
Submission template

Discussion paper:

Future reform – an integrated care at home program to support older Australians

Submissions close on 21 August 2017

Instructions:

- Save a copy of this template to your computer.
- It is recommended that you read the relevant pages in the discussion paper prior to responding.
- You do not need to respond to all of the questions posed in the discussion paper.
- The numbering of the questions in the template corresponds to the numbering in the discussion paper.
- Please keep your answers concise and relevant to the topic being addressed.
- Upload your completed submission on the [Consultation Hub](#). Alternatively, if you are experiencing difficulties uploading, you can email your submission to: agedcarereformenquiries@health.gov.au

Thank you for your interest in participating in our consultation.

Tell us about you

What is your full name?

First name Roderick

Last name Campbell

What is your organisation's name (if applicable)?

The Australia Institute

What stakeholder category/categories do you most identify with?

<input type="checkbox"/> Commonwealth Home Support Program ¹ service provider	<input type="checkbox"/> Peak body – consumer
<input type="checkbox"/> Home Care Package service provider	<input type="checkbox"/> Peak body – carers
<input type="checkbox"/> Flexible care provider	<input type="checkbox"/> Peak body – provider
<input type="checkbox"/> Residential aged care service provider	<input type="checkbox"/> Seniors membership association
<input type="checkbox"/> Aged care worker	<input type="checkbox"/> Professional organisation
<input type="checkbox"/> Volunteer	<input type="checkbox"/> Disability support organisation
<input type="checkbox"/> Regional Assessment Service	<input type="checkbox"/> Financial services organisation
<input type="checkbox"/> Aged Care Assessment Team/Service	<input type="checkbox"/> Union
<input type="checkbox"/> Consumer	<input type="checkbox"/> Local government
<input type="checkbox"/> Carer or representative	<input type="checkbox"/> State government
<input type="checkbox"/> Advocacy organisation	<input type="checkbox"/> Federal government
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other Research Organisation

Where does your organisation operate (if applicable)? Otherwise, where do you live?

<input type="checkbox"/> NSW	<input type="checkbox"/> SA
<input type="checkbox"/> ACT	<input type="checkbox"/> WA
<input type="checkbox"/> Vic	<input type="checkbox"/> NT
<input type="checkbox"/> Qld	<input type="checkbox"/> Tas
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Nationally	

May we have your permission to publish parts of your response that are **not** personally identifiable?

Yes, publish all of my response

No, do not publish any part of my response

¹ Includes Home and Community Care Providers in Western Australia

Section 2. Reform context

2.3 Reforms to date

Comments

We would welcome your views and feedback on the February 2017 (*Increasing Choice*) reforms.

Refer to page 6 of the discussion paper

The *Future reform – an integrated care at home program to support older Australians* discussion paper includes no consideration of shared living programs. This is a serious oversight given the paper's emphasis on reform and innovation in care-at-home services.

The main shared living programs relating to aged (and disability) care in Australia are Homeshare programs. Homeshare brings together older people, or people with a disability, who live alone in their own homes with responsible people to live with them. It provides company and security for the householder and affordable accommodation for the 'homesharer'. The householder provides a place for the homesharer to live, while the homesharer provides around 10 hours of practical assistance per week, such as cooking, cleaning and shopping.

Homeshare programs have been operating in Australia for 17 years. Programs are currently running in Victoria and the ACT, with considerable interest in other states.

Homeshare has generally been block funded and the current transition to MyAgedCare is posing a serious challenge to these programs as they do not easily fit into 'line-item' type service lists. Without Commonwealth recognition of Homeshare and integration into MyAgedCare, existing homeshare programs are at risk of closing and the opportunity to expand Homeshare will be lost.

