as there were poorer outcomes for mental wellbeing outcomes using the GHQ-12 measurement tool. There were no differences in quality of life, self-rated health or social care related outcomes as measured by the ASCOT tool. Qualitative interviews conducted on 40 older people (Glendinning 2008 p46) indicated that 'Most notably for older people, 3 types of experience emerged: those who did not want anything different; those who were anxious but could see some potential benefits; and those embracing the potential for choice and control over their own support (p72). There is evidence that for a sub-group of individuals in the intervention group experienced better mental health outcomes when comparing the proportion of individuals scoring 4+ on the GHQ-12 (higher scores indicate better outcomes) but there is some uncertainty with this estimate as these improvements were no longer significant when caregiver proxy outcomes were excluded.	
ES19	**Economic evidence relating to use of individual budgets**	
	The applicability of the economic evidence in relation to individual budgets is very limited due to delayed implementation of the intervention, meaning that only a very small proportion of individuals had a care plan in place at the time of the economic evaluation. Therefore, results of the economic evaluation, measured over a 6-months period, should not be taken at face value. The economic analysis is comprehensive in including both health and social care service use and prices reflect the 2007/2008 year. Results from the cost-effectiveness analysis indicate that standard care dominates when using the mental wellbeing outcome; but there is no dominance when using the ASCOT, quality of life or self-perceived health outcomes. Social care service use was similar for both groups (£227/ £228 per week) but it was reported that the intervention group had higher healthcare costs compared to standard care, although precise estimates and statistical significance was not presented.	
ES20	**Link between primary care and social work practitioners**	
	There is some good quality qualitative evidence (Keefe 2009 ++) that primary care staff realise their inability to address the social care needs of older people with complex social care needs living in the community, and hypothesise that having a social worker in the practice would improve outcomes for users and carers in need of practical, financial	

	and social support. There is moderate quality survey evidence (Challis 2010b +/-) that clinical case managers (the majority of whom are community nurses) find it difficult to refer people to social services, and do not have a good grasp of people's holistic needs. There is evidence of moderate quality comparison evaluation (Davey 2005 +/-) that it is feasible to co-locate a social work team in a primary care setting, but that co-location, whether or not it fostered closer integrated working, showed no particular advantages that could be traced to patient outcomes.
ES21	**GP-centred models for service delivery (without case management)** One low quality US study (Sommers 2000 -/+) (n=543) tested the addition of a nurse and social worker to a GP practice to assist in comprehensive health and social care assessment, care planning and service provision (self-management, education on self-care and referral) compared to usual GP care. The sample included community-dwelling older adults over aged 65 with at least 2 chronic conditions, few restrictions in activities of daily living and at least 1 restriction in instrumental activities of daily living. Findings indicate that the intervention leads to improvements in outcomes alongside reductions in the use of acute care services, small increases in community healthcare services, and no changes in use of nursing or care home services. The economic evaluation was presented as a cost–consequence analysis (presenting changes in costs alongside changes in outcomes). This economic evaluation is only partially applicable in determining whether the intervention is cost-effective in the UK context due to differences in institutional context, unit costs and additional issues of relevance as findings are based on older data. Altogether though, the quality of the economic evaluation was moderate due to some issues of unclear reporting in the calculation of net costs but had good reporting quality in changes in all relevant health and social care resource use.
ES22	**GP-centred models for service delivery (with case management)** One good quality multi-site non-UK RCT (Battersby 2007 +/+) tested the addition of service coordinators (a social worker, allied health professional or nurse) to GP working, in combination with patient-directed goals in the health and social care assessment and care planning process. The intervention was also coupled with changes in funding mechanisms by switching from fee-for-service to a 12-month care plan funded by pooling resources across acute and community health and social care services. The sample covered community-dwelling older adults over the age of 60, with a range mean age between 61 to 74 years across the 4 study sites and varying numbers of chronic conditions. The results show that the intervention is associated with improvements in outcomes and increases in costs from the perspective of health and social care services. However, the applicability of findings is limited by potentially serious limitations due to some issues in the comprehensiveness in the collection of resource use (due to issues with administrative databases). Furthermore, there are issues due to differences in institutional contexts, unit costs, and issues of relevance as findings are based on older data.
ES23	**Economic evidence on good care models in care homes** This review found no research evidence to address the question of barriers and facilitators to good care models in care homes.

Included studies for these review questions

Battersby, MW (2005) Health Reform through Coordinated Care: SA HealthPlus. British Medical Journal 330(7492): 662-65

Battersby MW (2007) SA Health- Plus: a controlled trial of a state-wide application of a generic model of chronic illness care. The Millbank Quarterly 85(1): 37-67

Beland F (2006) Integrated Services for Frail Elders (SIPA): A Trial of a Model for Canada. Canadian Journal of Aging 25(1): 5-42

Bernabei R, Landi F, Gambassi G, et al (1998) Randomised trial of impact of model of integrated care and case management for older people living in the community. BMJ 316(7141): 1348-51

Boult C, Boult L, Morishita L et al (1998) Outpatient geriatric evaluation and management (GEM). J Am Geriatr Soc 46: 296–302

Boult C, Boult LB, Morishita L, et al (2001) A randomized clinical trial of outpatient geriatric evaluation and management. J Am Geriatr Soc 49: 351-9

Brown K, Stainer K, Stewart J, et al (2008) Older people with complex long-term health conditions. Their views on the community matron service: a qualitative study. Quality in Primary Care 16(6): 409-17

Challis, D. (2010). Self-care and Case Management in Long-term Conditions: The Effective Management of Critical Interfaces. Report for the National Institute for Health Research Service Delivery and Organisation programme. HMSO, London.

Counsell SR, Callahan, CM Clark, DO, et al (2007) Geriatric Care Management for Low-Income Seniors: a randomised controlled trial. Journal of the American Medical Association 298(22): 2623-33

Counsell SR, Callahan CM, Tu W, Stump TE, Arling W (2009) Cost analysis of the geriatric resources for assessment and care of elders care management intervention. J Am Geriatr Soc 57(8): 1420-26

Davey B, Levin E, L Liffe S, et al (2005) Integrating health and social care: implications for joint working and community care outcomes for older people. Journal of Interprofessional Care 19(1): 22-34.

Engelhardt JB, Toseland RW, O'Donnell JC, et al (1996) The effectiveness and efficiency of outpatient geriatric evaluation and management. J Am Geriatr Soc, 44: 847-56

Glendinning C, Challis D, Fernandez J et al (2008) Evaluation of the Individual Budgets Pilot Programme: Final Report, Social Policy Research Unit, University of York, York.

Glendinning C, Arksey H, Jones K et al (2009) The Individual Budgets Pilot Projects: Impact and Outcomes for Carers. Social Policy Research Unit, University of York, York

Goodman C, Drennan V, Manthorpe J, et al (2012) A study of the effectiveness of inter-professional working for community-dwelling older people – Final Report. NIHR, UK

Johansson G, Eklund K, Gosman-Hedstrom G. (2010). Multidisciplinary team, working with elderly persons living in the community: a systematic literature review. Scandinavian Journal of Occupational Therapy 17(20): 101-16

Keefe B, Geron SM, Enguidanos S (2009). Integrating social workers into primary care: Physician and nurse perceptions of roles, benefits, and challenges. Social Work in Health Care 48(6): 579-96

Landi F, Gambassi G, Pola R, et al (1999a) Impact of integrated home care services on hospital use. J Am Geriatr Soc., 47:1430–4

Landi F, Lattanzio F, Gambassi G, et al (1999b) A model for integrated home care of frail older patients: the Silver Network project. SILVERNET-HC Study Group. Aging (Milano) Aug 11(44): 262-72

Morishita L, Boult C, Boult L, et al (1998) Satisfaction with outpatient geriatric evaluation and management (GEM). The Gerontologist 38(3): 303-8

Sargent, J. (2007) Patient and carer perceptions of case management for long-term conditions. Health and Social Care in the Community 15(6): 511-9

Sommers LS, Marton KI, Barbaccia JC et al (2000) Physician, nurse, and social worker collaboration in primary care for chronically ill seniors. Arch Intern Med 160: 1825-33

Toseland RW, O'Donnell JC, Engelhardt JB et al (1996) Outpatient geriatric evaluation and management: Results of randomized trial. Medical Care 34: 624-40

Toseland RW, O'Donnell JC, Englehardt JB et al (1997) Outpatient Geriatric Evaluation and Management: Is There an Investment Effect? Gerontologist 37: 324-32

Trivedi D, Goodman C, Gage H, et al (2013). The effectiveness of inter-professional working for older people living in the community: a systematic review. Health and Social Care in the Community 21(2): 113-28

3.3   Self-management support

Introduction to the review questions

The purpose of the review questions on self-management was to seek evidence which would guide recommendations about different ways services for older people with multiple long-term conditions can be supported in managing aspects of their care. The reviews sought evidence from effectiveness studies and views and experiences of service users and their

families and/or carers as well as views and experiences of service practitioners.

Review questions

Q 2.1.5 How effective are different types of support for older people to enable them to self-manage (aspects of) their own conditions?

Q.1.1.1 What are the views and experiences of older people with multiple long-term conditions and their carers, of the social care services they receive?

Q.1.1.2 Do service users and carers consider that their care is (a) personalised; (b) integrated or coordinated with healthcare?

Q.1.1.2 What do they think works well and what needs to change?

Q.1.2.1 What are the views and experiences of practitioners, managers and commissioners in health and social care who procure, manage or deliver care to older people with multiple long-term conditions, in community and care home settings?

Q.1.2.2 What do they think works well, and what needs to change?

Summary of review protocol

The protocol sought to identify studies which would:

- identify the effectiveness of the different ways in which self-management is facilitated within care packages.

Population: Older people, aged 65 years and older, with multiple long-term conditions who use social care services, and their families, partners and carers. People who pay for and who organise their own care are included.

Interventions: Assessment and care planning as it facilitates self-management; may also include direct and indirect factors that support self-management such as housing adaptations or telecare, personal budgets and direct payments, peer support and access to transport in so much as they relate to a package of care for long-term conditions.

Setting: Service users' homes, including sheltered housing accommodation, care (residential and nursing) homes (not hospital settings).

Comparator: Comparative studies could compare alternative ways to help older people with multiple long-term conditions to self-manage.

Outcomes: These should relate primarily to social care outcomes, such as choice, control and dignity, and to service use and costs (rather than clinical outcomes). Emergency hospital admissions and inappropriate entry into residential care may also be considered outcomes of poor support to self-manage.

The study designs relevant to these questions were expected to include:

- systematic reviews of qualitative and quantitative evaluations on this topic

- qualitative studies of service user and carer views

- standardised scales measuring satisfaction and wellbeing

- RCTs and cluster RCTs of support to self-manage

- other comparative/controlled evaluations

- observational and descriptive studies of implementation and process.

Full protocols can be found in Appendix A.

How the literature was searched

The evidence reviews used to develop the guideline recommendations were underpinned by systematic literature searches. The aim of the systematic searches was to comprehensively identify the published evidence to answer the review questions developed by the Guideline Committee and NICE Collaborating Centre for Social Care.

The search strategies for the review questions (based on the scope) were developed by the NICE Collaborating Centre for Social Care in order to identify empirical research. The search strategies are listed in Appendix A.

Searches were based upon retrieving items for the population groups: 'older people', 'carers', 'long-term conditions', 'workforce/social care organisation' in the settings of 'residential care', 'nursing/care homes', 'intermediate care' or 'community care'. Searches were developed using subject heading and free text terms, aiming to balance sensitivity and precision, and the strategy was run across a number of databases. The searches limited results to studies published from 2004 onwards. The database searches were not restricted to specific geographical areas; however, in selecting the websites to search, research on people's views was focused on the UK. The sources searched are listed below. Forward and backwards citation searches using Google Scholar were undertaken in January 2015 for all of the included studies.

The Guideline Committee members were also asked to alert the NICE Collaborating Centre for Social Care to any additional evidence, published, unpublished or in press, that met the inclusion criteria.

Full details of the search can be found in Appendix A.

How studies were selected

Search outputs (title and abstract only) were stored in EPPI Reviewer 4 – a software programme developed for systematic review of large search outputs – and screened against an exclusion tool informed by the parameters of the scope. Formal exclusion criteria were developed and applied to each item in the search output, as follows:

- language (must be in English)
- population (must be older people with multiple long-term conditions, with a social care need)
- intervention (must be identification/assessment of social care needs; personalised care planning; support to self-manage; integration of social and healthcare; training of staff to recognise/manage common long-term conditions; support for carers to care; interventions to support involvement and participation, including information for users and carers
- setting (must be in the person's home or care home)

- workforce (must involve people who work in social care, are integrated with social care or act as gatekeepers to social care)
- country (must be UK, European Union, Denmark, Norway, Sweden, Canada, USA, Australia and New Zealand)
- date (not published before 2004)
- type of evidence (must be research)
- relevance to (1 or more) review questions.

Title and abstract of all research outputs were screened against these exclusion criteria. Those included at this stage were marked for relevance to particular review questions and retrieved as full texts.

Full texts were again reviewed for relevance and research design. If still included, critical appraisal (against NICE tools) and data extraction (against a coding set developed to reflect the review questions) was carried out. The coding was all conducted within EPPI Reviewer 4, and formed the basis of the analysis and evidence tables. All processes were quality assured by double coding of queries, and of a random sample of 10%.

There were 39 studies which appeared relevant (by title and abstract). We ordered full texts of those which appeared to concern either evaluations of self-management support, reporting impacts for service users, or UK studies which reported older people's and/or their carers' views on self-management support. On receiving and reviewing the full texts, we identified 11 which fulfilled these criteria. These were numbered alphabetically in the discussion below. We divided them according to whether they primarily reported views of users and carers, or primarily concerned effectiveness and outcomes. Where applicable, the evidence statements reflect the findings from both views and impact studies.

All of the studies included in this paper concern UK data, except for Brody 2006, which is from the USA.

The included studies were critically appraised using NICE tools for appraising different study types, and the results tabulated. Further information on critical appraisal is given in the introduction at the beginning of [Section 3](). Study findings were extracted into findings tables. For full critical appraisal and findings tables, see Appendix B.

Narrative summary

Expert Patient Programme

Abraham (2009 +) is a small UK qualitative study of 5 males and 27 females, aged 33–79 years, mean age 56.9 who had completed a 6-week Expert Patient Programme (EPP) in Tower Hamlets, London. The EPP course comprised 6 weekly structured self-management training sessions, delivered to groups of 8–16 patients with heterogeneous health conditions, led by trained volunteer lay tutors with chronic health conditions. Patients also received a self-help manual (entitled 'Living a healthy life with chronic conditions'). The programme provided information and employed a variety of cognitive and behavioural modification techniques addressing topics such as action planning, problem solving, dealing with depression, nutrition and exercise.

Although the sample was ethnically diverse, it was not confined to the age range and health profiles of interest to our topic, and the study is too small to adequately separate out views and experiences of our target population. Respondents reported challenges of coping with chronic conditions: there was a strong sense of frustration over inability to function, and loss of social confidence leading to social isolation. However, although there was not consensus across the group, most respondents benefited from the increased social contact, and the goal setting aspect of the course, and reported improvements in self-efficacy. When the course ended, most participants felt the loss of a social activity, and this aspect appeared more dominant than the educative aspect of EPP.

Implementation and content of the Expert Patient Programme (EPP)

Rogers (2008) is a mixed methods study (evidence rating +/+) evaluating the pilot of the EPP in England. It reports on the survey of 299 primary care trusts, and case study analysis of implementation issues. This paper also includes the RCT of 629 patients randomised to the EPP (which is discussed more fully in Kennedy 2007 +/+). The paper illustrates the difficulties experienced by NHS staff in supporting the Programme. These include organisational problems in implementing a service which aims to provide generic, rather than specialist, support to people with different long-term conditions (an issue also picked up by the participating patients), a lack of NHS experience of engaging with patients and the public, and lack of familiarity with the concept of 'expert patients'.

The data was collected between 2003 and 2006, and there may have been significant progress in these areas since then. Personal comments from Programme participants were varied in their opinions, although most people appeared to value the social aspect of the group work. The generic nature of the Programme was criticised by some service users, who felt disease-specific groups would be more worthwhile, and the inflexibility of the content was criticised, with some participants suggesting that they would have preferred more coverage of generic issues such as welfare benefit entitlements.

As reported more fully in Kennedy (2007 +/+), which is an RCT of the effects of the pilot phase of the EPP in England, 629 patients with at least 1 long-term condition were randomised (1:1) to the EPP or to the waiting list control (who were to be offered the programme 6 months later). Although the characteristics of the 629 sample population are not entirely clear – mean age 55, with only the main long-term condition reported, and unclear social care need – the programme did demonstrate some self-reported improvements in the primary outcomes. Patients receiving immediate course access reported considerably greater self-efficacy and energy at 6-month follow-up, but reported no statistically significant reductions in routine health services utilisation over the same time period. The cost-effectiveness analysis showed

that patients receiving immediate course access reported considerably greater health-related quality of life, and a small reduction in costs. If a quality adjusted life year was valued at £20,000, there was a 70% probability that the intervention was cost-effective.

There was no change in health services utilisation (sum of GP consultations, practice nurse appointments, A&E attendances and outpatient visits), although overnight hospital stays and use of day care facilities were reduced in the EPP group.

Medication adherence

Banning (2008) is a literature review of international qualitative research (evidence rating +/+), which applies some of the methods of systematic review, and includes 30 studies. It considers reasons why older people (65+) do not adhere to their prescribed medication. Some 'intentional' non-adherence concerns dislike of side effects or future affects, dislike of 'unnatural' medication, fear of addiction to analgesics, lack of faith in the prescriber and inadequate explanation of what the medication does and why it is important. Non-intentional reasons include forgetfulness, change in routine, lifestyle change, change in prescribed dosage, unclear instructions, feeling asymptomatic and the cognitive effects of medication.

Mobility and transport

Challis (2010b) is a mixed methods report (evidence rating +/-) which aims to assess the interaction between UK self-care initiatives and case management services. Mobility and transport was also found to be an issue for older people using services in the community. Older people were also often frail and struggled with tasks associated with daily living. This limited their ability to access self-care resources and also the appropriateness of self-care for this group, given the complexity and severity of their conditions. Instructions would help older people to manage their medication more effectively.

Signposting to services

Challis (2010b +/-), as described above, found that it was difficult to find research which focused on self-care for older people. This UK study does not

measure outcomes, but focuses on problems and variations in practice, and as such is limited in its applicability to this topic. However, the paper does highlight some issues which might affect the implementation and efficacy of self-management, including the importance of information being made available to the service user and (all) carers about a person's conditions, and information about locally available services that would facilitate self-care/self-management. Some people commented that information was not readily available, making a proactive approach difficult. Others said that the internet is a good source of information but not everyone has access.

Urinary incontinence

Horrocks (2004) is a qualitative study (evidence rating +) reporting interviews with 20 older people in the UK who had reported urinary incontinence (UI) in a wider survey. It establishes, on the basis of experience of the interviewees, that primary care professionals do not raise UI with elderly people, even though the problem is common, and may often coexist with other chronic conditions. It then considers reasons why older people do not ask for support with UI. Findings are that older people have reduced health expectations, and may see UI as a 'natural' consequence of ageing. They were often embarrassed to seek help, and were likely to try to contain the problem, but at some social and psychological cost: restricting fluid intake, wearing certain clothing, avoiding social situations. Some did use pads (and one described an embarrassing and public disclosure when she went to pick them up). Management of urinary incontinence is an aspect of self-management which social care staff could support, while also prompting referral to a GP or community nurse.

Understanding and using telecare

May (2011 ++) is a UK qualitative study which aims to understand the general dynamics of service implementation and integration across a range of settings, and in particular understand the factors inhibiting the implementation and integration of telecare systems for chronic disease management. Authors noted a range of factors that affect or inhibit the implementation of telecare which mean that 'uncertainty is continuously cycled' (May 2011 Figure 1).

These include, for example: the difficulty of negotiating its use with people who use services; telecare systems being inflexible, inadequate or incoherent across organisational boundaries; and, insufficient or inappropriate evidence underpinning its use.

Service user experience: Service users reported not being informed on how telecare may impact on other technologies in the home – there was little opportunity to individualise the system, and the workings of the machine forced the user to adapt to the workings of the machine. There was a sense of a lack of purpose in collecting the kind of information demanded by the system.

For some service users telecare was 'stepping up' from what they were already doing and provided an extra feeling of security. From service users' perspective, the system provided a fast-track route to access to professional care as and when required.

Education for self-care

Berzins (2009) is a good quality systematic review with a high degree of relevancy to the topic and takes a UK perspective on self-management. The study looks at characteristics of self-care support initiatives in the UK, aimed at older people with long-term conditions. Eighteen studies were included, and the average age of participants was 60, so it was clearly not confined to older people. The review looks at a range of health and social care outcomes including physical functioning, self-efficacy, quality of life, admissions and adherence to treatment. The studies showed a particular emphasis on patient education to enhance self-efficacy in self-managing particular long-term conditions, and included only one paper on the generic EPP.

The studies focused on the following long-term conditions: arthritis, diabetes, congestive obstructive pulmonary disease and stroke (1 study). The review observed that each study linked self-management interventions to the needs of the group concerned, so pain management was important for arthritis sufferers and dietary advice was a central part of intervention for diabetes patients. A tailored approach for different conditions was clearly adopted.

Of studies included in the review, none showed large effects on outcomes following the intervention. Some of the studies showed positive effects: the best effects were found in relation to physical functioning. Exercise was part of 16 of the pilots but not reported as an outcome in most; of the 3 that did, 2 found positive effects. Interventions which targeted pain as an outcome had little success in securing improvements, with 1 study of 13 showing a small effect. The study authors suggest that the lack of significant outcomes could be due to short follow up periods in some of the studies.

Self-management support in primary care

Kennedy (2013) is a methodologically rigorous, UK cluster RCT (evidence rating +/+). The intervention trialled involved training primary care staff in practices to develop a 'whole system' approach to self-management support. The intervention included: tools to assess the needs of patients regarding self-care, guides on self-care and access on an online resource with links to self-management resources. The study attempted to embed self-management support into practice. The study took place in 44 practices in North West England, and aimed to measure outcomes such as shared decision making, self-efficacy and generic health-related quality of life.

Outcome measures aimed to determine the effects of self-management support on primary care patients with chronic conditions in the UK. The findings are disappointing, as, although follow ups were carried out at 6 and 12 months, no significant effects were observed in the intervention group. The authors conclude that the intervention to enhance self-management support in routine primary care did not add noticeable value to existing care for long-term conditions. The active components required for effective self-management support need to be better understood, both within primary care and in patients' everyday lives. The authors also suggest that there was variation between practices in the way that self-management support was embedded into treatment, and that some professionals were not given adequate training.

Managing insomnia

Morgan (2011 +/+) is a UK RCT of a self-help cognitive behavioural therapy (CBT) programme which offers a practical first line response to older people

(55+) being treated with hypnotic drugs for insomnia symptoms associated with chronic disease in primary care settings. The intervention is delivered through 6 booklets on aspects of sleep hygiene and management, and a telephone helpline staffed by trained 'expert patients' was made available at restricted times of the day to provide support in using the CBT materials.

A total of 193 patients (aged 55–87) were randomly allocated to the intervention (n=98) or treatment as usual (n=95) groups. Patients in the self-help arm showed significantly improved sleep quality, and significantly reduced insomnia symptom severity at post-treatment, 3- and 6-month follow ups (all p<0.001); and significantly reduced sleep medication use at the post treatment follow up (p<0.05). Effect sizes were moderate (range of adjusted Cohen d=0.51–0.75), and treatment had no effect on levels of daytime fatigue, which the authors suggest may be a result of symptoms of long-term chronic conditions. Most treated patients (73%) said they would recommend the self-help programme to others. Management of insomnia is a problem which social care staff might support.

Evidence statements

ES24	**Expert Patient Programme**
	There is moderately good qualitative evidence (from Abraham 2009 +) that group activities such as the EPP are valued by participants (age unclear) as an opportunity for social contact, and that the goal-setting aspect of the Programme increased self-efficacy. There is additional evidence of moderate quality from an RCT (Kennedy 2007 +/+, see below) that the EPP may achieve some statistically significant increases in self-efficacy and energy in people of all ages who undertake the Programme.
ES25	**Medication adherence**
	There is moderate systematic review evidence (Banning 2008 +) that older people who do not adhere to their prescribed medication may have both

	intentional and non-intentional reasons for not doing so. The evidence suggests that shared decision making between clinicians and patients on what to prescribe, aided by better explanations of effects and clearer instruction, could increase older people's ability and willingness to take their prescribed medication.
ES26	**Signposting**
	There is evidence of moderate quality from a mixed methods study (Challis 2010b +/-) that older people might be enabled to play a more effective role in managing their conditions if they had better information about their conditions, and were signposted to local services that might support them.
ES27	**Transport availability**
	There is evidence of moderate quality from a mixed methods study (Challis 2010b +/-) that frailty of older people may reduce their ability to self-manage their health conditions, as well as their personal and household care tasks. Availability of transport may be of particular importance in maintaining independence in the community.
ES28	**Urinary incontinence**
	There is moderate to good qualitative evidence (Horrocks 2004 +) that older people often do not seek help with UI, out of embarrassment or belief that it is a natural outcome of ageing, and that primary care staff do not routinely enquire about this. Consequently, people with UI lead more restricted lives than they otherwise might, avoiding unfamiliar social situations and restricting fluid intake.
ES29	**Information about telecare**
	There is good qualitative evidence (May 2011 ++) that potential and actual users of telecare services are not well-informed about their purposes, and how they do or might support person-centred care within an individual care plan.
ES30	**Implementation of the Expert Patient Programme**
	There is evidence of moderate quality from a mixed methods study (Rogers 2008 +/+) that, at least in 2006, NHS primary care trusts struggled to implement the EPP due to lack of expertise in public and patient engagement, and the separation of specialist services from generic approaches.
ES31	**Content of the Expert Patient Programme**
	There is evidence of moderate quality from a mixed methods study (Rogers 2008, +/+) that participants in the Expert Patients' Programme would also favour a less generic and more disease-specific formula, but would welcome the ability to influence the Programme content to reflect generic concerns, such as access to welfare benefits.
ES32	**Education for self-management**
	There is good systematic review evidence (Berzins 2009 ++/++) that self-management educative programmes to support self-care in people with specific long-term conditions of average age of 60 may not secure measurable improvements. Some positive effects of exercise on physical functioning were apparent, but it is uncertain whether they made significant improvements within participants' lives.
ES33	**Economic evidence for self-management programmes**
	While there is moderate quality evidence on the effectiveness of self-management programmes from the EPP (Kennedy 2007 +/+, moderate

	quality), which also reported on cost-effectiveness, the sample population is insufficiently applicable to draw conclusions about cost-effectiveness for older people with multiple long-term conditions and social care needs.
ES34	**Self-management support in primary care**
	There is some evidence of moderate quality from an RCT (Kennedy 2013 +/+) that embedding self-management support in primary care practice is difficult, and may not yield any measurable improvements for patients.
ES35	**CBT for insomnia**
	There is some moderate evidence from an RCT (Morgan, 2011 +/+) to support the use of a CBT programme administered in primary care settings in helping older people (55+) with chronic disease to manage insomnia.

Included studies for these review questions

Abraham C (2009) What psychological and behaviour changes are initiated by 'expert patient' training and what training techniques are most helpful? Psychology and Health 24(10): 1153-65

Banning M (2008) Older people and adherence with medication: A review of the (qualitative) literature. International Journal of Nursing Studies 45(10): 1150-61

Berzins K, Reilly S, Abell J et al (2009) UK self-care support initiatives for older patients with long-term conditions: A review. Chronic Illness 5(1): 56-72

Brody BL, Roch-Levecq AC, Kaplan RM et al. (2006) Age-related macular degeneration: self-management and reduction of depressive symptoms in a randomized, controlled study. Journal of the American Geriatrics Society 54(10): 1557-62

Challis DJ, Hughes J, Berzins K, et al (2010b) Self-care and Case Management in Long-term Conditions: The Effective Management of Critical Interfaces. NIHR. UK

Horrocks S, Somerset M, Stoddart H et al. (2004) What prevents older people from seeking treatment for urinary incontinence? A qualitative exploration of barriers to the use of community continence services. Family Practice 21(6): 689-96

Kennedy A, Reeves D, Bower P et al. (2007) The effectiveness and cost effectiveness of a national lay-led self care support programme for patients with long-term conditions: a pragmatic randomised controlled trial. Journal of Epidemiology and Community Health 61(3): 254-61

Kennedy A, Bower P, Reeves D et al. (2013) Implementation of self-management support for long-term conditions in routine primary care settings: Cluster randomised controlled trial. BMJ, 346 (f2882): 1-11

Mason A, Weatherly H, Spilsbury K, et al (2007) A systematic review of the effectiveness and cost-effectiveness of different models of community-based respite care for frail older people and their carers. Health technology assessment 11(15)

Morgan K, Gregory P, Tomeny M et al. (2011) Self-help treatment for insomnia symptoms associated with chronic conditions in older adults: a randomised controlled trial. Journal of the American Geriatrics Society 60(10). 1803-10

Rogers A, Kennedy A, Bower P, et al (2008) The United Kingdom Expert Patients Programme: results and implications from a national evaluation. The Medical Journal of Australia 190(10suppl): S21-4

3.4 Social isolation

Introduction to the review questions

The purpose of the review questions on social isolation was to identify evidence that would guide recommendations about different ways to recognise and respond to social isolation experienced by older people with multiple long-term conditions. The review sought evidence from effectiveness studies and views and experiences of service users and their families and/or carers as well as views and experiences of service practitioners.

Review questions

Q.2.1.6   How can older people with multiple long-term conditions living in the community or in care home settings be supported to participate in community, family and social activities?

Q.1.1.1   What are the views and experiences of older people with multiple long-term conditions and their carers, of the social care services they receive?

Q.1.1.2   Do service users and carers consider that their care is (a) personalised; (b) integrated or coordinated with healthcare?

Q.1.1.2   What do they think works well and what needs to change?

Q.1.2.1   What are the views and experiences of practitioners, managers and commissioners in health and social care who procure, manage or deliver care to older people with multiple long-term conditions, in community and care home settings?

Q.1.2.2   What do they think works well, and what needs to change?

Summary of review protocols

The protocols sought to identify studies which would:

- review material identified to address 2.1.1, to consider how social participation is reflected in care assessment and planning; and how people access information about participation-related activities
- consider how social participation can be improved in each of the relevant care settings as part of a coordinated package of care.

Population: Older people, aged 65 years and older, with multiple long-term conditions that use social care services, and their families, partners and carers. People who pay for and people who organise their own care are included.

Intervention: Interventions and approaches targeted at reducing isolation, including: befriending schemes, group activities, volunteer schemes, strengths-based approaches.

Setting: Service users' home, including sheltered housing accommodation; care (residential and nursing) homes (not hospital settings).

Comparator: Comparisons could be made between usual care and different ways of alleviating social isolation.

Outcomes: Measures of wellbeing and quality of life, participation in community, family and social activities, measures of social support and effects on social isolation and loneliness.

The study designs relevant to these questions were expected to include:

- systematic reviews of qualitative and quantitative studies on interventions on this topic

- qualitative studies of service user views

- standardised scales measuring satisfaction and wellbeing

- RCTs and cluster RCTs

- other studies with controlled comparisons

- analyses of care planning materials.

Full protocols can be found in Appendix A.

How the literature was searched

The evidence reviews used to develop the guideline recommendations were underpinned by systematic literature searches. The aim of the systematic searches was to comprehensively identify the published evidence to answer the review questions developed by the Guideline Committee and NICE Collaborating Centre for Social Care.

The search strategies for the review questions (based on the scope) were developed by the NICE Collaborating Centre for Social Care in order to identify empirical research. The search strategies are listed in Appendix A.

Searches were based upon retrieving items for the population groups: 'older people', 'carers', 'long-term conditions', 'workforce/social care organisation' in the settings of 'residential care', 'nursing/care homes', 'intermediate care' or 'community care'. Searches were developed using subject heading and free text terms, aiming to balance sensitivity and precision, and the strategy was run across a number of databases. The searches limited results to studies published from 2004 onwards. The database searches were not restricted to specific geographical areas; however, in selecting the websites to search, research on people's views was focused on the UK. The sources searched are listed below. Forward and backwards citation searches using Google Scholar were undertaken in January 2015 for all of the included studies.

The Guideline Committee members were also asked to alert the NICE Collaborating Centre for Social Care to any additional evidence, published, unpublished or in press, that met the inclusion criteria.

Full details of the search can be found in Appendix A.

How studies were selected

Search outputs (title and abstract only) were stored in EPPI Reviewer 4 – a software programme developed for systematic review of large search outputs – and screened against an exclusion tool informed by the parameters of the scope. Formal exclusion criteria were developed and applied to each item in the search output, as follows:

- language (must be in English)
- population (must be older people with multiple long-term conditions, with a social care need)
- intervention (must be identification/assessment of social care needs; personalised care planning; support to self-manage; integrate social and healthcare; training of staff to recognise/manage common long-term

conditions; support for carers to care; interventions to support involvement and participation, including information for users and carers

- setting (must be in the person's home or care home)
- workforce (must involve people who work in social care, are integrated with social care or act as gatekeepers to social care)
- country (must be UK, European Union, Denmark, Norway, Sweden, Canada, USA, Australia and New Zealand)
- date (not published before 2004)
- type of evidence (must be research)
- relevance to (1 or more) review questions.

Title and abstract of all research outputs were screened against these exclusion criteria. Those included at this stage were marked for relevance to particular review questions and retrieved as full texts.

Full texts were again reviewed for relevance and research design. If still included, critical appraisal (against NICE tools) and data extraction (against a coding set developed to reflect the review questions) was carried out. The coding was all conducted within EPPI Reviewer 4, and formed the basis of the analysis and evidence tables. All processes were quality assured by double coding of queries, and of a random sample of 10%.

We screened the papers (titles and abstracts) identified in the search outputs and retrieved full texts for those that appeared relevant. We then screened the papers using the full study to assess quality and relevance. The focus of this search was to find high quality studies which contained the views and experiences of service users, carers and practitioners.

Qualitative studies and papers with a mixed methodology were assessed for quality and relevance for older people with long-term conditions. Our focus for this question was on identifying high quality and contextually relevant evidence, as a result so we looked only at UK studies. The following 2 studies met the criteria.

The included studies were critically appraised using NICE tools for appraising different study types, and the results tabulated. Further information on critical appraisal is given in the introduction at the beginning of [Section 3](#). Study findings were extracted into findings tables. For full critical appraisal and findings tables, see Appendix B.

Narrative summary

The 2 papers identified (Blickem 2013; Granville 2010) are both of qualitative papers of moderate to good quality (+) in relation to their qualitative methods. Both of their samples were relatively small and taken in localised areas. The sample demographics for either study were not representative in terms of gender or ethnic origin. The Granville study (2010 +) set out to gather views and experiences of older people on a variety of topics and so may be relevant to other questions to be addressed during the guidance development process. The Blickem study (2013 +) has data which specifically relates to social isolation but its findings around community interventions are inconclusive. There appears to be a particular lack of evidence which focuses on the views and experiences of practitioners and carers in relation to social isolation.

Due to the specificity of our target group there remains a paucity of evidence which reports older people's views and experiences around social isolation.

Factors that can contribute to social isolation

Isolation and loneliness were revealed to relate to getting older, the loss of a partner or spouse, retirement, poor finances and peers dying or going into care homes. Social Isolation is also shown to be related to poor health and mobility problems which made getting about difficult or impossible. Problems accessing transport was shown to be a key barrier to participation in community activities. 'Deprived communities' (Blickem 2013 p56) might also lack the resources to hold community groups. The socially isolated may also lack the connections within their communities to find out about resources in their area.

Extent of social isolation in communal living environments compared to when living alone

Both papers found that social isolation and loneliness were a 'significant issue for older people with high support needs – both for those living in care homes and those living at home' (Granville 2010 + p69). Blickem reports an assumption that being with other older people in a care home means that a person is not lonely, and participants in this study refute this. Older people in care homes who were able to maintain links with friends and family reported that they maintained a sense of identity and meaning in their lives (Granville 2010 +). Participants in the Granville study ask that care staff raise their expectations of what older people want from their social lives and provide more assistance to realise these ambitions.

Older people's perceptions of social isolation and opportunities to meet others

Participants in Granville's study reported that loneliness and isolation was 'the most difficult part of getting older or coping with poor health' (p16). Blickem reports that older people feel isolated not only from family and friends but also their local communities as a whole, particularly those living in care homes.

Older people also wanted to diversify their interactions beyond people of their own age groups: 'Having friends of diverse ages and with varying levels of need for support themselves might help people maintain fuller social lives' (Granville 2010 p31). Day centres were also not necessarily seen as a providing an adequate mix of ages or opportunities to be involved in 'normal life' (Granville 2010 p31).

Facilitators of, and structures to, support participation and involvement

Involvement in community activities of various types expanded older people's social networks, sometimes helping them to remain in their own homes for longer (Blickem 2013). Older people who were able to keep visiting familiar social places retained a sense of participation in normal life (Granville 2010). Community groups they visited provided a 'rare opportunity for social contact' (Blickem 2013 p52). Community groups were an environment which

normalised chronic illness and could function as a 'forum for exchange of emotional and practical support' for users (Blickem 2013 p52). Blickem also found that community groups provided additional services for the socially isolated like transport services and advice on welfare benefits.

Evidence statements

ES36	**Factors that can contribute to social isolation**
	Two qualitative papers of good quality with qualitative methods (Blickem 2013 +; Granville 2010 +) found that social isolation was a significant problem for older people with high support needs – whether they lived in the community at home, or in care homes. Isolation and loneliness were exacerbated by the loss of a partner or spouse, retirement, peers dying or going into residential care, poor finances and poor mobility and lack of transport.
ES37	**Extent of social isolation in communal living environments compared to when living alone**
	A good quality qualitative paper (Blickem 2013 +) reports that older people who live in communal environments are as likely to feel isolated and lonely as those remaining in their own homes. Granville (2010 +) also confirms that people in care homes who maintained a network of friends and family retained 'more of their own sense of identity and have more meaning in their lives' (p69).
ES38	**Older people's perceptions of social isolation**
	Two good quality qualitative studies (Blickem 2013 +; Granville 2010 +) found that older people felt cut off from the wider 'community', not just from family and friends. Some had left their home and could no longer access local facilities and community activities. This led to a sense of disconnection, and a loss of activity and interaction that was part of 'normal life'. People therefore want to take part in activities that are situated in the community. Community participation was felt to be a motivating factor to be positive about themselves, their lives and their health.
ES39	**Older people's perceptions of opportunities for meeting other people**
	There is good evidence from a good quality qualitative study (Blickem 2013 +) that people valued the opportunity to meet with people who shared similar frustrations and needs because of their health: support from other older people with long-term conditions could be a 'forum for exchange of emotional and practical support' (p52). The groups also provided additional services for the socially isolated in that they could help access transport services and give advice on welfare benefits: 'Linkage to these resources through the groups was described as a lifeline to help which otherwise participants struggled to know how access' (p52). There is evidence from 1 good study (Granville 2010 +) that older people also want diverse opportunities for social participation with people of different ages and interests as in 'normal life', so day centres (for example) were not necessarily an adequate response. Some people said they wanted more support to carry out activities such as shopping and going to the pub as opportunities to participate in 'normal' life.
ES40	**Facilitators of, and structures to, support participation and involvement**

	Two good quality qualitative studies (Blickem 2013 +; Granville 2010 +) conclude that older people living in the community or care homes need more opportunities for social participation in the community, and that transport is a vital service needed to support this. Granville (2010 +) emphasises the importance of visibility and retaining/strengthening personal and social networks as people age (p80), and recommends further development of approaches such as: 'circles of support, time-banking, home-share, and other forms of mutual support' (p80).
ES41	**Economic evidence on interventions to address social isolation**
	There was no economic evidence to draw conclusions about the cost-effectiveness of different interventions to address social isolation.

Included studies for these review questions

Blickem C, Kennedy A, Vassilev I et al (2013) Linking people with long-term health conditions to healthy community activities: development of Patient-Led Assessment for Network Support (PLANS). Health Expect 16(3): e48-59

Granville G, Runnicles J, Barker S, et al (2010) Increasing the Voice, Choice and Control of Older People with High Support Needs: A Research Findings Paper from the South East Regional Initiative (SERI). Centre for Policy on Aging 1-122.

Expert witnesses

In response to gaps in the evidence, 2 expert witnesses were called to give additional evidence on social isolation. A summary of the testimony provided by each expert witness is provided below along with the rationale for inviting these particular expert witnesses. For full testimonies see Appendix D.

Section A	
Name:	1. Melissa March (MM)
Job title:	Director – Learning for the Fourth Age

| Rationale for, and aims of, expert witness testimony: | There is no good research evidence about the ability of interventions to reduce social isolation, and provide stimulating and social activity for older people with multiple long-term conditions, whether they are living in community dwellings or in care homes. The aims of such activity might be to reduce loneliness, increase social contact with people of all ages, continue to sustain and develop interests, activities and identities of older people, and enable older people with multiple long-term conditions to participate meaningfully in their local communities. These are all outcomes which research tells us are valued by older people.

This group of people are likely to have health and mobility problems which act as barriers to social participation and other activity. They may also be living with dementia, have sensory impairment, and may not speak English as a first language.

A Guideline Committee member suggested the director of Learning for the Fourth Age as someone with experience and knowledge in this area, to provide useful testimony. |
|---|---|

Expert testimony

Learning for the Fourth Age (L4A) provides learning opportunities for older people receiving care. We focus on better quality of life, mental stimulus and delaying the onset of dementia by learning through activities, pastimes and roles, which bring pleasure and meaning. Learning mentors encourage existing interests or developing new ones, with resources meeting support needs.

L4A is a social enterprise providing learning opportunities to older people receiving care across in Leicester and Leicestershire. A not-for-profit organisation, we work with over 150 older people each week and have 80 volunteers at any one time. During 2013/14, L4A volunteers provided over 14,500 hours of volunteering time to fourth agers living across Leicester and Leicestershire. Any surplus created is reinvested in to our work with some of the oldest people across the city and county.

L4A is strongly established in Leicester, with a track record of providing high quality, personalised learning opportunities to older people receiving care. Our work makes a real difference to the quality of older people's lives and provides mental stimulus, for example using new technologies, and getting engaged with absorbing practical activities, such as gardening, art and music.

From 'Exploring Learning in Later Life: External Evaluation of Learning for the Fourth Age (L4A)' by independent evaluators: Dr Trish Hafford-Letchfield (University of Middlesex) and Dr Peter Lavender (NIACE) in December 2013:

Independent evaluators, Dr Trish Hafford-Letchfield and Dr Peter Lavender, found:

There are significant benefits. L4A's creates successful learning partnerships with

traditionally neglected groups of older people in poor health and with limiting disabilities.

'L4A has developed methods that engage older people in 1-to-1 learning, in couples and groups, with some taking up lead roles) for example, facilitating music appreciation, art and computing.

'We saw rich examples of learning experiences … Within care homes, older people had made significant progress, found new skills and knowledge and had become more confident by:

- learning new things (e.g. painting)
- keeping the body active (e.g. knitting); learning for health (e.g. armchair exercise)
- learning what's going on in the world (e.g. discussion of news) learning more capability
- keeping the mind active (e.g. discussing topics, books)
- stimulating the process of learning (e.g. through arts-based learning)
- reflecting on a life well spent (through reminiscence using films, biography, and storytelling)
- helping maintain independence (e.g. better social contact, developing new relationships)
- developing skills and knowledge for survival (e.g. online shopping, emailing relatives)
- learning to understand and build relationships with other people in relation to age and ethnicity, and particularly being in contact with younger people
- learning about oneself in later life and how to connect, contribute, feel productive and promoting resilience where there are adverse health conditions.

These make a significant difference to individuals' wellbeing, bringing new ideas, improving understanding and maintaining a positive outlook. L4A is creative and ground-breaking in non-formal learning.'

Section A:	
Name:	2. Rachel Mortimer (RM)
Job title:	Founder, Engage and Create
Subject of expert testimony:	Research question 2.1.6: Social isolation: How can older people with multiple long-term conditions living in the community or in residential care be supported to participate in community, family and social activities?
Rationale for, and aims of expert witness testimony:	There is limited good research evidence concerning the ability of interventions to reduce social isolation, and provide stimulating and social activity for older people with multiple long-term conditions, whether they are living in community dwellings or in care homes. The aims of such activity might be to reduce loneliness, increase social contact with people of all ages, continue to sustain and develop interests, activities and identities of older people, and enable older people with multiple long-term conditions to participate meaningfully in their local communities. These are all outcomes which research tells us are valued by older people. This group of people are likely to have health and mobility problems which act as barriers to social participation and other activity. They may also be living with dementia, have sensory impairment, and may not speak English as a first language. A GDG member suggested an individual who leads the Engage and Create programme that could provide testimony/case studies of activities in care homes.

Rachel Mortimer is a social entrepreneur and professional artist. Her background is an eclectic mix of media organisation (ITV, Saatchi's), teaching and caring. Having gained a Montessori Diploma with distinction she is currently completing a BSc psychology. Rachel started Engage and Create after visiting a dementia care home and realising the lack of opportunities for residents to participate in meaningful activity that provided cognitive stimulation. She developed the Ignite Sessions to provide a cultural and stimulating way of getting people engaging with each other. They will be available to access via a licence later this year with training in the technique used to facilitate these sessions with people at all stages of dementia.

Rachel has been awarded a Fellowship from The School of Social Entrepreneurs, been a winner of the SE Assist programme (Legal & General), Juice FM's chosen social enterprise 2014/15

Research Question 2.1.6: Social isolation: how can older people with multiple long-term conditions living in the community or in residential care be supported to participate in community, family and social activities?

What we know

- Social identities are built from group membership. Feeling a sense of

belonging affects our self-esteem.

- Passive activities (watching TV/listening to radio) for both women and men increase risk of death.
- Social activities are very important for not only wellbeing but longer life.

Solution 1: future planning, build to encourage community inclusion and social opportunities

- Humanitas NL – apartments for life – sick and healthy people live together, old and young, poor and rich, migrant and Dutch. There is a deliberate mixing of residents, in terms of health status and socioeconomic status. Their inclusion is seen as an important element in avoiding an 'institutional' feel.
- Hogeway Dementia Village – themed houses of 6 to 7 people. The restaurant and theatre are open to the public, help towards the running costs and bring local community into the setting, breaking down barriers.

Solution 2: making the most of what we have, bring the outside in

- Engage and Create's Ignite Sessions for people with dementia use culture as an opportunity to bring people together. Ignite Sessions introduce art appreciation as a social experience in care homes/day centres/art galleries.
- Festival in a Box, Bloomsbury – connect festivals to care homes and bring parts of them into the home or creates 'dementia friendly' performances.
- Community Visitor Scheme, Essex – dedicated community volunteers befriending those in care homes. Encouraged participation in activities.
- Gloucestershire Care Homes Part of Our Community (POPPs) – unlocked potential and skills of current care home workforce. Used quality training to help activities coordinators.

Solution 3: sharing spaces, the outdoors

- Kastaniehaven, Denmark – kindergarten and care homes use the same spaces, older people can watch the children playing.
- Dementia Adventure (Essex) – provides easy walks on wheelchair friendly paths in local parks.

Solution 4: sharing spaces, residential care and learning

- Lasell Village, Boston, USA – combines retirement community with the cultural, social and recreational opportunities of lifelong learning.
- Hillcrest Mable Rose, Omaha, USA – students from the Montessori School visit every Friday to study alongside the centre's residents.
- Peder Lykke Centre, Copenhagen – Day High School offers opportunity to have an active life, challenging and developing individuals.

Solution 5: sharing spaces, virtually

- CNA Language Exchange, Brazil – retirement home residents and language students share conversation over Skype to help improve children's English language skills. They also become pen pals.

Solution 6: sharing spaces, creatively

- Alive! Activities Paint Pals project – intergenerational project twinning junior schools with care homes to send painted postcards to one another.

Solution 7: creating communities within the care home

- The Gentlemen's Club, Truro – while decreasing wellbeing tends to be the norm in long-term residential care, building new social group memberships in the form of gender clubs can counteract this decline, particularly among men.

3.5   Workforce competencies

Introduction to the review questions

The purpose of the review questions on workforce competencies was to seek evidence which would guide recommendations about the induction, training, supervision and support given to social care staff providing care to older people in their own homes or in the community, in recognising and referring on commonly occurring, but often neglected, conditions. Examples of common conditions raised by stakeholders included UI, dehydration and malnutrition, as well as others.

Review questions

Q 3.1   How can social care practitioners delivering services to people with multiple long-term conditions be assisted to recognise, refer on and/or manage common health conditions and symptoms?

Q.1.1.1   What are the views and experiences of older people with multiple long-term conditions and their carers, of the social care services they receive?

Q.1.1.2   Do service users and carers consider that their care is (a) personalised; (b) integrated or coordinated with healthcare?

Q.1.1.2   What do they think works well and what needs to change?

Q.1.2.1   What are the views and experiences of practitioners, managers and commissioners in health and social care who procure, manage or deliver

care to older people with multiple long-term conditions, in community and care home settings?

Q.1.2.2   What do they think works well, and what needs to change?

Summary of review protocols

The protocol sought to identify studies which would:

- identify the effectiveness of approaches to existing induction, training and continuing personal development delivered to social care staff and (unregulated) personal assistants working with older people with multiple long-term conditions
- identify barriers and facilitators to the implementation of approaches which enable social care staff to identify and manage common health conditions and symptoms
- consider whether and how increased integration could foster shared learning and improved communication between care staff in relation to the identification and management of these common conditions.

Population: Social care practitioners (providers, workers, managers, social workers), and social care commissioners involved in delivering social care to people with long-term conditions in the community or care homes; personal assistants engaged by people with long-term conditions and their families. Nurses in residential care settings, primary and community healthcare staff, community matrons (who have a role in supporting care homes to access healthcare).

Intervention: Organisational skills support and continuing personal development; models of integration and cross-agency work and training; personalised services which identify and respond to the physical and mental existing and evolving care needs of the individual; staff support, supervision, training and assessment; development of and use of protocols.

Setting: Service users' home, including sheltered housing accommodation; care (residential and nursing) homes (not hospital settings).

Comparator: Comparative studies could compare different approaches to training in before and after studies in individuals, or compare training outcomes in different organisations.

Outcomes: Effectiveness studies of 'training' with follow up; outcomes relating to safeguarding and safety, such as falls prevention, prevention of back injury in carer; reduction in emergency hospital admissions; implementation of CQC regulations and contract monitoring; initiation of treatments (for example, for depression); measures of staff confidence.

The study designs relevant to these questions were expected to include:

- systematic reviews of qualitative and quantitative studies on interventions designed to improve staff competencies

- qualitative studies of service user and carer views of training and competencies of staff and themselves (drawing on 1.1.1)

- standardised scales measuring satisfaction and wellbeing

- RCTs and cluster RCTs on training

- other comparative studies

- observational and descriptive studies of implementation and process.

Full protocols can be found in Appendix A.

How the literature was searched

The evidence reviews used to develop the guideline recommendations were underpinned by systematic literature searches. The aim of the systematic searches was to comprehensively identify the published evidence to answer the review questions developed by the Guideline Committee and NICE Collaborating Centre for Social Care.

The search strategies for the review questions (based on the scope) were developed by the NICE Collaborating Centre for Social Care in order to identify empirical research. The search strategies are listed in Appendix A.

Searches were based upon retrieving items for the population groups: 'older people', 'carers', 'long-term conditions', 'workforce/social care organisation' in the settings of 'residential care', 'nursing/care homes', 'intermediate care' or 'community care'. Searches were developed using subject heading and free text terms, aiming to balance sensitivity and precision, and the strategy was run across a number of databases. The searches limited results to studies published from 2004 onwards. The database searches were not restricted to specific geographical areas; however, in selecting the websites to search, research on people's views was focused on the UK. The sources searched are listed below. Forward and backwards citation searches using Google Scholar were undertaken in January 2015 for all of the included studies.

The Guideline Committee members were also asked to alert the NICE Collaborating Centre for Social Care to any additional evidence, published, unpublished or in press, that met the inclusion criteria.

Full details of the search can be found in Appendix A.

How studies were selected

Search outputs (title and abstract only) were stored in EPPI Reviewer 4 – a software programme developed for systematic review of large search outputs – and screened against an exclusion tool informed by the parameters of the scope. Formal exclusion criteria were developed and applied to each item in the search output, as follows:

- language (must be in English)
- population (must be older people with multiple long-term conditions, with a social care need)
- intervention (must be identification/assessment of social care needs; personalised care planning; support to self-manage; integrate social and healthcare; training of staff to recognise/manage common long-term conditions; support for carers to care; interventions to support involvement and participation, including information for users and carers
- setting (must be in the person's home or care home)

- workforce (must involve people who work in social care, are integrated with social care or act as gatekeepers to social care)
- country (must be UK, European Union, Denmark, Norway, Sweden, Canada, USA, Australia and New Zealand)
- date (not published before 2004)
- type of evidence (must be research)
- relevance to (1 or more) review questions.

Title and abstract of all research outputs were screened against these exclusion criteria. Those included at this stage were marked for relevance to particular review questions and retrieved as full texts.

Full texts were again reviewed for relevance and research design. If still included, critical appraisal (against NICE tools) and data extraction (against a coding set developed to reflect the review questions) was carried out. The coding was all conducted within EPPI Reviewer 4, and formed the basis of the analysis and evidence tables. All processes were quality assured by double coding of queries, and of a random sample of 10%.

In our initial screen (on title and abstract), we found 72 studies which appeared relevant to one or more of the review questions. However, on screening further on title and abstract we did not find any material which directly responded to this question, because there were no experimental studies for training the social care workforce in recognising common long-term conditions in older people, either in their own home or in a care home.

Although no evidence was identified, recommendations were made on workforce training based on the consensus of the Guideline Committee.

3.6 Carer support

Introduction to the review questions

The purpose of the review questions on carer support was to identify evidence that would guide recommendations about different ways services can support informal and family carers of older people with multiple long-term conditions. The review sought evidence from effectiveness studies and views and experiences of service users and their families and/or carers as well as views and experiences of service practitioners.

Review questions

Q.3.3.2   How should services work with and support carers of older people with multiple long-term conditions (who may have long-term conditions themselves)?

Q.1.1.1   What are the views and experiences of older people with multiple long-term conditions and their carers, of the social care services they receive?

Q.1.1.2   Do service users and carers consider that their care is (a) personalised; (b) integrated or coordinated with healthcare?

Q.1.1.2   What do they think works well and what needs to change?

Q.1.2.1   What are the views and experiences of practitioners, managers and commissioners in health and social care who procure, manage or deliver care to older people with multiple long-term conditions, in community and care home settings?

Q.1.2.2   What do they think works well, and what needs to change?

Summary of review protocols

The protocol sought to identify studies which would:

- identify approaches in care planning and delivery which enable carers, partners and families to participate in care planning and delivery, both in community and care home contexts
- identify and evaluate interventions and approaches (including information, education) which support carers in the tasks of caring
- consider how providers of social care and healthcare should work in partnership and support carers of older people with multiple long-term conditions, including identification of remediable difficulties (such as need for training and introduction of lifting equipment; need for support for social interaction and participation).

Population: Carers of older people with multiple long-term conditions, aged 65 years and older with multiple long-term conditions. Carers and family members of people who pay for and people who organise their own care are included.

Intervention: Support to carers (involvement in planning and delivery, specific support such as needs assessment and respite, training in skills such as lifting; support to enable social participation and reduce isolation of carers).

Setting: Service users' homes, including sheltered housing accommodation; family carers' role in supporting older people in care home settings.

Comparator: Comparative studies could compare different models and interventions that support carers.

Outcomes: User and carer satisfaction with services; perception of quality and continuity of care; perception of carer burden; choice and control for users and carers; involvement in decision making; dignity and independence; quality of life; health status of user and carer; safety and safeguarding within both settings; unplanned hospital admissions and entry into residential care.

The study designs relevant to these questions were expected to include:

- systematic reviews of qualitative studies on this topic
- systematic reviews utilising measures of carer burden and satisfaction
- RCTs and cluster randomised trials of interventions to support carers to care (for example, education).

Full protocols can be found in Appendix A.

How the literature was searched

The evidence reviews used to develop the guideline recommendations were underpinned by systematic literature searches. The aim of the systematic searches was to comprehensively identify the published evidence to answer the review questions developed by the Guideline Committee and NICE Collaborating Centre for Social Care.

The search strategies for the review questions (based on the scope) were developed by the NICE Collaborating Centre for Social Care in order to identify empirical research. The search strategies are listed in Appendix A.

Searches were based upon retrieving items for the population groups: 'older people', 'carers', 'long-term conditions', 'workforce/social care organisation' in the settings of 'residential care', 'nursing/care homes', 'intermediate care' or 'community care'. Searches were developed using subject heading and free text terms, aiming to balance sensitivity and precision, and the strategy was run across a number of databases. The searches limited results to studies published from 2004 onwards. The database searches were not restricted to specific geographical areas; however, in selecting the websites to search, research on people's views was focused on the UK. The sources searched are listed below. Forward and backwards citation searches using Google Scholar were undertaken in January 2015 for all of the included studies.

The Guideline Committee members were also asked to alert the NICE Collaborating Centre for Social Care to any additional evidence, published, unpublished or in press, that met the inclusion criteria.

Full details of the search can be found in Appendix A.

How studies were selected

Search outputs (title and abstract only) were stored in EPPI Reviewer 4 – a software programme developed for systematic review of large search outputs – and screened against an exclusion tool informed by the parameters of the scope. Formal exclusion criteria were developed and applied to each item in the search output, as follows:

- language (must be in English)
- population (must be older people with multiple long-term conditions, with a social care need)
- intervention (must be identification/assessment of social care needs; personalised care planning; support to self-manage; integrate social and healthcare; training of staff to recognise/manage common long-term conditions; support for carers to care; interventions to support involvement and participation, including information for users and carers
- setting (must be in the person's home or care home)
- workforce (must involve people who work in social care, are integrated with social care or act as gatekeepers to social care)
- country (must be UK, European Union, Denmark, Norway, Sweden, Canada, USA, Australia and New Zealand)
- date (not published before 2004)
- type of evidence (must be research)
- relevance to (one or more) review questions.

Title and abstract of all research outputs were screened against these exclusion criteria. Those included at this stage were marked for relevance to particular review questions and retrieved as full texts.

Full texts were again reviewed for relevance and research design. If still included, critical appraisal (against NICE tools) and data extraction (against a coding set developed to reflect the review questions) was carried out. The coding was all conducted within EPPI Reviewer 4, and formed the basis of the

analysis and evidence tables. All processes were quality assured by double coding of queries, and of a random sample of 10%.

From 44 studies which appeared relevant (by title and abstract), we ordered full texts of those which appeared to concern either UK views and experiences of service users and their carers or impact studies of acceptable methodological quality On receiving and reviewing the full texts, we found 1 UK qualitative study of moderate quality looking at IPW in social care planning and delivery published by the National Institute for Health Research (NIHR). We also found a single systematic review published by the Health Technology Assessment (HTA) NHS R&D HTA Programme, on respite interventions.

The included studies were critically appraised using NICE tools for appraising different study types, and the results tabulated. Further information on critical appraisal is given in the introduction at the beginning of [Section 3](). Study findings were extracted into findings tables. For full critical appraisal and findings tables, see Appendix B.

Narrative summary

One systematic review (Mason et al 2007 +/+) was found relevant to this topic. This review of international research included 42 studies of which 20 were other systematic reviews, 22 were effectiveness studies (10 RCTs, 7 controlled and 5 uncontrolled), and 5 economic evaluations. Most of the included studies came from the USA, with a few from the UK and Australia.

Types of community-based respite for carers identified in the review included:

- adult day care (rehabilitative; day care providing case management range of services, including healthcare; special purpose day care)
- host family, providing a 5- to 7-day break for both carer and service user
- in-home respite (in some cases from volunteers, such as Marie Curie/hospice care, serving cancer patients)
- institutional respite (a single study on temporary admissions to nursing homes)

- video respite (video respite tape, to be used by carer to combat attention deficit (unclear if the tape content was personalised – 'favourite things').

Topics important to carers also drew on material identified as views of carers in relation to questions on approaches to care planning and delivery (2.1.1) and service delivery (2.1.2).

Impact of carer breaks on outcomes

No reliable evidence was found that respite either benefits or adversely affects care recipients, or that it delays entry to residential care. In-home respite (short stay 56%, overnight 48%) was more popular than either day care (28%) or overnight institutional respite (24%), and there were concerns that loved ones placed outside their familiar surroundings might experience deterioration and/or distress.

Cost-effectiveness of carer breaks

Mason et al (2007) conclude that the literature is unable to inform UK policy due to limitations in the evidence base: firstly, the one UK economic evaluation was a quasi-experimental study not an RCT, and secondly, the other non-UK studies – whether randomised or quasi-experimental – were limited in terms of their documentation of service use and inadequate reporting. Furthermore, none of the studies measured health-related quality of life.

Aspects of the care and support process that are important to older people and carers

Goodman et al (2011) was a study of moderate quality (+/+) using a multi-method approach. The focus was on IPW at all stages of care planning and delivery. The study concluded that older people and their carers define effectiveness of IPW by the processes of care as well as the outcomes. Timeliness, completion of actions as promised and perceived expertise, as well as the quality of relationships, were considered important.

Evidence statements

ES43	**Impact of carer breaks on outcomes**
	There is good quality evidence from a systematic review (Mason et al 2007 +/+) which relies on studies published before 2004 that carer breaks (referred to in the literature as 'carer respite') for carers of frail elderly people may have a small positive effect upon carers in terms of burden and mental or physical health. No reliable evidence was found that respite either benefits or adversely affects care recipients, or that it delays entry to residential care. In-home respite (short stay 56%, overnight 48%) was more popular than either day care (28%) or overnight institutional respite (24%), and there were concerns that loved ones placed outside their familiar surroundings might experience deterioration and/or distress.
ES44	**Aspects of the care and support process that are important to older people and carers**
	There is good evidence from 2 qualitative studies (Goodman et al 2012, +/+; Granville et al 2010 +) that, for older people and their carers, the process of care is as important as the outcomes. Older people want continuity of care in order to develop relationships with paid carers, a named key person to coordinate care, co-production of care with users and carers, and good links with the wider system of health and social care, allowing effective response at times of crisis.
ES45	**Cost-effectiveness of carer breaks**
	There is 1 good quality systematic review (Mason et al 2007 +/+) that identified 4 non-UK economic evaluations and 1 UK economic evaluation comparing day care with usual care in providing carers with respite (carer breaks). The authors conclude that the literature is unable to inform UK policy due to limitations in the evidence base: firstly, the one UK economic evaluation was a quasi-experimental study, not an RCT, and secondly, the other non-UK studies – whether randomised or quasi-experimental – were limited in terms of their documentation of service use and inadequate reporting. Furthermore, none of the studies measured health-related quality of life.

Included studies for these review questions

Goodman C, Drennan V, Manthorpe J, et al (2012) A study of the effectiveness of interprofessional working for community-dwelling older people - Final Report. NIHR, UK

Mason A, Weatherly H, Spilsbury K, et al (2007): A systematic review of the effectiveness and cost-effectiveness of different models of community-based respite care for frail older people and their carers. Health technology assessment 11(15): 1-157

1 *3.7   Evidence to recommendations*

2 This section of the guideline details the links between the guideline

3 recommendations, the evidence reviews, expert witness testimony and the

4 Guideline Committee discussions. The information is presented in a series of

5 linking evidence to recommendations (LETR tables).

6 **Linking Evidence to Recommendations (LETR) tables**

Topic/section heading	Identifying and assessing social care needs
Recommendations	1.1.1 Health and social care practitioners should consider referring older people with multiple long-term conditions to the local authority for a needs assessment as soon as it is identified that they may social need care and support. **(Guideline Committee Consensus)** 1.1.2 Consider referral for a specialist clinical assessment by a geriatrician or old-age psychiatrist to guide social care planning for older people with social care needs and multiple long-term conditions: - whose social care needs are likely to increase to the point where they are assessed as having a significant impact on the person's wellbeing - who may need to go into a nursing or care home. **(ES12)** 1.1.3 When planning and undertaking assessments for older people with social care needs and multiple long-term conditions, health and social care practitioners should: - always involve the person and, if appropriate, their carer take into account the person's strengths, needs and preferences - involve all relevant practitioners to address all of the person's needs, including their medical, psychological, emotional, social, personal, sexual, spiritual and cultural needs, sight, hearing and communication needs, and accommodation and environmental care needs - ensure that if a person and their carer cannot attend an assessment meeting, they have the opportunity to be involved in another way, for example in a separate meeting or through an advocate - give people information about the services available to them, their cost and how they can be paid for. **(ES6, Guideline Committee consensus, expert witness testimony 1. MM and 2. RM)** 1.1.4 Recognise that many carers of older people with social care needs and multiple long-term conditions will also need support. If the person's carer has specific social care needs of their own, refer them to the local authority for a needs assessment in

	their own right. **(Guideline Committee consensus)**
	1.1.5 Recognise that many older people with social care needs and multiple long-term conditions are also carers, but may not see themselves as such. Ask the person if they have caring responsibilities and, if so, ensure they are offered a carer's assessment. **(Guideline Committee consensus)**
Research recommendations	3.2 Which models of service delivery are effective and cost-effective for older people with social care needs and multiple long-term conditions?
Review questions	**Main review question**
	Q 2.1.1 What are the effects (benefits and harms) of different types of assessment and planning of personalised care on outcomes for older people with multiple long-term conditions and their carers?
	Other relevant review questions
	Q.1.1.1 What are the views and experiences of older people with multiple long-term conditions and their carers, of the social care services they receive?
	Q.1.1.2 Do service users and carers consider that their care is (a) personalised; (b) integrated or coordinated with healthcare?
	Q.1.1.2 What do they think works well and what needs to change?
	Q.1.2.1 What are the views and experiences of practitioners, managers and commissioners in health and social care who procure, manage or deliver care to older people with multiple long-term conditions, in community and care home settings?
	Q.1.2.2 What do they think works well, and what needs to change?
Quality of evidence	Most of the evidence for this topic of assessment and care planning was of moderate quality, and was largely based on the views and experiences of service users, their carers and practitioners. There was 1 high quality systematic review but the majority of the included studies in the review were largely outside of the date inclusion criteria and may be out of date in terms of current practice.
	None of the studies compared the effectiveness of different models of assessment and care planning and there was a lack of evidence of social care contribution to personalised care in assessment and care planning.
	The quality of research evidence in respect of users' and carers' views of services is of moderate to good quality. There was consistency across studies in relation to the issues of communication between professionals, service users and their carers care and barriers to a shared approach to assessment and care planning.
Relative value of different outcomes	The lack of effectiveness studies relevant to this question meant that it was not possible to ascertain and compare the relative value of outcomes associated with different models of assessment.
Trade-off between benefits and harms	Given the lack of effectiveness studies, it was not possible to make an assessment of the trade-offs between benefits and harms of different models based on comparative data. These recommendations, therefore, were informed predominantly by data on views and the Guideline Committee's experiences. Views data

	and the Guideline Committee's experience indicated that potential harms of conducting an assessment which does not take into account 'the whole person' may be that it results in a care plan which does not meet their needs.
Economic considerations	The economic evidence in relation to cost-effective models of service delivery are based on 3 non-UK studies: Australia (ES22), USA (ES17) and Canada (ES17). The economist conducted additional bibliographic searches that identified an additional 7 economic evaluations but these studies are older and it is unclear whether they are relevant for informing current practice and recommendations. Of the studies identified from the additional searches, there was only 1 UK study (ES12) and the remaining studies came from the USA or Italy (ES17). The internal validity of most studies was of moderate quality or higher quality (+ or ++) and only 1 study was rated as having low quality (-). Please refer to the evidence statements regarding the applicability of the economic evaluations in informing recommendations for UK practice. The studies are grouped into 4 main model types and even then interventions are not completely identical.
	Further economic analysis, as agreed in the Economic Plan, was carried on 1 particular model of assessment, care planning and service delivery (from Counsell et al 2007 ++/+ USA). A cost-utility and cost-consequence analysis was performed, along with sensitivity analyses, to test the likelihood of the intervention being cost-effective in the English context. This model was an outpatient, multidisciplinary geriatric team (composed of a geriatrician, pharmacist, physical therapist, mental health social worker, community-based services liaison, practice manager and administrative assistant) plus case management (performed jointly by an advanced practice nurse and social worker). Using only evidence from Counsell et al (2007), with the cost-utility analysis being based on health-related quality of life, our findings, which include sensitivity analyses, indicate that using a clinical threshold of £20,000 per quality-adjusted life year the intervention was not likely to be cost-effective in either 2- or 3-year scenarios but was more so at £30,000 per quality-adjusted life year. When considering additional evidence via the cost-consequence analysis, cost-effectiveness may be more favourable. The additional studies find that the intervention's effect includes improvements or no significant differences on mental health, general health, cognitive function, activities of daily living, function, and mortality. However, this is still within the context of the limitations, in particular, insufficient information on the intervention's impact on personal social services, in particular, the use of community social care services and admission to nursing or care homes. The implication being that the impact on social care costs is unclear. This is also in the context of a lack of information on the intervention's impact on carers. Taken together, there is still the fundamental issue that the evidence base we draw on is mainly older and from the USA. While we have attempted to explore the possibility of the intervention being cost-effective given the available data and using additional data, there is still too much uncertainty in order to draw a firm conclusion about the intervention's cost-effectiveness.

Evidence statements – numbered evidence statements from which the recommendation(s) were developed	**ES6 What older people want from care and support** There is good evidence from 1 qualitative study (Granville et al 2010 +) that older people value the importance of living a 'normal' life, maintaining social contact with people of all generations, having money and knowing their rights, and the ability to choose meaningful activities. **(RECs 1.1.2 and 1.1.5)** **ES12 Health and social care inputs into social care assessment and planning** This evidence statement is based on 1 good quality UK study measured over a 6-month period (Challis 2004 +/++). Findings from this study indicate that from the perspective of the NHS, personal social services, and individuals' private costs, the intervention is cost-effective for community-dwelling older people who may have 'substantial' or 'critical' social care needs or be at risk of nursing or care home placement. The intervention is a one-time healthcare assessment by a geriatrician or old age psychiatrist to guide the social care manager in social care planning. **(REC 1.1.2)**
Other considerations	The GC discussed that evidence was limited but agreed that this was an important area to make recommendations on the assessment process given how critical this is to people being supported in a way that addresses their needs. In particular, they identified how the assessment process should be delivered, aimed at emphasising and building on Care Act guidance. This involved, including reference to the role played by all practitioners involved in the assessment process, and by emphasising explicitly: - the importance of a multidisciplinary approach to assessment (an aspect which was strengthened by the economic analysis) to ensure health, social care and wider needs – such as preferred past-times and social activities – are considered by the most appropriate professionals from the outset - the importance of seeing the person as a whole, within the context of the life they want to lead and designing support accordingly (rather than seeing them as a collection of symptoms or conditions to be 'treated') - that the person and their carer or advocate should be central to, and involved in, the whole assessment process – committee members gave a range of examples that illustrated how people can be excluded or marginalised during assessment, and the negative impact this can have on their experience of care and the package of support available to them. In considering, based on their experiences, people's variable experience of assessment and planning, they also agreed to emphasise, as distinct recommendations (1.1.5, 1.1.6): - the rights of carers to an independent assessment (noting particularly that older people's carers are frequently other older people with complex social care needs of their own that may not have been addressed) - people's legal right to a copy of the planning and assessment documentation – members gave examples illustrating that this does not always happen.

Topic/section heading	Identifying and assessing social care needs
	Telecare to support older people with social care needs and multiple long-term conditions
Recommendations	1.1.6 The health or social care practitioner leading the assessment should discuss with the person any telecare options that may support them so that they can make informed choices about their usefulness to help them manage their conditions, as well as other potential benefits, risks and costs. **(ES 29)**
	1.1.7 The lead practitioner should consider, in discussion with the person, whether a demonstration of telecare equipment would help them to make an informed decision about it. **(ES29, Guideline Committee consensus)**
Research recommendations	The Guideline Committee did not identify this as a priority area to make research recommendations on.
Review questions	**Main review question**
	Q 2.1.1 What are the effects (benefits and harms) of different types of assessment and planning of personalised care on outcomes for older people with multiple long-term conditions and their carers?
	Other relevant review questions
	Q.1.1.1 What are the views and experiences of older people with multiple long-term conditions and their carers, of the social care services they receive?
	Q.1.1.2 Do service users and carers consider that their care is (a) personalised; (b) integrated or coordinated with healthcare?
	Q.1.1.2 What do they think works well and what needs to change?
	Q.1.2.1 What are the views and experiences of practitioners, managers and commissioners in health and social care who procure, manage or deliver care to older people with multiple long-term conditions, in community and care home settings?
	Q.1.2.2 What do they think works well, and what needs to change?
Quality of evidence	Most of the evidence for this topic of assessment and care planning was of moderate quality, and was largely based on the views and experiences of service users, their carers and practitioners. There was 1 high quality systematic review but the majority of the included studies in the review were largely outside of the date inclusion criteria and may be out of date in terms of current practice.
	None of the studies compared the effectiveness of different models of assessment and care planning and there was a lack of evidence of social care contribution to personalised care in assessment and care planning.
	The quality of research evidence in respect of users' and carers' views of services is of moderate to good quality. There was consistency across studies in relation to the issues of communication between professionals, service users and their carers care and barriers to a shared approach to assessment

	and care planning.
Relative value of different outcomes	The lack of effectiveness studies relevant to this question meant that it was not possible to ascertain and compare the relative value of outcomes associated with different models of assessment.
Trade-off between benefits and harms	Given that this review did not include a question on the effectiveness of telecare, it was not possible to make an assessment of the trade-offs between benefits and harms of different models of telecare based on comparative data. These recommendations, therefore, were informed predominantly by data on views and the Guideline Committee's experiences. They noted the potential benefits of telecare in terms of promoting people's independence but also cautioned that reduced contact (particularly if telecare is used as a substitute for face-to-face time) may be disadvantageous for the person. They also noted that many older people may have to fund their own telecare.
Economic considerations	No directly applicable economic evidence was identified. The guideline committee were, however, mindful of potential costs and resource use when making the recommendations.
Evidence statements – numbered evidence statements from which the recommendation(s) were developed	**ES29 Information about telecare** There is good qualitative evidence (May 2011 ++) that potential and actual users of telecare services are not well-informed about their purposes, and how they do or might support person-centred care within an individual care plan. **(RECs 1.1.6, 1.1.7)**
Other considerations	While it was not within the scope of this guideline to examine effectiveness evidence on specific telecare interventions for older people with multiple long-term conditions, telecare did feature in the evidence on self-management and views. The Guideline Committee also highlighted a number of examples of how telecare can be used to support people to live independently. On this basis, they agreed that the recommendations should include a reference to telecare, specifically focused on ensuring people have sufficient information to be able to consider their options and make decisions accordingly. Based on their experience, the Guideline Committee thought that the assessment stage would be the right time to discuss telecare with people to ensure they are informed about what is available and how it might help them achieve the outcomes identified in their support plan. They discussed the rapid pace of technological change and the fact that many older people may be very unfamiliar with different telecare devices, or anxious about using them. They agreed that offering people the option to test equipment before committing to it may therefore be useful.

8
9

10

Topic/section heading	Care planning Coordinating care
Recommendations	1.2.1 Ensure that older people with social care needs and multiple long-term conditions have a single, named care coordinator who acts as their first point of contact. Working within local arrangements, the named care coordinator should: - play a lead role in the assessment process - liaise and work with all health and social care services, including those provided by the voluntary and community sector - ensure referrals are made and actioned appropriately. **(ES4, ES5)** 1.2.2 Offer the older person the opportunity to: - be involved in planning their care and support - have a summary of their life story included in their care plan - prioritise the support they need, recognising that people want to do different things with their lives at different times, and that the way that people's long-term conditions affect them can change over time. **(Guideline Committee consensus)** 1.2.3 Ensure the person, their carers or advocate and the care practitioners jointly own the care plan, sign it to indicate they agree with it and are given a copy. **(ES4, ES5 and Guideline Committee Consensus)** 1.2.4 Review and update care plans regularly and at least annually (in line with the Care Act 2014) to recognise the changing needs associated with multiple long-term conditions. Record the results of the review in the care plan, along with any changes made. **(Guideline Committee consensus)**
Research recommendations	3.2 Which models of service delivery are effective and cost-effective for older people with social care needs and multiple long-term conditions?
Review questions	**Main review question** Q 2.1.1 What are the effects (benefits and harms) of different types of assessment and planning of personalised care on outcomes for older people with multiple long-term conditions and their carers? **Other relevant review questions** Q.1.1.1 What are the views and experiences of older people with multiple long-term conditions and their carers, of the social care services they receive? Q.1.1.2 Do service users and carers consider that their care is (a) personalised; (b) integrated or coordinated with healthcare? Q.1.1.2 What do they think works well and what needs to change? Q.1.2.1 What are the views and experiences of practitioners, managers and commissioners in health and social care who

	procure, manage or deliver care to older people with multiple long-term conditions, in community and care home settings?
	Q.1.2.2 What do they think works well, and what needs to change?
Quality of evidence	Most of the evidence for this topic of assessment and care planning was of moderate quality, and was largely based on the views and experiences of service users, their carers and practitioners. There was 1 high quality systematic review but the majority of the included studies in the review were largely outside of the date inclusion criteria and may be out of date in terms of current practice.
	None of the studies compared the effectiveness of different models of assessment and care planning and there was a lack of evidence of social care contribution to personalised care in assessment and care planning.
	The quality of research evidence in respect of users' and carers' views of services is of moderate to good quality. There was consistency across studies in relation to the issues of communication between professionals, service users and their carers and barriers to a shared approach to assessment and care planning.
Relative value of different outcomes	The lack of effectiveness studies relevant to this question meant that it was not possible to ascertain and compare the relative value of outcomes associated with different models of care planning.
Trade-off between benefits and harms	Given the lack of effectiveness studies, it was not possible to make an assessment of the trade-offs between benefits and harms of different models of telecare based on comparative data. These recommendations, therefore, were informed predominantly by data on views and the Guideline Committee's experiences Views data and the Guideline Committee's experience indicated that potential harms of conducting an assessment which does not take into account 'the whole person' may be that it results in a care plan which does not meet their needs.
Economic considerations	The economic evidence in relation to cost-effective models of care planning and service delivery are based on 3 non-UK studies: Australia (ES22), the USA (ES17) and Canada (ES17). The economist conducted additional bibliographic searches that identified an additional 7 economic evaluations but these studies are older it is unclear whether they are relevant for informing current practice and recommendations. Of the studies identified from the additional searches, there was only 1 UK study (ES12) and remaining studies came from the USA or Italy (ES17). The internal validity of most studies was of moderate quality or higher quality (+ or ++) and only 1 study was rated as having low quality (-). Please refer to the evidence statements regarding the applicability of the economic evaluations in informing recommendations for UK practice. The studies are grouped into 4 main model types and even then interventions are not completely identical.
	Further economic analysis, as agreed in the Economic Plan, was carried on 1 particular model of assessment, care planning, and service delivery (from Counsell et al 2007 ++/+ USA). A cost-utility and cost-consequence analysis was performed, along with sensitivity analyses, to test the likelihood of the intervention being

	cost-effective in the English context. This model was an outpatient, multidisciplinary geriatric team (composed of a geriatrician, pharmacist, physical therapist, mental health social worker, community-based services liaison, practice manager and administrative assistant) plus case management (performed jointly by an advanced practice nurse and social worker). Using only evidence from Counsell et al (2007), the cost-utility analysis based on health-related quality of life, our findings, which include sensitivity analyses, indicate that using a clinical threshold of £20,000 per quality-adjusted life year, the intervention was not likely to be cost-effective in either 2 or 3-year scenarios but was more so at £30,000 per quality-adjusted life year. When considering additional evidence via the cost-consequence analysis, cost-effectiveness may be more favourable. The additional studies find that the intervention's effect includes improvements or no significant differences on mental health, general health, cognitive function, activities of daily living, function, and mortality. However, this is still within the context of the limitations, in particular, insufficient information on the intervention's impact on personal social services, in particular, the use of community social care services and admission to nursing or care homes. The implication being that impact on social care costs are unclear. This is also in the context of a lack of information on the intervention's impact on carers. Taken together, there is still the fundamental issue that the evidence base we draw on is mainly older and from the USA. While we have attempted to explore the possibility of the intervention being cost-effective given the available data and using additional data, there is still too much uncertainty in order to draw a firm conclusion about the intervention's cost-effectiveness.
Evidence statements – numbered evidence statements from which the recommendation(s) were developed	**ES4: Models of interdisciplinary working** There is moderate quality evidence from systematic review and mixed methods papers (Trivedi 2013 +/-; Goodman et al 2012 +/+) that IPW may be cost-effective but does not show clearly that any particular model (for example, care management, collaborative working or integrated teams) delivers better outcomes. User and carers consistently value aspects of integrated service delivery which foster confidence in the reliability of services, continuity of paid carers, user and carer involvement in planning and reviewing care, services to support carers and the ability of services to respond effectively at times of crisis. There is also qualitative evidence that IPW can reduce carer burden. **(RECs 1.2.1, 1.2.9)** **ES5: Aspects of the care and support process that are important to older people and carers** There is good evidence from 2 studies, 1 mixed methods and 1 qualitative (Goodman et al 2012 +/+; Granville et al 2010 +) that, for older people and their carers, the process of care is as important as the outcomes. Older people want continuity of care in order to develop relationships with paid carers, a named key person to coordinate care, co-production of care with users and carers, and good links with the wider system of health and social care, allowing effective response at times of crisis. **(REC 1.2.1)**

Other considerations	The recommendations here drew on views studies of service users and carers, economic evidence and analysis, and a small amount of evidence of impact. It was supplemented by expert witness testimony and expertise from the Guideline Committee.
	The Guideline Committee consensus was that there should be a named coordinator to proactively navigate the various services for health and social care which was likely to be challenging for older people with multiple long-term conditions. This was a theme that was raised in several Guideline Committee meetings (4,5,7 and 9) and was also relevant to issues around enabling self-care (including medicines management) and undertaking assessments for care planning.
	While the evidence on models of care planning was limited, the Guideline Committee agreed that this was an important area to make recommendations on given how critical this is to people being supported in a way that addresses their needs. Similarly, they chose to also emphasise the importance of reviewing and updating care plans regularly.

11
12

Topic/section heading	**Care planning** **Planning care collaboratively**
Recommendations	1.2.5 Ensure care plans are tailored to each person, giving them choice and control and recognising the inter-related nature of multiple long-term conditions. Offer the person the opportunity to: - address a range of needs including medical, psychological, emotional, social, personal, sexual, spiritual and cultural needs, sight, hearing and communication needs and environmental care needs - address palliative and end-of-life needs - identify health problems, including continence needs and chronic pain and skin integrity, if appropriate, and the support needed to minimise their impact - identify the help they need to look after their own care and support, manage their conditions, take part in preferred activities, hobbies and interests, and make contact with relevant support services (see also section 1.5) - include leisure and social activities outside and inside the home, mobility and transport needs, adaptations to the home and any support needed to use them. **(ES6, ES7, ES10, ES39, expert witness testimony – 1. MM and 2. RM – and Guideline Committee consensus)** 1.2.6 Discuss medicines management with each person and their carer as part of care planning. (Guideline Committee consensus) 1.2.7 Write any requirements about managing medicines into the care plan including: - the purpose of, and information on medicines

- the importance of dosage and timing and implications of non-adherence
- details of who to contact in the case of any concerns.

For more information on managing medicines see the NICE guideline on medicines optimisation.

(ES25 and Guideline Committee consensus)

1.2.8 Develop care plans in collaboration with GPs and representatives from other agencies that will be providing support to the person in the care planning process. **(ES17, ES22)**

1.2.9 With the person's agreement, involve their carers or advocate in the planning process. Recognise that carers are important partners in supporting older people with social care needs and multiple long-term conditions. **(ES4, ES17, ES22 and Guideline Committee consensus)**

1.2.10 Ensure older people with social care needs and multiple long-term conditions are supported to make use of personal budgets, continuing healthcare budgets, individual service funds and direct payments (where they wish to) by:
- giving them and their carers information about the different mechanisms they could use to manage the budget available to them, and any impact these may have on their carer
- supporting them to try out different mechanisms for managing their budget
- offering information, advice and support to people who pay for or arrange their own care, as well as to those whose care is publicly funded
- offering information about benefits entitlement
- ensuring that carers' needs are taken fully into account.

(Guideline Committee consensus)

1.2.11 Ensure that care plans enable older people with social care needs and multiple long-term conditions to participate in different aspects of daily life, as appropriate, including:
- self-care
- taking medicines
- learning
- volunteering
- maintaining a home
- financial management
- employment
- socialising with friends
- hobbies and interests.

(ES17, ES21, ES22, expert witness testimony – 1. MM and 2.

	RM – and Guideline Committee consensus)
	1.2.12 Ensure that care plans include ordinary activities outside the home (whether that is a care home or the person's own home), for example, shopping or visiting public spaces. Include activities that:
	- reduce isolation, because this can be particularly acute for older people with social care needs and multiple long-term conditions (see also section 1.6)
	- build people's confidence by involving them in their wider community, as well as with family and friends.
	(Expert witness testimony – 1.MM and 2.RM – and Guideline Committee consensus)
Research recommendations	3.2 Which models of service delivery are effective and cost-effective for older people with social care needs and multiple long-term conditions?
Review questions	**Main review question**
	Q 2.1.1 What are the effects (benefits and harms) of different types of assessment and planning of personalised care on outcomes for older people with multiple long-term conditions and their carers?
	Other relevant review questions
	Q.1.1.1 What are the views and experiences of older people with multiple long-term conditions and their carers, of the social care services they receive?
	Q.1.1.2 Do service users and carers consider that their care is (a) personalised; (b) integrated or coordinated with healthcare?
	Q.1.1.2 What do they think works well and what needs to change?
	Q.1.2.1 What are the views and experiences of practitioners, managers and commissioners in health and social care who procure, manage or deliver care to older people with multiple long-term conditions, in community and care home settings?
	Q.1.2.2 What do they think works well, and what needs to change?
Quality of evidence	Most of the evidence for this topic of assessment and care planning was of moderate quality, and was largely based on the views and experiences of service users, their carers and practitioners. There was 1 high quality systematic review but the majority of the included studies in the review were largely outside of the date inclusion criteria and may be out of date in terms of current practice.
	None of the studies compared the effectiveness of different models of assessment and care planning and there was a lack of evidence of social care contribution to personalised care in assessment and care planning.
	The quality of research evidence in respect of users' and carers' views of services is of moderate to good quality. There was consistency across studies in relation to the issues of communication between professionals, service users and their

	carers and barriers to a shared approach to assessment and care planning.
Relative value of different outcomes	The lack of effectiveness studies relevant to this question meant that it was not possible to ascertain and compare the relative value of outcomes associated with different models of care planning.
Trade-off between benefits and harms	Given the lack of effectiveness studies, it was not possible to make an assessment of the trade-offs between benefits and harms of different models of telecare based on comparative data. These recommendations, therefore, were informed predominantly by data on views and the Guideline Committee's experiences indicated that potential harms of conducting an assessment which does not take into account 'the whole person' may be that it results in a care plan which does not meet their needs.
Economic considerations	The economic evidence in relation to cost-effective models of care planning and service delivery are based on 3 non-UK studies: Australia (ES22), USA (ES17) and Canada (ES17). The economist conducted additional bibliographic searches that identified an additional 7 economic evaluations but these studies are older it is unclear whether they are relevant for informing current practice and recommendations. Of the studies identified from the additional searches, there was only 1 UK study (ES12) and the remaining studies came from the USA or Italy (ES17). The internal validity of most studies was of moderate quality or higher quality (+ or ++) and only 1 study was rated as having low quality (-). Please refer to the evidence statements regarding the applicability of the economic evaluations in informing recommendations for UK practice. The studies are grouped into 4 main model types and even then interventions are not completely identical.
	Further economic analysis, as agreed in the Economic Plan, was carried on one particular model of assessment, care planning, and service delivery (from Counsell et al 2007 ++/+ USA). A cost-utility and cost-consequence analysis was performed, along with sensitivity analyses, to test the likelihood of the intervention being cost-effective in the English context. This model was an outpatient, multidisciplinary geriatric team (composed of a geriatrician, pharmacist, physical therapist, mental health social worker, community-based services liaison, practice manager and administrative assistant) plus case management (performed jointly by an advanced practice nurse and social worker). Using only evidence from Counsell et al (2007), the cost-utility analysis based on health-related quality of life, our findings, which include sensitivity analyses, indicate that using a clinical threshold of £20,000 per quality-adjusted life year, the intervention was not likely to be cost-effective in either 2 or 3-year scenarios but was more so at £30,000 per quality-adjusted life year. When considering additional evidence via the cost-consequence analysis, cost-effectiveness may be more favorable. The additional studies find that the intervention's effect includes improvements or no significant differences on mental health, general health, cognitive function, activities of daily living, function and mortality. However, this is still within the context of the limitations, in particular, insufficient information on the intervention's impact on personal social services, in particular the use of community social care services and admission to nursing or care homes. The

	implication being that impact on social care costs are unclear. This is also in the context of a lack of information on the intervention's impact on carers. Taken together, there is still the fundamental issue that the evidence base we draw on is mainly older and from the USA. While we have attempted to explore the possibility of the intervention being cost-effective given the available data and using additional data, there is still too much uncertainty in order to draw a firm conclusion about the intervention's cost-effectiveness.
Evidence statements – numbered evidence statements from which the recommendation(s) were developed	**ES4: Models of interdisciplinary working** There is moderate quality evidence from systematic review and mixed methods papers (Goodman 2012 +/+; Trivedi 2013 +/-) that IPW may be cost-effective but does not show clearly that any particular model (for example, care management, collaborative working or integrated teams) delivers better outcomes. Users and carers consistently value aspects of integrated service delivery which foster confidence in the reliability of services, continuity of paid carers, user and carer involvement in planning and reviewing care, services to support carers and the ability of services to respond effectively at times of crisis. There is also qualitative evidence that inter-professional working can reduce carer burden. **(RECs 1.2.1, 1.2.9)** **ES5: Aspects of the care and support process that are important to older people and carers** There is good evidence from 2 studies, 1 mixed methods and 1 qualitative (Goodman et al 2012 +/+; Granville et al 2010 +) that, for older people and their carers, the process of care is as important as the outcomes. Older people want continuity of care in order to develop relationships with paid carers, a named key person to coordinate care, co-production of care with users and carers, and good links with the wider system of health and social care, allowing effective response at times of crisis. **(REC 1.2.1)** **ES6 What older people want from care and support** There is good evidence from 1 qualitative study (Granville et al 2010 +) that older people value the importance of living a 'normal' life, maintaining social contact with people of all generations, having money and knowing their rights, and the ability to choose meaningful activities. **(REC 1.2.5)** **ES7: Older people's experience of choice and control in care homes** There is good evidence from 1 qualitative study (Granville et al 2010 +) that older people living in care homes feel they are required 'to fit in' at the expense of their choice and control, personal identity and preferences, while those in the community felt they lacked choice and control over the amount and content of home care services they could have, particularly when other stakeholders clearly felt that the residential option was preferable. **(REC 1.2.5)**

ES10: Importance of support that extends beyond personal care

There is moderately good evidence from a mixed methods study (Challis 2010b +/-) that service users, especially those living alone without an unpaid carer, want services, whether organised by care management or not, to deliver different types of essential support, prioritising the basic needs for shopping, laundry, housework and other practical needs over personal care. **(REC 1.2.5)**

ES17: Outpatient geriatric multidisciplinary evaluation and management plus case management

This evidence statement is based on the findings of 2 studies of excellent quality controlled trials from Canada (++/+) (Beland 2006) and the US (++/ +) (Counsell et al 2007), 3 good quality controlled trials (+,/+) 2 of which were from the US (Boult 2001; Toseland 1997) and 1 from Italy (Bernabei 1998), and 1 low quality before and after study (-/+) from Italy (Landi 1999). Taken together, there is moderate evidence from 6 international studies of mixed quality that the coordination of health and social care services through the use of case management plus outpatient multidisciplinary health and social care geriatric teams can improve a range of service user health and social care outcomes while reducing or having no changes on the use of acute care services with mixed impacts on health and social care resource use. It is important to note that not all of the same outcomes were measured, and where there were overlaps, in some cases, findings were equivocal (improvements or no differences) but none of the findings indicated worse outcomes. **(RECs 1.2.5,1.2.9, 1.2.11)**

ES21 GP-centred models for service delivery (without case management)

One low quality US study (-/+) (Sommers 2000) (n=543) tested the addition of a nurse and social worker to a GP practice to assist in comprehensive health and social care assessment, care planning and service provision (self-management, education on self-care and referral) compared to usual GP care. The sample included community-dwelling older adults over aged 65 with at least 2 chronic conditions, few restrictions in activities of daily living, and at least one restriction in instrumental activities of daily living. Findings indicate that the intervention leads to improvements in outcomes alongside reductions in the use of acute care services, small increases in community health care services, and no changes in use of nursing or care home services The economic evaluation was presented as a cost-consequence analysis (presenting changes in costs alongside changes in outcomes). This economic evaluation is only partially applicable in determining whether the intervention is cost-effective in the UK context due to differences in institutional context, unit costs, and additional issues of relevance as findings are based on older data. Altogether though, the quality of the economic evaluation was moderate due to some issues of unclear reporting in the calculation of net costs but had good reporting quality in changes in all relevant health and social care resource use. **(RECs 1.2.9 and 1.2.11)**

ES22 GP-centred models for service delivery (with case management)

One good quality multi-site (+/+) non-UK study (Battersby 2007) tested the addition of service coordinators (a social worker, allied health professional, or nurse) to GP-working, in combination with patient-directed goals in the health and social care assessment and care planning process. The intervention was also coupled with changes in funding mechanisms by switching from fee-for-service to a 12-month care plan funded by pooling resources across acute and community health and social care services. The sample covered community-dwelling older adults over the age of 60, with a range mean age between 61 to 74 years old across the 4 study sites and varying numbers of chronic conditions. The results show that the intervention is associated with improvements in outcomes and increases in costs from the perspective of health and social care services. However, the applicability of findings is limited by potentially serious limitations due to some issues in the comprehensiveness in the collection of resource use (due to issues with administrative databases). Furthermore, there are issues due to differences in institutional contexts, unit costs, and issues of relevance as findings are based on older data. **(RECs 1.2.8, 1.2.9 and 1.2.11)**

ES25 Medication adherence

There is moderate systematic review evidence (Banning 2008 +) that older people who do not adhere to their prescribed medication may have both intentional and non-intentional reasons for doing so. The evidence suggests that shared decision making between clinicians and patients on what to prescribe, aided by better explanations of effects and clearer instruction, could increase older people's ability and willingness to take their prescribed medication. **(REC 1.2.7)**

ES27 Transport availability

There is evidence of moderate quality from a mixed methods study (Challis 2010b +/-) that frailty of older people may reduce their ability to self-manage their health conditions, as well as their personal and household care tasks. Availability of transport may be of particular importance in maintaining independence in the community. **(REC 1.2.5)**

ES39 Older people's perceptions of social isolation

There is good evidence from a good quality qualitative study (Blickem 2013 +) that people valued the opportunity to meet with people who shared similar frustrations and needs because of their health: support from other older people with long-term conditions could be a 'forum for exchange of emotional and practical support' (p52). The groups also provided additional services for the socially isolated in that they could help access transport services and advise on welfare benefits. 'Linkage to these resources through the groups was described as a lifeline to help which otherwise

	participants struggled to know how access' (p52). There is evidence from 1 good study (Granville 2010 +) that older people also want as diverse opportunities for social participation with people of different ages and interests as in 'normal life', so day centres (for example) were not necessarily an adequate response. Some people said they wanted more support to carry out activities such as shopping and going to the pub as opportunities to participate in 'normal' life. **(REC 1.2.5)**
Other considerations	The recommendations here drew on views studies of service users and carers, economic evidence and analysis and a small amount of evidence of impact. It was supplemented by expert witness testimony and expertise from the Guideline Committee.

The Guideline Committee discussed that evidence was limited in respect to medicines management and support to use different funding mechanisms but agreed that these were both important areas to make recommendations about, given how critical they are to people's wellbeing, independence and control.

In terms of medicines management in particular, this was a theme that was raised in several Guideline Committee meetings (4, 5, 7 and 9) and was also relevant to issues around enabling self-care (including medicines management) and undertaking assessments for care planning. The economic evidence supported the use of both service integration and involvement of key professionals, including GPs. The expert witness evidence addressed the importance of considering social needs and supporting people to take part in activities they find interesting and stimulating. |

13

14

Topic/section heading	Supporting carers
Recommendations	1.3.1　In line with the Care Act 2014, local authorities must offer carers an individual assessment of their needs. Ensure this assessment: - recognises the complex nature of multiple long-term conditions and their impact on people's wellbeing - takes into account carers' views about services that could help them maintain their caring role and live the life they choose - involves cross-checking any assumptions the person has made about the support their carer will provide. **(Guideline Committee consensus)** 1.3.1　Check what impact the carer's assessment is likely to have on the person's care plan. **(Guideline Committee consensus)** 1.3.2　Support carers to explore the possible benefits of personal budgets and direct payments, and how they might be used for themselves and for the person they care for. Offer the carer help to administer their budget, so that their ability to support the person's care or their own health problems are not undermined by anxiety about managing the process. **(Guideline Committee consensus)** 1.3.3　Consider helping carers access support services and interventions, such as carer breaks. **(ES44 and Guideline Committee consensus)**
Research recommendations	The Guideline Committee did not identify this as a priority area to make research recommendations on.
Review questions	3.2 Carer support: how should services work with and support carers of older people with multiple long-term conditions (who may have long-term conditions themselves)?
Quality of evidence	The search identified only 1 systematic review. The rating of the study was affected because it was outside the remit dates for this guideline. All the studies included in the review were published before 2003. The search did not identify any UK focused or high quality studies in relation to this question. The review included 42 studies, mainly from the USA with some from the UK and Australia. The criteria for inclusion on age matched the one for this guideline and the focus was on 'frail' older people, which was assumed would include those with multiple long-term conditions. All the included studies were effectiveness studies and had strong methodologies.
Relative value of different outcomes	Given that only 1 paper was reviewed for this question it is not possible to compare outcomes of different approaches to carer support. The study focuses on community based respite for carers including adult day care, host families, in-home respite, institutional and video respite. The study is critical of the ways that many of the studies measured outcomes and none of the studies were powered on

	the basis of carer outcomes. In general the review reports that many of the trials it reviewed only found modest outcomes for carers and not everyone benefited.
	Some of the studies provided qualitative evidence about carers' experiences of respite care. Some expressed satisfaction with the services and also talked about what options for respite they preferred.
Trade-off between benefits and harms	The Guideline Committee discussed the potential trade-offs between the benefits of respite for carers and the harms for older people who may find respite a negative experience. Guideline Committee members also said that respite could sometimes be stressful for the carer and so might not be as beneficial as other options.
Economic considerations	Please see ES45 (below).
Evidence statements – numbered evidence statements from which the recommendation(s) were developed	**ES44 Aspects of the care and support process that are important to older people and carers**
	There is good evidence from 2 qualitative studies (Goodman et al 2012 +/+; Granville et al 2010 +) that, for older people and their carers, the process of care is as important as the outcomes. Older people want continuity of care in order to develop relationships with paid carers, a named key person to coordinate care, co-production of care with users and carers, and good links with the wider system of health and social care, allowing effective response at times of crisis.
	ES45 Cost-effectiveness of carer breaks
	There is 1 good quality systematic review (Mason et al 2007 +/+) that identified 4 non-UK economic evaluations and 1 UK economic evaluation comparing day care with usual care in providing carers with respite (carer breaks). The authors conclude that the literature is unable to inform UK policy due to limitations in the evidence base: firstly, the one UK economic evaluation was a quasi-experimental study not an RCT, and secondly, the other non-UK studies – whether randomised or quasi-experimental – were limited in terms of their documentation of service use and inadequate reporting. Furthermore, none of the studies measured health-related quality of life.
Other considerations	The Guideline Committee discussed evidence on carer assessment at length and agreed that, in spite of gaps in, and limitations of, the evidence, this was an important area on which to make recommendations. They agreed how to build on the mandatory requirements of the Care Act by specifying how carers assessments could be delivered, and also agreed a high-level recommendation about the need to consider possible options in terms of support for carers, to emphasise the importance of this issue. They also extrapolated from other views evidence related to the importance of information and signposting – particularly to enable people to manage their finances and know their entitlements – to develop a recommendation related to funding mechanisms.

15

Topic/section heading	Integrating health and social care planning
Recommendations	1.4.1 Build into service specifications and contracts the need: - to direct older people with social care needs and multiple long-term conditions to different services as needed - for seamless referrals between practitioners, including the appropriate sharing of information - to make links with appropriate professionals, for example geriatricians in acute care settings. **(ES3, ES8 and Guideline Committee consensus)** 1.4.2 Ensure there is community-based multidisciplinary support for older people with social care needs and multiple long-term conditions, recognising the progressive nature of many conditions. The health and social care practitioners involved in the team might include, for example, a community pharmacist, physiotherapist or occupational therapist, a mental health social worker or psychiatrist, and a community-based services liaison worker. **(ES17+ consensus)** 1.4.3 Health and social care practitioners should inform the named care coordinator if the person has needs that they cannot meet. **(ES3 and Guideline Committee consensus)** 1.4.4 Named care coordinators should record any needs the person has that health and social care practitioners cannot meet. Discuss and agree a plan of action to address these needs with the person and their carer. **(ES3 and Guideline Committee consensus)**
Research recommendations	3.2 Which models of service delivery are effective and cost-effective for older people with social care needs and multiple long-term conditions?
Review questions	**Main review question** Q 2.1.1 What are the effects (benefits and harms) of different types of assessment and planning of personalised care on outcomes for older people with multiple long-term conditions and their carers? **Other relevant review questions** Q.1.1.1 What are the views and experiences of older people with multiple long-term conditions and their carers of the social care services they receive? Q.1.1.2 Do service users and carers consider that their care is (a) personalised; (b) integrated or coordinated with healthcare? Q.1.1.2 What do they think works well and what needs to change? Q.1.2.1 What are the views and experiences of practitioners, managers and commissioners in health and social care who procure, manage or deliver care to older people with multiple long-term conditions, in community and care home settings? Q.1.2.2 What do they think works well, and what needs to change?

Quality of evidence	Most of the evidence for this topic of assessment and care planning was of moderate quality, and was largely based on the views and experiences of service users, their carers and practitioners. There was 1 high quality systematic review but the majority of the included studies in the review were largely outside of the date inclusion criteria and may be out of date in terms of current practice.
	None of the studies compared the effectiveness of different models of assessment and care planning and there was a lack of evidence of social care contribution to personalised care in assessment and care planning.
	The quality of research evidence in respect of users' and carers' views of services is of moderate to good quality. There was consistency across studies in relation to the issues of communication between professionals, service users and their carers, and barriers to a shared approach to assessment and care planning.
Relative value of different outcomes	The lack of effectiveness studies relevant to this question meant that it was not possible to ascertain and compare the relative value of outcomes associated with different models of assessment.
Trade-off between benefits and harms	Given the lack of effectiveness studies, it was not possible to make an assessment of the trade-offs between benefits and harms of different models of stakeholder involvement based on comparative data. These recommendations, therefore, were informed predominantly by data on views and the Guideline Committee's experiences which indicated that potential harms of conducting an assessment which does not take into account 'the whole person' may be that it results in a care plan which does not meet their needs.
Economic considerations	The economic evidence in relation to cost-effective models of care planning and service delivery is based on 3 non-UK studies: Australia (ES22), USA (ES17) and Canada (ES17). The economist conducted additional bibliographic searches that identified an additional 7 economic evaluations but these studies are older it is unclear whether they are relevant for informing current practice and recommendations. Of the studies identified from the additional searches, there was only 1 UK study (ES12) and remaining studies came from the USA or Italy (ES17). The internal validity of most studies was of moderate quality or higher quality (+ or ++) and only 1 study was rated as having low quality (-). Please refer to the evidence statements regarding the applicability of the economic evaluations in informing recommendations for UK practice. The studies are grouped into 4 main model types and even then interventions are not completely identical.
	Further economic analysis, as agreed in the Economic Plan, was carried on one particular model of assessment, care planning and service delivery (from Counsell et al 2007 ++/+, USA). A cost-utility and cost-consequence analysis was performed, along with sensitivity analyses, to test the likelihood of the intervention being cost-effective in the English context. This model was an outpatient, multidisciplinary geriatric team

	(composed of a geriatrician, pharmacist, physical therapist, mental health social worker, community-based services liaison, practice manager and administrative assistant) plus case management (performed jointly by an advanced practice nurse and social worker). Using only evidence from Counsell et al (2007), the cost-utility analysis based on health-related quality of life, our findings, which include sensitivity analyses, indicate that using a clinical threshold of £20,000 per quality-adjusted life year, the intervention was not likely to be cost-effective in either 2 or 3-year scenarios but was more so at £30,000 per quality-adjusted life year. When considering additional evidence via the cost-consequence analysis, cost-effectiveness may be more favourable. The additional studies find that the intervention's effect includes improvements or no significant differences on mental health, general health, cognitive function, activities of daily living, function, and mortality. However, this is still within the context of the limitations, in particular, insufficient information on the intervention's impact on personal social services, the use of community social care services and admission to nursing or care homes. The implication being that impact on social care costs are unclear. This is also in the context of a lack of information on the intervention's impact on carers. Taken together, there is still the fundamental issue that the evidence base we draw on is mainly older and from the USA. While we have attempted to explore the possibility of the intervention being cost-effective given the available data and using additional data, there is still too much uncertainty in order to draw a firm conclusion about the intervention's cost-effectiveness.
Evidence statements – numbered evidence statements from which the recommendation(s) were developed	**ES3 Assessment functions within case management** There is good qualitative and survey evidence (King 2012 ++) and Challis (2010b +/+), and evidence of uncertain quality (secondary evidence) (Reilly et al 2010, uncertain selection of studies) that assessment functions within case management might involve little continuity with care delivery and review of care plans; that nurses are overwhelmingly likely to be case managers, with little support from social workers; and that nurses without community training were likely to underestimate the impact of social and environmental factors in improving the health of patients, and be constrained by the shortage of services to support social care needs. Assessment records were unlikely to detail the contribution and responsibilities of different practitioners. Nurse case managers were likely to act as brokers, but found it difficult to refer people on to social care services. **(RECs 1.4.1, 1.4.3, 1.4.4)** **ES8 Areas of support that older people and carers think need improving** There is good evidence from a mixed methods study (Goodman 2012 +/+) that service users and carers want improvement in areas of care assessment and delivery that concern the integration of health and social care practitioners, including discharge planning, GP involvement in the care delivery team, and the inability and/or unwillingness of health and social care assessors and providers to access or refer into these

	complementary care agencies. **(REC 1.4.1)**
	ES12 Health and social care inputs into social care assessment and planning
	This evidence statement is based on one good quality mixed methods UK study measured over a 6-month period (Challis 2004 +/++). Findings from this study indicate that from the perspective of the NHS, personal social services and individuals' private costs, the intervention is cost-effective for community-dwelling older people who may have 'substantial' or 'critical' social care needs or be at risk of nursing or care home placement. The intervention is a one-time healthcare assessment by a geriatrician or old age psychiatrist to guide the social care manager in social care planning.
	ES17 Outpatient geriatric multidisciplinary evaluation and management plus case management
	This evidence statement is based on the findings of 2 studies of excellent quality controlled trials from Canada (++/+) (Beland 2006) and the USA (++/ +) (Counsell 2007), 3 good quality controlled trials (+/+) 2 of which were from the USA (Boult 2001; Toseland 1997) and 1 from Italy (Bernabei 1998), and 1 low quality before and after study (-/+) from Italy (Landi 1999). Taken together, there is moderate evidence from 6 international studies of mixed quality that the coordination of health and social care services through the use of case management plus outpatient multidisciplinary health and social care geriatric teams can improve a range of service user health and social care outcomes while reducing or having no changes on the use of acute care services with mixed impacts on health and social care resource use. It is important to note that not all of the same outcomes were measured, and where there were overlaps, in some cases, findings were equivocal (improvements or no differences) but none of the findings indicated worse outcomes. **(REC 1.4.2)**
Other considerations	The recommendations here drew on views studies of service users and carers, economic literature and supplementary analysis and Guideline Committee expertise.
	The recommendations seek to address the areas of practice where views evidence indicates people are experiencing a poor quality of care, most notably:
	• people 'falling through the gap' when they have been referred to a service which can then not meet their needs
	• disjointed care (or lack of ownership of care) at the point of hospital discharge
	• the need for joined-up working at both strategic and operational levels, which requires both commissioner and practitioner input.

16

17

Topic/section heading	Providing support and information
Recommendations	1.5.1 Health and social care practitioners should ensure care is person-centred and that the person is supported in a way that is respectful and promotes dignity and trust. **(Guideline committee consensus)**
	1.5.2 Named care coordinators should review people's information needs regularly, recognising that people with existing conditions may not take in information when they receive a new diagnosis. **(Guideline committee consensus)**
	1.5.3 Consider continuing to offer information and support to people and their family members and their carers even if they have declined it previously, recognising that long-term conditions can be changeable or progressive, and people's information needs may change. **(Guideline Committee consensus)**
	1.5.4 Inform people about, and direct them to, advocacy services. **(Guideline Committee consensus)**
	1.5.5 Health and social care practitioners should offer older people with social care needs and multiple long-term conditions:
	- opportunities to interact with older people with similar conditions
	- help to access one-to-one or group support, social media and other activities, such as dementia cafes, walking groups and specialist support groups, exercise and dance. **(ES37, ES39, ES40, expert witness – 1. MM and 2. RM – and Guideline Committee consensus)**
Research recommendations	3.5 What is the most effective and cost-effective way of supporting older people with social care needs and multiple long-term conditions in care homes to live as independently as possible?
	3.6 What is the effectiveness and acceptability of different strategies to enable positive risk-taking in care homes?
Review questions	**Main review questions**
	Q 2.1.4 What are the barriers and facilitators to the delivery of effective, personalised, integrated care for people with multiple long-term conditions in care home settings?
	Q 2.1.6 How can older people with multiple long-term conditions living in the community or in care home settings be supported to participate in community, family and social activities?
	Other relevant review questions
	Q.1.1.1 What are the views and experiences of older people with multiple long-term conditions and their carers of the social care services they receive?
	Q.1.1.2 Do service users and carers consider that their care is (a) personalised; (b) integrated or coordinated with healthcare?
	Q.1.1.2 What do they think works well and what needs to change?

	Q.1.2.1 What are the views and experiences of practitioners, managers and commissioners in health and social care who procure, manage or deliver care to older people with multiple long-term conditions, in community and care home settings? Q.1.2.2 What do they think works well, and what needs to change?
Quality of evidence	There were no experimental evaluations or views studies found that directly addressed questions on how to best support delivery of care in care homes.
Relative value of different outcomes	The lack of effectiveness studies relevant to this question meant that it was not possible to ascertain and compare the relative value of outcomes associated with personalised, integrated care in care homes.
Trade-off between benefits and harms	The lack of effectiveness studies relevant to this question meant that it was not possible to ascertain and compare the trade-off between benefits and harms associated with personalised, integrated care in care homes. The Guideline Committee did discuss extensively however the potential negative experience older people can have if they are in a care home that does not provide opportunities for them to take part in the activities they would like, or to spend time with others in their local community.
Economic considerations	There was no economic evidence to draw conclusions about the cost-effectiveness of personalised and integrated care for older people with multiple long-term conditions in care homes. The guideline committee were, however, mindful of potential costs and resource use when making the recommendations.
Evidence statements – numbered evidence statements from which the recommendation(s) were developed	**ES37 Extent of social isolation living in communal environments compared to when living alone** A good quality qualitative paper (Blickem 2013 +) reports that older people who live in communal environments are as likely to feel isolated and lonely as those remaining in their own homes. Granville (2020 +) also confirms that people in care homes who maintained a network of friends and family retained 'more of their own sense of identity and have more meaning in their lives' (p69). **(RECs 1.5.4, 1.5.3, 1.5.5)** **ES39 Older people's perceptions of opportunities for meeting other people** There is good evidence from a good quality qualitative study (Blickem 2013 +) that people valued the opportunity to meet with people who shared similar frustrations and needs because of their health: support from other older people with long-term conditions could be a 'forum for exchange of emotional and practical support' (p52). The groups also provided additional services for the socially isolated in that they could help access transport services and advise on welfare benefits. 'Linkage to these resources through the groups was described as a lifeline to help which otherwise participants struggled to know how access' (p52). There is evidence from 1 good study (Granville 2010 +) that older people also want diverse opportunities for social participation with people of different ages and interests as in 'normal life', so day centres (for example) were not

	necessarily an adequate response. Some people said they wanted more support to carry out activities such as shopping and going to the pub as opportunities to participate in 'normal' life. **(REC 1.5.5)**
Other considerations	The recommendations here drew on and expert witness testimony as well as Guideline Committee consensus. The Guideline Committee discussed the lack of good research evidence concerning the availability, effectiveness and cost-effectiveness of different interventions to reduce social isolation and facilitate social contact for people in care homes. The expert witness testimony provided a range of examples of how this has been delivered successfully elsewhere which the Guideline Committee felt strongly should inform recommendations. They agreed that care homes should promote a culture which reflects the interests and needs of their clients, allowing them to live the life they choose, so far as possible. They also noted that this should involve everyone being able to access information about the cost of care home services so they can make informed decisions about their support. Guideline Committee members also gave examples, from their own experience, of how care homes can improve residents' experience and facilitate social contact both in and outside the home. Expert witness testimony highlighted examples of creative uses of care home space and innovative ways to involve members of the wider local community in the life of the care home.

18

Topic/section heading	**Delivering care** **Supporting self-management**
Recommendations	1.5.6 Health and social care practitioners should review recorded information about medicines and therapies regularly and follow up any issues related to managing medicines. This includes making sure information on changes to medicines is made available to relevant agencies. **(ES25 and Guideline Committee consensus)**
	1.5.7 Social care practitioners should contact the person's healthcare practitioners with any concerns about prescribed medicines. **(Guideline Committee consensus)**
	1.5.8 Social care practitioners should tell the named care coordinator if any prescribed medicines are affecting the person's wellbeing. This could include known side effects or reluctance to take medicines. **(Guideline Committee consensus)**
	1.5.9 Health and social care providers should recognise incontinence as a symptom and ensure people have access to diagnosis and treatment. This should include meeting with a specialist continence nurse. **(ES28 and Guideline Committee consensus)**
	1.5.10 Health and social care providers should give people information and advice about continence. Make a range of

	continence products available, paying full attention to people's dignity and treating them with respect. **(ES28 and Guideline Committee consensus)**
	1.5.11 Health and social care providers should give people information about services that can help them manage their lives. This should be given:
	- at the first point of contact and when new problems or issues arise
	- in different formats which should be accessible, including through interpreters (see making information accessible). (**Guideline Committee consensus**)
Research recommendations	3.1 What is the lived experience of older people with social care needs and multiple long-term conditions?
	3.3 What is the impact of reablement interventions on outcomes for older people with multiple long-term conditions?
	3.6 What is the impact of different early intervention-focused approaches to self-management on outcomes for older people with social care needs and multiple long-term conditions?
Review questions	**Main review question**
	2.1.5 Self-management support: how effective are different types of support for older people to enable them to self-manage (aspects of) their own conditions?
	Other relevant review questions
	Q.1.1.1 What are the views and experiences of older people with multiple long-term conditions and their carers of the social care services they receive?
	Q.1.1.2 Do service users and carers consider that their care is (a) personalised; (b) integrated or coordinated with healthcare?
	Q.1.1.2 What do they think works well and what needs to change?
	Q.1.2.1 What are the views and experiences of practitioners, managers and commissioners in health and social care who procure, manage or deliver care to older people with multiple long-term conditions, in community and care home settings?
	Q.1.2.2 What do they think works well, and what needs to change?
Quality of evidence	The evidence related to service user and carer views and self-management was of moderate, and moderate to good quality. Three studies using qualitative or mixed methods provided experiences of self-management interventions like the EPP. Another 3 studies looked more generally at people's ability to manage their symptoms, adhere to medications and at the challenges of implementing specific self-management interventions, such as telecare. There were some considerable methodological limitations such as small sample size, poorly reported participant characteristics, bias or concerns about relevance. Results were therefore interpreted with caution and the Guideline Committee relied on their experience of self-management interventions for wider context.
Relative value of	There is moderately good evidence that the EPP was valued as an opportunity for social contact and some evidence that it

different outcomes	increased self-efficacy (over 5 months). However, the Guideline Committee noted that this was no longer delivered by the NHS and also was not specific to older people with multiple long-term conditions. Self-management education programmes had some positive effects in terms of the effects of exercise on physical functioning but the effect on quality of life was uncertain.
Trade-off between benefits and harms	The effect of a number of interventions included was often slight and there was extremely limited information about their long-term effects or their effects on quality of life. The Guideline Committee were therefore hesitant to base recommendations on the evidence. The Guideline Committee also noted the lack of evidence on the impact of timing of self-management interventions on outcomes, noting that when people first receive a diagnosis they may not be ready to immediately start managing their own support.
Economic considerations	There were no economic evaluations to support recommendations in relation to medication and continence management. The guideline committee were, however, mindful of potential costs and resource use when making the recommendations.
Evidence statements – numbered evidence statements from which the recommendation(s) were developed	**ES5 Aspects of the care and support process that are important to older people and carers** There is good evidence from 2 studies, 1 mixed methods and 1 qualitative (Goodman et al 2012 +/+; Granville et al 2010 +) that, for older people and their carers, the process of care is as important as the outcomes. Older people want continuity of care in order to develop relationships with paid carers, a named key person to coordinate care, co-production of care with users and carers, and good links with the wider system of health and social care, allowing effective response at times of crisis. **ES25 Medicines adherence** There is moderate systematic review evidence (Banning 2008 +) that older people who do not adhere to their prescribed medication may have both intentional and non-intentional reasons for doing so. The evidence suggests that shared decision making between clinicians and patients on what to prescribe, aided by better explanations of effects and clearer instruction, could increase older people's ability and willingness to take their prescribed medication. **(RECs 1.5.6 and 1.5.12)** **ES28 Urinary incontinence (UI)** There is moderate to good qualitative evidence (Horrocks 2004 +) that older people often do not seek help with UI, out of embarrassment or belief that it is a natural outcome of ageing, and that primary care staff do not routinely enquire about this. Consequently, people with UI lead more restricted lives than they otherwise might, avoiding unfamiliar social situations and restricting fluid intake. **(RECS 1.5.19, 1.5.10, 1.5.15)**
Other considerations	The Guideline Committee saw the management of medicine and UI as issues of particular importance. They spent considerable time discussing the specific recommendations to make, building on the evidence reviewed on these 2 topics and informed by their own extensive experience. They also noted that this

	guideline should cross-reference existing NICE guidance on these topics. The Guideline Committee also emphasised the importance of ensuring that people are supported to manage their lives and their conditions in the way that they choose, so far as possible.

19
20

Topic/section heading	**Delivering care** **Ensuring continuity of care and links with specialist services**
Recommendations	1.5.12Named care coordinators should take responsibility for: - giving people and their carers information about what to do and who to contact in times of crisis, at any time of day and night - ensuring an effective response in times of crisis - ensuring there is continuity of care with familiar workers, so that wherever possible, personal care and support is carried out by workers known to the person and their family and carers - engaging local community health and social care services, including those in the voluntary sector - ensuring older people and their carers have information about their particular conditions, and how to manage them - knowing where to access specialist knowledge and support about particular health conditions - involving carers and advocates. **(ES5, ES9 and Guideline Committee consensus)**
Research recommendations	The Guideline Committee did not identify this as a priority area to make research recommendations on.
Review question	Q 2.1.3 What are the barriers and facilitators to the delivery of effective, personalised, integrated care for people with multiple long-term conditions in community settings?
Quality of evidence	There were no experimental evaluations or views studies found that directly addressed questions on how to best support delivery of care in care homes. Data were extracted from evidence emerging in response to other review questions.
Relative value of different outcomes	The lack of effectiveness studies relevant to this question meant that it was not possible to ascertain and compare the benefits and harms associated with different approaches to keeping records up to date.
Trade-off between benefits and harms	Given the lack of effectiveness studies, it was not possible to make an assessment of the trade-offs between benefits and harms of different approaches for keeping records up to date, based on comparative data. These recommendations, therefore, were informed predominantly by data on views and the Guideline Committee's experiences.
Economic considerations	There was no applicable economic evidence relevant to these recommendations. The guideline committee were, however, mindful of potential costs and resource use when making the recommendations.
Evidence statements –	**ES5: Aspects of the care and support process that are**

numbered evidence statements from which the recommendations were developed	**important to older people and carers**
	There is good evidence from 2 studies, 1 mixed methods and 1 qualitative (Goodman et al 2012 +/+; Granville et al 2010 +) that, for older people and their carers, the process of care is as important as the outcomes. Older people want continuity of care in order to develop relationships with paid carers, a named key person to coordinate care, co-production of care with users and carers, and good links with the wider system of health and social care, allowing effective response at times of crisis. **(REC 1.5.13)**
	ES9 Importance of continuity of care to older people and carers
	There is good evidence from a mixed methods study (Goodman 2012 +/+) that service users and carers want more continuity of staff, as they are otherwise liable to experience care of a lower quality, plus embarrassment and loss of dignity in receiving personal care. They also want a designated person with a remit across all care services who is accessible in a crisis. **(REC 1.5.13)**
Other considerations	The Guideline Committee strongly supported, and built on the findings summarised in ES5 and ES9 providing examples of the poor experiences or outcomes that can result from not having continuity of care or effective crisis response. They also described the importance of having a coordinated team of workers who have generalist and specialist knowledge, as appropriate, recognising that it is not always possible (or appropriate) for a single worker to be competent in all aspects of care or support needed.

21
22

Topic/section heading	**Delivering care** **Care in care homes**
Recommendations	These recommendations for care home providers are about ensuring that care and support addresses the specific needs of older people with social care needs and multiple long-term conditions.
	1.5.13Identify ways to address particular nutritional and hydration requirements. **(ES7, expert witness – 2. RM – and Guideline Committee consensus)**
	1.5.14 Ensure people have a choice of things to eat and drink and varied snacks throughout the day, including outside regular meal times. **(ES7, expert witness – 2.RM – and Guideline Committee consensus)**
	1.5.15 Ensure the care home environment and layout are used in a way that encourages social interaction, activity and peer support, as well as providing privacy and personal space. **(Expert witness – 2.RM – and Guideline Committee consensus)**
	1.5.16Ensure people are physically comfortable, for example, by allowing them control over the heating in their rooms. **(ES7 and Guideline Committee consensus)**
	1.5.17Encourage social contact and provide opportunities for education, entertainment and meaningful occupation by:

	- making it easier for people to communicate and interact with others, for example, by reducing background noise, providing face-to-face contact with other people, using accessible signage and lighting - using a range of technologies such as IT platforms and Wi-Fi, hearing loops and TV listeners - involving the wider community in the life of the care home through befriending schemes and intergenerational projects - offering opportunities for movement. **(ES36, ES37, Expert Witness testimony – 2.RM – and Guideline Committee consensus)** 1.5.18 Build links with local communities, including voluntary and community sector organisations that can support older people with social care needs and multiple long-term conditions, and encourage interaction between residents and local people of all ages and backgrounds. **(Expert Witness testimony – 1.MM and Guideline Committee consensus).** 1.5.19 Make publicly available information about: - tariffs for self-funded and publicly-funded care - what residents are entitled to and whether this could change if their funding status or ability to pay changes. **(Guideline Committee consensus)** Make available a statement for each person using services about what their funding pays for. **(Guideline Committee consensus)**
Research recommendations	3.5. What is the most effective and cost-effective way of supporting older people with social care needs and multiple long-term conditions in care homes to live as independently as possible? 3.6 What is the effectiveness and acceptability of different strategies to enable positive risk-taking in care homes?
Review questions	Q 2.1.4 What are the barriers and facilitators to the delivery of effective, personalised, integrated care for people with multiple long-term conditions in care home settings?
Quality of evidence	There were no experimental evaluations or views studies found that directly addressed questions on how to best support delivery of care in care homes. Data were extracted from evidence emerging in response to other review questions.
Relative value of different outcomes	The lack of effectiveness studies relevant to this question meant that it was not possible to ascertain and compare the relative value of outcomes associated personalised, integrated care in care homes.
Trade-off between benefits and harms	Given the lack of effectiveness studies, it was not possible to make an assessment of the trade-offs between benefits and harms of different models of stakeholder involvement based on comparative data. These recommendations, therefore, were informed predominantly by data on views and the Guideline Committee's experiences. The committee highlighted the

	potential benefits of having nutritional meals on people's health. They described the importance of people being able to eat or drink when they choose, in the same way as they would if they were living independently, as well as the potential disadvantages in terms of psychological wellbeing, feelings of choice and control when this was not possible. They noted that this would require some providers to work very differently.
Economic considerations	There was no economic evidence to draw conclusions about the cost-effectiveness of personalised and integrated care for older people with multiple long-term conditions in care homes. The guideline committee were, however, mindful of potential costs and resource use when making the recommendations.
Evidence statements – numbered evidence statements from which the recommendation(s) were developed	**ES7 Older people's experience of choice and control in care homes** There is good evidence from 1 qualitative study (Granville et al 2010 +) that older people living in care homes feel they are required 'to fit in' at the expense of their choice and control, personal identity and preferences, while those in the community felt they lacked choice and control over the amount and content of home care services they could have, particularly when other stakeholders clearly felt that the residential option was preferable. (**RECs 1.5.14, 1.5.15, 1.5.17, 1.5.18)** **ES36 Factors that can contribute to social isolation** Two qualitative papers of good quality with qualitative methods (Blickem 2013 +; Granville 2010 +) found that social isolation was a significant problem for older people with high support needs – whether they lived in the community at home, or in care homes. Isolation and loneliness were exacerbated by the loss of a partner or spouse, retirement, peers dying or going into residential care, poor finances and poor mobility and lack of transport. **(REC 1.5.18)**
Other considerations	While there was a lack of research evidence on the specifics of providing care in care homes, the Guideline Committee thought it important to make recommendations on this area given the extent of the population affected and the negative impact poor care can have. They drew on their expertise and expert witness testimony to develop the recommendations, highlighting as particularly important physical comfort, nutrition and hydration, choice, control and independence. The Guideline Committee supported and strengthened the finding summarised in ES7, emphasising, based on their experience and the expert witness testimony, particular aspects of choice and control they deemed important. These include: food and drink – when they discussed the very significant effect this can have on people's health and wellbeing – and the physical environment. Expert witness testimony identified the benefits of using care home spaces in a way that encourages activity, creativity, social interaction and involvement of the local community. They also noted that this should involve everyone being able to access information about the cost of care home services so

	they can make informed decisions about their support. Guideline Committee members also gave examples, from their own experience, of how care homes can improve residents' experience and facilitate social contact both in and outside the home. Expert witness testimony highlighted examples of creative uses of care home space and innovative ways to involve members of the wider local community in the life of the care home.

23

24
25

Topic/section heading	Preventing social isolation
Recommendations	1.6.1 All practitioners should recognise that social isolation can be a particular problem for older people with social care needs and multiple long-term conditions. (**ES36**) 1.6.2 Health and social care practitioners should support older people with social care needs and multiple long-term conditions to maintain links with their friends, family and community, and identify if people are lonely or isolated. **(ES36, ES 37, ES38, ES39, ES40)** 1.6.3 Named care coordinators and advocates should provide information to help people who are going to live in a care home to choose the right care home for them, for example, one where they have friends or links with the community already. **(ES37 and Guideline Committee consensus)** 1.6.4 Health and social care practitioners should give people advice and information about social activities and opportunities that can help them maintain their social contacts, and build new contacts if they wish to. **(ES38 and Guideline Committee consensus)** 1.6.5 Consider contracting with voluntary and community sector enterprises and services to help older people with social care needs and multiple long-term conditions to remain active in their home and engaged in their community, including when people are in care homes. **(ES39, ES40 and Guideline Committee consensus)** 1.6.6 Voluntary and community sector providers should consider collaborating with local authorities to develop new ways to help people to remain active and engaged in their communities, including when people are in care homes. **(ES40 and Guideline Committee consensus)**
Research recommendations	3.1 What is the lived experience of older people with social care needs and multiple long-term conditions?
Review questions	**Main review question** Q 2.1.6 How can older people with multiple long-term conditions living in the community or in care home settings be supported to participate in community, family and social activities? **Other relevant review questions** Q.1.1.1 What are the views and experiences of older people with multiple long-term conditions and their carers of the social care services they receive? Q.1.1.2 Do service users and carers consider that their care is (a) personalised; (b) integrated or coordinated with healthcare? Q.1.1.2 What do they think works well and what needs to change? Q.1.2.1 What are the views and experiences of practitioners, managers and commissioners in health and social care who procure, manage or deliver care to older people with multiple long-term conditions in community and care home settings?

	Q.1.2.2 What do they think works well, and what needs to change?
Quality of evidence	The search identified 2 papers relevant to this question. They were both of good quality, one with qualitative methods and the other a case control trial. Both papers had a UK focus. Blickham et al (2013) provides valuable information on the experiences of older people with regard to social isolation. The paper has limitations in that none of the participants were very old, it is not clear what services were provided locally and the views seem somewhat out of context. Dickens (2011) had samples of a reasonable size and robust methods for data collection and analysis. The limitations related to the compatibility of the intervention and the control groups were adequately discussed in the paper.
Relative value of different outcomes	The search only identified 1 effectiveness study relevant to this question. As a result the outcomes related to different approaches to tackling social isolation cannot be compared.
Trade-off between benefits and harms	The search only identified 1 effectiveness study relevant to this question. As a result of these very limited data, the trade-offs between benefits and harms in terms of addressing social isolation cannot be identified from research evidence. Instead, the recommendations were informed predominantly by data on views and the Guideline Committee's experiences.
Economic considerations	No economic evaluations were identified to support recommendations related to social isolation. The Guideline Committee were, however, mindful of potential costs and resource use when making the recommendations.
Evidence statements – numbered evidence statements from which the recommendation(s) were developed	**ES36 Factors that can contribute to social isolation** Two qualitative papers of good quality with qualitative methods (Blickem 2013 +; Granville 2010 +) found that social isolation was a significant problem for older people with high support needs – whether they lived in the community at home, or in care homes. Isolation and loneliness were exacerbated by the loss of a partner or spouse, retirement, peers dying or going into residential care, poor finances and poor mobility and lack of transport. **(RECs 1.6.1, 1.6.2, 1.6.3)** **ES37 Extent of social isolation in communal living environments compared to when living alone** A good quality qualitative paper (Blickem 2013 +) reports that older people who live in communal environments are as likely to feel isolated and lonely as those remaining in their own homes. Granville (2020 +) also confirms that people in care homes who maintained a network of friends and family retained 'more of their own sense of identity and have more meaning in their lives' (p69). **(REC 1.6.3)** **ES38 Older people's perceptions of social isolation** Two good quality qualitative studies (Blickem 2013 +; Granville, 2010 +) found that older people felt cut off from the wider 'community', not just from family and friends. Some had left their home and could no longer access local facilities and community activities. This led to a sense of disconnection, and a loss of activity and interaction that was part of 'normal life'. People

	therefore want to take part in activities that are situated in the community. Community participation was felt to be a motivating factor to be positive about themselves, their lives and their health. **(REC 1.6.4)**
	ES39 Older people's perceptions of opportunities for meeting other people
	There is good evidence from a good quality qualitative study (Blickem 2013 +) that people valued the opportunity to meet with people who shared similar frustrations and needs because of their health: support from other older people with long-term conditions could be a 'forum for exchange of emotional and practical support' (p52). The groups also provided additional services for the socially isolated in that they could help access transport services and advise on welfare benefits. 'Linkage to these resources through the groups was described as a lifeline to help which otherwise participants struggled to know how access' (p52). There is evidence from 1 good study (Granville 2010 +) that older people also want diverse opportunities for social participation with people of different ages and interests as in 'normal life', so day centres (for example) were not necessarily an adequate response. Some people said they wanted more support to carry out activities such as shopping and going to the pub as opportunities to participate in 'normal' life. **(RECs 1.6.4, 1.6.5)**
	ES40 Facilitators of, and structures to, support participation and involvement
	Two good quality qualitative studies (Blickem 2013 +; Granville 2010 +) conclude that older people living in the community or care homes need more opportunities for social participation in the community, and that transport is a vital service needed to support this. Granville (2010 +) emphasises the importance of visibility and retaining/strengthening personal and social networks as people age (p80), and recommends further development of approaches such as: 'circles of support, time-banking, home-share, and other forms of mutual support' (p80). **(RECs 1.6.5,1.6.6)**
Other considerations	The recommendations here drew on and expert witness testimony as well as Guideline Committee consensus. The Guideline Committee discussed the lack of good research evidence concerning the availability, effectiveness and cost-effectiveness of different interventions to reduce social isolation and facilitate social contact for people in care homes. The expert witness testimony provided a range of examples of how this has been delivered successfully elsewhere which the Guideline Committee felt strongly should inform recommendations. They agreed that care homes should promote a culture which reflects the interests and needs of their clients, allowing them to live the life they choose, so far as possible.
	The Guideline Committee discussed that older people need to be supported to continue their lives and hobbies despite their conditions, and even if they are in residential care. Expert witness evidence responded to some of the gaps in effectiveness data and the Guideline Committee also described a range of initiatives

	that can facilitate social contact based on their experience. They agreed the recommendations should focus on the need for commissioners and providers to work together to address this problem – particularly given the limited resources available and the need to use the capacity and expertise of voluntary and community sector organisations. The recommendations are therefore aimed at building local capacity to address social isolation, and ensuring that helping people to stay in touch with the people they want to is built into both assessment and care planning.

26

Topic/section heading	Training and supporting health and social care practitioners
Recommendations	1.7.1 Those responsible for contracting and providing care services should ensure health and social care practitioners caring for people with social care needs and multiple long-term conditions have the necessary training and are assessed as having the necessary training and competencies in managing medicines. **(Guideline Committee consensus)** 1.7.2 Ensure health and social care practitioners are able to recognise, consider the impact of, and respond to: - common conditions, such as dementia, hearing and sight loss, and - common care needs, such as nutrition, hydration, chronic pain, falls and skin integrity, and - common support needs, such as dealing with bereavement and end-of-life, and - deterioration in someone's health or circumstances. **(Recommendations adapted from draft NICE guideline on Home Care)** 1.7.3 Make provision for more specialist support to be available to people who need it – for example, in response to complex long-term health conditions – either by training practitioners directly involved in supporting people, or by ensuring partnerships are in place with specialist organisations. **(Guideline Committee consensus)**
Research recommendations	The Guideline Committee did not identify this as a priority area to make research recommendations on and were mindful of a potential future NICE guideline on management of medication in the home.
Review questions	Q. 3.1 How can social care practitioners delivering services to people with multiple long-term conditions be assisted to recognise, refer on and/or manage common health conditions and symptoms? Q.1.1.1 What are the views and experiences of older people with multiple long-term conditions and their carers, of the social care services they receive? Q.1.1.2 Do service users and carers consider that their care is

	(a) personalised; (b) integrated or coordinated with healthcare?
	Q.1.1.2 What do they think works well and what needs to change?
	Q.1.2.1 What are the views and experiences of practitioners, managers and commissioners in health and social care who procure, manage or deliver care to older people with multiple long-term conditions in community and care home settings?
	Q.1.2.2 What do they think works well, and what needs to change?
Quality of evidence	No studies were identified which directly answered this question.
Relative value of different outcomes	No studies were identified which directly answered this question.
Trade-off between benefits and harms	No studies were identified which directly answered this question.
Economic considerations	No economic evaluations were identified to support recommendations on workforce training. The guideline committee were, however, mindful of potential costs and resource use when making the recommendations.
Evidence statements – numbered evidence statements from which the recommendation(s) were developed	None.
Other considerations	The Guideline Committee thought this an important topic on which to make recommendations and, with the lack of literature, drew on their own experience.
	The Guideline Committee members discussed the competencies and skills that would most likely be required of social care practitioners in recognising, referring on and/or managing common health conditions and symptoms. They also discussed workforce competence more broadly, particularly in relation to the recommendations that relate to a 'named care coordinator' for which some additional mapping work was undertaken.
	They agreed that frontline social care practitioners should have the skills and competence to:
	- recognise and understand the impact of common conditions so they can either provide support needed or refer on to others (who may be specialists) to do so
	- know when to raise concerns, signpost or refer on
	- understand when and how to keep the care coordinator informed about a person's condition or support needs
	- understand how technology can/is used to support the person.

	The Guideline Committee also discussed the wide range of relevant NICE guidance already in existence or development (including for example, on UI in women, faecal incontinence and managing medicines in care homes). They agreed that, given the existing guidance, the remit of this guideline and the lack of evidence, they should develop general, rather than condition-specific, recommendations in respect of this issue.
	The NCCSC research team highlighted to the Guideline Committee that recognition of common conditions by frontline workers had been discussed extensively as part of the NICE Home care guideline development. On reviewing the draft recommendation used in the Home care guideline, and discussing the nature and needs of the people using home care services, the Long-term conditions Guideline Committee agreed to adopt the wording for inclusion in this guideline.
	The Guideline Committee also raised an implementation issue in these discussions, about the difficulty of ensuring new information reaches the frontline practitioner workforce. This was recorded to inform the NCCSC's work on dissemination and adoption.

27

28

29

30

31

32

33

34

35

36

37

38

4 Implementation: getting started

This section highlights 3 areas of the older people with social care needs and multiple long-term conditions guideline that could have a big impact on practice and be challenging to implement, along with the reasons why change is happening in these areas (given in the box at the start of each area). We identified these with the help of stakeholders and Guideline Committee members (see section 9.4 of the manual). The section also gives information on resources to help with implementation.

4.1 The challenge: empowering older people with social care needs and multiple long-term conditions and their carers to choose and manage their own support

See recommendations 1.1.3, 1.2.5 and 1.2.10

A person-centred assessment, focused on ensuring a person has choice and control over their care and support, can:

- result in a care and support plan that better meets the person's needs, helps them to maintain their independence for longer and may delay the need for higher levels of care
- contribute to the person's sense of wellbeing and improve their quality of life, which is consistent with the principles of the Care Act 2014 and the desire of older people to live a 'normal' life as described in published research.

Changing perceptions

As a result of pressures within the social care system, managers and practitioners often prioritise meeting older peoples' essential personal care needs over their wish to live a 'normal' life. This approach needs to change to reflect a much wider understanding of the role and contribution of social care.

58   To do this, social care managers and practitioners could:

59   • Work in partnership with focus groups, care providers or existing local
60   forums to review their provision of information and advice, and ensure it
61   covers all aspects needed to enable people to choose and manage their
62   own care and support. The Care Act Statutory Guidance provides some
63   helpful points to consider. The SCIE guide on co-production in social care
64   provides some helpful pointers and practice examples about reviewing
65   services in partnership with those who use them.
66   • Draw on information and examples, such as those found in SCIE's
67   Prevention Library or as part of the Campaign to End Loneliness, to
68   develop an awareness and understanding of the impact of social isolation.
69   They should also consider the contribution that person-centred assessment
70   and support planning can make to reduce social isolation, including through
71   access-to-peer support.
72   • Work with older people locally who are already using personal budgets,
73   continuing healthcare budgets, individual service funds and direct
74   payments, to review the support they need.
75

76   *4.2   The challenge: empowering practitioners to deliver*
77   *person-centred care*

78   See recommendations 1.2.5, 1.5.1 1.7.1–3

Knowledgeable, confident and well-supported practitioners can deliver:

• more effective person-centred care and support that promotes
  independence, choice and control for older people with multiple long-term
  conditions using health and social care services
• coordinated care that is more cost-effective and better meets the wishes of
  older people as highlighted in the National Voices publication 'I'm still me – a
  narrative for co-ordinated support for older people

79

80

Skills and knowledge development

To support older people with social care needs and multiple long-term conditions, health and social care practitioners need to have skills and knowledge about a range of conditions, care needs, support options and legislation. Managers also need to understand their role in supporting this.

To do this, managers could:

- Use this guideline and local forums to review the knowledge, skills and qualifications practitioners need to provide person-centred care and support to older people with social care needs and multiple long-term conditions, and to identify any gaps.
- Use resources (such as the SCIE guide to effective supervision in a variety of settings) that highlight the importance of supervision, coaching, training and development plans, and regularly review progress and performance in partnership with practitioners.
- Use the Care Quality Commission's provider handbook (Appendix B: Characteristics of each rating level) to understand the characteristics of a well-led service and review the current approach using this as a benchmark.
- Use resources such as those developed by Skills for Care to review and identify the personal support managers need, including from their peers, to provide effective and supportive management and leadership.

4.3 The challenge: integrating different care and support options to enable person-centred care

See recommendations 1.2.1, 1.4.1 and 1.4.2.

> Joined-up care and support helps to deliver better experiences and outcomes for older people with social care needs and multiple long-term conditions and their carers, who are known to value coordinated care with good links to the wider health and social care system. It also saves time and money across the health and social care system through avoiding duplication.

106 **Working across boundaries**

107 Traditionally, health and social care services that support older people with

108 social care needs and multiple long-term conditions focus on managing

109 separate health conditions, and the system is complex to navigate. Systems

110 and structures may need to change to help professionals to work athwart

111 service boundaries and specialisms.

112 To do this, managers and commissioners could:

113 • Establish named care coordinators locally and ensure they have the

114 authority to provide continuity of support and amend care and support

115 plans as needed. Share information about their role and responsibilities

116 widely to make sure it is fully understood.

117 • Provide care coordinators with the necessary training and support based

118 on a clear understanding of their role, and the skills and knowledge they

119 need.

120 • Review local relationships across health, social care and the voluntary

121 sector and identify where more support is needed to work across service

122 boundaries and professions. Resources such as The How to… guides

123 produced to support the Better Care Fund can help with this.

124

125 ## Need more help?

126 Further resources are available from NICE that may help to support

127 implementation.

128 • NICE produces indicators annually for use in the Quality and Outcomes

129 Framework (QOF) for the UK. The process for this and the NICE menu

130 can be found here.

131 • Uptake data about guideline recommendations and quality standard

132 measures are available on the NICE website.

5   References

Abraham C (2009) What psychological and behaviour changes are initiated by 'expert patient' training and what training techniques are most helpful? Psychology and Health 24(10): 1153-65

Alzheimer's Disease International (2011) World Alzheimer Report 2011: The benefits of early diagnosis and intervention

Banning M (2008) Older people and adherence with medication: A review of the literature. International Journal of Nursing Studies 45(10): 1150-61

Battersby MW (2005) Health Reform through Coordinated Care: SA HealthPlus. British Medical Journal 330(7492): 662-65

Battersby MW (2007) SA Health- Plus: a controlled trial of a state-wide application of a generic model of chronic illness care. The Millbank Quarterly 85(1): 37-67

Beland F (2006) Integrated Services for Frail Elders (SIPA): A Trial of a Model for Canada. Canadian Journal of Aging 25(1): 5-42

Bernabei R, Landi F, Gambassi G, et al (1998) Randomised trial of impact of model of integrated care and case management for older people living in the community. British Medical Journal 316 (7141): 1348-51

Berzins K, Reilly S, Abell J, et al (2009) UK self-care support initiatives for older patients with long-term conditions: A review. Chronic Illness 5(1): 56-72

Blickem C, Kennedy A, Vassilev I, et al (2013) Linking people with long-term health conditions to healthy community activities: development of Patient-Led Assessment for Network Support (PLANS). Health Expect 16(3): 48-59

Boult C, Boult LB, Morishita L, et al (2001). A randomized clinical trial of outpatient geriatric evaluation and management. J Am Geriatr Soc 49: 351-9

Boult C, Boult L, Morishita L, et al (1998). Outpatient geriatric evaluation and management (GEM). J Am Geriatr Soc 46: 296-302

160   British Geriatric Society (2011) A Quest for Quality in Care Homes

161   British Medical Association (2014) What is social care, and how can health
162   services better integrate with it?

163   Brody BL, Roch-Levecq AC, Kaplan RM et al (2006) Age-related macular
164   degeneration: self-management and reduction of depressive symptoms in a
165   randomized, controlled study. Journal of the American Geriatrics Society
166   54(10): 1557-62

167   Brown K, Stainer K, Stewart J, et al (2008) Older people with complex long-
168   term health conditions. Their views on the community matron service: a
169   qualitative study. Quality in Primary Care 16(6): 409-17

170   Challis DJ, Abendstern M, Clarkson P et al (2010a) Comprehensive
171   assessment of older people with complex care needs: The multi-discipliniarity
172   of the Single Assessment Process in England. Ageing and Society 30 (7):
173   1115-34

174   Challis DJ, Hughes J, Berzins K, et al (2010b) Self-care and Case
175   Management in Long-term Conditions: The Effective Management of Critical
176   Interfaces. Report for the National Institute for Health Research Service
177   Delivery and Organisation programme. Personal Social Services Research
178   Unit. University of York

179   Challis DJ, Clarkson P, Williamson J, et al (2004). The value of specialist
180   clinical assessment of older people prior to entry to care homes. Age and
181   Ageing 33: 25-34

182

183   Counsell SR, Callahan CM Clark DO et al (2007) Geriatric Care Management
184   for Low-Income Seniors: a randomised controlled trial. Journal of the
185   American Medical Association 298(22): 2623-33

186 Counsell SR, Callahan CM, Tu W et al (2009) Cost analysis of the geriatric
187 resources for assessment and care of elders care management intervention. J
188 Am Geriatr Soc 57(8): 1420-26

189 Davey B, Levin E, L Liffe S, et al (2005) Integrating health and social care:
190 implications for joint working and community care outcomes for older people.
191 Journal of Interprofessional Care 19(1): 22-34

192 Department of Health (2011) No Health Without Mental Health: a cross-
193 government mental health outcomes strategy for people of all ages

194 Department of Health (2012) Long Term Conditions Compendium of
195 Information: Third Edition.

196 Department of Health (2012) NHS Constitution for England

197 Department of Health (2013) Integrated Care: Our Shared Commitment

198 Department of Health (2013) The Mandate: a mandate from the government
199 to the NHS Commissioning Board: April 2013 to March 2015

200 Department of Health (2014) Carers strategy: the second national action plan
201 2014-2016

202 Department of Health (2014) Mental Capacity Act: making decisions

203 Department of Health (2014) Mental Capacity Act 2005: Deprivation of liberty
204 safeguards - Code of Practice to supplement the main Mental Capacity Act
205 2005 Code of Practice

206 Department of Health, Social Services and Public Safety (2012) Living with
207 Long Term Conditions – A Policy Framework

208 Dozeman E, van Marwijk H, van Schaik DJF, et al (2012) Contradictory
209 Effects for Prevention of Depression and Anxiety in Residents in Homes for
210 the Elderly: a Pragmatic Randomized Controlled Trial. International
211 Psychogeriatrics 24(8): 1242-51

212   Engelhardt JB, Toseland RW, O'Donnell JC, et al (1996) The effectiveness
213   and efficiency of outpatient geriatric evaluation and management. Journal of
214   the American Geriatrics Society 44: 847-856

215   Glendinning C, Challis D, Fernandez J et al (2008) Evaluation of the Individual
216   Budgets Pilot Programme: Final Report, Social Policy Research Unit,
217   University of York, York

218   Glendinning C, Arksey H, Jones K et al. (2009) The Individual Budgets Pilot
219   Projects: Impact and Outcomes for Carers. Social Policy Research Unit,
220   University of York, York

221   Goodman C, Drennan V, Manthorpe J, et al (2012) A study of the
222   effectiveness of interprofessional working for community-dwelling older people
223   – Final Report. NIHR, UK

224   Granville G, Runnicles J, Barker S, et al (2010) Increasing the Voice, Choice
225   and Control of Older People with High Support Needs: A Research Findings
226   Paper from the South East Regional Initiative (SERI). National Development
227   Team for Inclusion. HM Government Office for Disability Issues

228   HM Government (2014) The Care Act

229   Horrocks S, Somerset M, Stoddart H et al. (2004) What prevents older people
230   from seeking treatment for urinary incontinence? A qualitative exploration of
231   barriers to the use of community continence services. Family Practice 21(6):
232   689-96

233   Johansson G, Eklund K, Gosman-Hedstrom G (2010) Multidisciplinary team,
234   working with elderly persons living in the community: a systematic literature
235   review. Scandinavian Journal of Occupational Therapy 17(20): 101-16

236   Joseph Rowntree Foundation (2009) Older people's vision for long term care

237   Keefe B, Geron SM, Enguidanos S (2009) Integrating social workers into
238   primary care: Physician and nurse perceptions of roles, benefits, and
239   challenges. Social Work in Health Care. 48(6): 579-96

Keeler EB, Robalino DA, Frank JC, et al (1999) Cost-Effectiveness of Outpatient Geriatric Assessment with an Intervention to Increase Adherence. Medical Care 37(12): 1199-206

Kennedy A, Reeves D, Bower P et al. (2007) The effectiveness and cost effectiveness of a national lay-led self care support programme for patients with long-term conditions: a pragmatic randomised controlled trial. Journal of Epidemiology and Community Health. 61(3): 254-61

Kennedy A, Bower P, Reeves D et al. (2013) Implementation of self-management support for long-term conditions in routine primary care settings: Cluster randomised controlled trial. BMJ 346(f2882): 1-11

King G, O'Donnell C, Boddy D, et al (2012) Boundaries and e-health implementation in health and social care. BMC Medical Informatics and Decision Making 12: 100

Landi F, Gambassi G, Pola R et al (1999a) Impact of integrated home care services on hospital use. J Am Geriatr Soc 47: 1430-4

Landi F, Lattanzio F, Gambassi G at al. (1999b) A model for integrated home care of frail older patients: the Silver Network project. SILVERNET-HC Study Group. Aging (Milano) 44: 262-72.

Local Government Association (2014) Adult social care funding: 2014 state of the nation report

Mason A, Weatherly H, Spilsbury K et al (2007) A systematic review of the effectiveness and cost-effectiveness of different models of community-based respite care for frail older people and their carers. Health technology assessment 11(15): 1-157

Morgan K, Gregory P, Tomeny M et al. (2011) Self-help treatment for insomnia symptoms associated with chronic conditions in older adults: a randomised controlled trial. Journal of the American Geriatrics Society 60(10): 1803-10

268 Morishita L, Boult C, Boult L et al. (1998). Satisfaction with outpatient geriatric
269 evaluation and management (GEM). The Gerontologist 38(3): 303-8

270 National Development Team for Inclusion (2011) A Long Time Coming - Part
271 1 - Strategies for achieving age equality in mental health services

272 National Voices (2012) Integrated care: what do patients, service users and
273 carers want?

274 NHS England (2014) NHS England's Commitment to Carers

275 Reilly S, Hughes J, Challis D (2010) Case management for long-term
276 conditions: implementation and processes. Ageing and Society. 30(1): 125-55

277 Reuben DB, Frank JC, Hirsch SH et al (1999). A randomized clinical trial of
278 outpatient comprehensive geriatric assessment coupled with an intervention
279 to increase adherence to recommendations. Journal of American Geriatric
280 Society 47: 269-76

281 Rogers A, Kennedy A, Bower P et al (2008): The United Kingdom Expert
282 Patients Programme: results and implications from a national evaluation. The
283 Medical Journal of Australia 190(10suppl): S21-4

284 Rosengard, A., Laing, I., Ridley, J and Hunter, S. (2007) A literature review on
285 multiple and complex needs. Scottish Executive Social Research.

286 Sargent P, Pickard S, Sheaff R et al (2007) Patient and carer perceptions of
287 case management for long-term conditions. Health and Social Care in the
288 Community. 15(6): 511-9

289 Sommers LS, Marton KI, Barbaccia JC et al (2000). Physician, nurse, and
290 social worker collaboration in primary care for chronically ill seniors. Arch
291 Intern Med 160: 1825-33

292 The Kings Fund (2010) Avoiding hospital admissions: What does the research
293 evidence say?

294 The Kings Fund (2012) Long-term Conditions and Mental Health

295 The National Institute for Health and Care Excellence (2013) The Social Care
296 Guidance Manual

297 Toseland RW, O'Donnell JC, Engelhardt JB et al (1996) Outpatient geriatric
298 evaluation and management: Results of randomized trial. Medical Care
299 34:624-40

300 Toseland RW, O'Donnell JC, Englehardt JB et al (1997) Outpatient Geriatric
301 Evaluation and Management: Is There an Investment Effect? Gerontologist
302 37: 324-32

303 Trivedi D, Goodman C, Gage H, et al (2013) The effectiveness of inter-
304 professional working for older people living in the community: a systematic
305 review. Health & Social Care in the Community 21(2): 113-28

306

307 6   Related NICE guidance

308 Details of related guidance are correct at the time of consultation on the
309 guideline (September 2015).

310 Published

311 • Managing medicines in care homes NICE guideline SC1 (March 2014)
312 • Osteoarthritis NICE guideline CG177 (February 2014).
313 • Osteoporosis NICE guideline CG146 (August 2012).
314 • Hypertension NICE guideline CG127 (August 2011).
315 • Chronic heart failure NICE guideline CG108 (August 2010).
316 • Depression in adults with a chronic physical problem NICE guideline CG91
317   (October 2009).
318 • Rheumatoid arthritis NICE guideline CG79 (2009).
319 • Occupational therapy and physical activity interventions to promote the
320   mental wellbeing of older people in primary care and residential care NICE
321   guideline PH16 (2008).
322 • Type 2 diabetes NICE guideline CG66 (partially updated by CG87) (2008).
323 • Dementia NICE guideline CG42 (2006).

324 • [Parkinson's disease](#) NICE guideline CG35 (2006).

325 **In development**

326 NICE is [developing](#) the following guidance:

327 • Home care. NICE guideline. Publication expected September 2015.

328 • Transition between inpatient hospital settings and community or care home

329   settings for adults with social care needs. NICE guideline. Publication

330   expected November 2015.

331 • [Short-term interventions for regaining independence](#). Publication expected

332   July 2017.

333 • Multi-morbidities: system integration to meet population needs. NICE

334   guideline. (Publication date to be confirmed).

335

336

7   Glossary and abbreviations

Abbreviations

Abbreviation	Term
ADL	activities of daily living
ASCOT	Adult Social Care Outcomes Toolkit
C	comparison group
DP	direct payment
EQ-5D	EuroQol: a standard health measure that allows the calculation of quality-adjusted life years (QALYs)
GHQ	General Health Questionnaire
GP	general practitioner
IADL	instrumental activities of daily living
IB	Individual budget
ICER	incremental cost effectiveness ratio as a ratio of change in costs to change in benefits
I	intervention group
n	number of participants
p	p-value: a measure that indicates whether the change in outcome was due to chance; a p-value of less than 0.05 suggests that the change was not due to chance (statistically significant)
RCT	randomised controlled trial
SCRQOL	social care-related quality of life
SD	standard deviation
SE	standard error
wk	week
WTP	willingness-to-pay value: a threshold set by NICE that the government is prepared to pay for a year in perfect health; the threshold is set between £20,000 and £30,000

Please see the NICE glossary for an explanation of terms not described above.

343 # About this guideline

344 ## *What does this guideline cover?*

345 The Department of Health (DH) asked the National Institute for Health and

346 Care Excellence (NICE) to produce this guideline on social care of older

347 people with multiple long-term conditions (see the scope).

348 The recommendations are based on the best available evidence. They were

349 developed by the Guideline Committee (GC) – for membership see Section 6.

350 For information on how NICE guidelines are developed, see Developing NICE

351 Guidelines: The Manual.

352 ## *Other information*

353 For consultation document: we will develop a pathway and information for the

354 public and tools to help organisations put this guideline into practice. Details

355 will be available on our website after the guideline has been issued.

356 ## *Copyright*

357

362