The Australia Institute has published two research papers on Homeshare in Australia, which are appended to this submission. The first is an economic assessment of homeshare programs Key points:

- Australians overwhelmingly want to continue to live in our own homes as we get older. 82 per cent of survey respondents intend to stay in their own home for as long as possible.
- Most Australians are 'concerned' or 'very concerned' that they cannot afford the care they need to stay in their homes. Even among people earning \$150,000 per year, only 18 per cent are confident they can afford to stay at home.
- Homeshare delivers economic benefits through reduced service costs, delayed entry to residential care, earlier householder exit from hospital stays and affordable housing for homesharers.
- A program with 32 ongoing homeshare matches delivers an estimated annual net benefit of \$1.1 million per year.
- The main Victorian Homeshare program, Wesley Homeshare, has delivered an \$11 million net benefit over 15 years of operation.
- Report available here:
<http://www.tai.org.au/sites/default/files/P199%20Homeshare%20report.pdf>

Our second report on Homeshare examined the difficulties in transition from state funding to the Federal system. Key points:

- Systemic issues in the pricing and payment structures place innovation for new semi-formal service models, such as Homeshare, at risk.

- MyAgedCare and NDIS pricing systems do not clearly account for indirect service costs that do not involve a paid relationship between a carer and the care recipient.
- Shared living programs that are based on a voluntary exchange of resources do not have a clear place in the new structure of aged and disability care funding.
- As the NDIS and MyAgedCare develop, they should be adapted to ensure that these arrangements are not excluded as they deliver important social and economic outcomes.
- Report available here:
<http://www.tai.org.au/sites/default/files/P281Homeshare%20NDIS%20and%20MyAgedCare%20FINAL.pdf>

The current consultation process must include consideration of shared living programs such as homeshare if the potential for these services is to be realised. Excluding these services will reduce innovation in service provision, increase service costs to government and deprive many older Australians of years of living in their own homes, participating in their communities.

Please see appended reports, or links above. We would be happy to discuss these issues with the Department in person or in further correspondence.

Section 3. What type of care at home program do we want in the future?

3.1 Policy objectives

Question

Are there any other key policy objectives that should be considered in a future care at home program?

Refer to page 9 of the discussion paper

Click here to enter text.

Section 4. Reform options

4.2 An integrated assessment model

Question

What do you believe could be done to improve the current assessment arrangements, including addressing variations or different practices between programs or care types (e.g. residential care, home care and flexible care)?

Refer to page 12 of the discussion paper

Click here to enter text.

4.3.1 New higher level home care package | 4.3.2 Changing the current mix of home care packages

Questions

Would you support the introduction of a new higher package level or other changes to the current

package levels?

If so, how might these reforms be funded within the existing aged care funding envelope?

Refer to pages 12 – 14 of the discussion paper

[Click here to enter text.](#)

4.4.1 Changing the current mix of individualised and block funding

Question

Which types of services might be best suited to different funding models, and why?

Refer to pages 14 – 15 of the discussion paper

[Click here to enter text.](#)

Question

What would be the impact on consumers and providers of moving to more individualised funding?

Refer to pages 14 – 15 of the discussion paper

[Click here to enter text.](#)

Question

Are there other ways of funding particular services or assisting consumers with lower care or support needs, e.g. a combination of individualised funding and block funding, vouchers etc.?

Refer to pages 14 – 15 of the discussion paper

[Click here to enter text.](#)

4.5.1 Refocussing assessment and referral for services

Questions

Should consumers receive short-term intensive restorative/reablement interventions before the need for ongoing support is assessed?

If so, what considerations need to be taken into account with this approach?

Refer to page 16 of the discussion paper

[Click here to enter text.](#)

Question

How could a wellness and independence focus be better embedded throughout the various stages of the consumer journey (i.e. from initial contact with My Aged Care through to service delivery)?

Refer to page 16 of the discussion paper

[Click here to enter text.](#)

4.6.1 Ensuring that services are responsive to consumer needs and maximise independence

Questions

How do we ensure that funding is being used effectively to maximise a person's ability to live in the community and to delay entry to residential care for as long as possible?

For example, should funding be targeted to services or activities where there is a stronger connection with care and/or independent living? Are there examples of current services or activities that you believe should not be funded by government?

Refer to pages 16 - 17 of the discussion paper

[Click here to enter text.](#)

Question

How do we maximise the flexibility of care and support so that the diverse needs of older people, including those with disability, are met?

Refer to pages 16 - 17 of the discussion paper

[Click here to enter text.](#)

4.6.2 Accessing services under different programs

Question

Under the current program arrangements, does allowing some consumers to access both programs promote inequity, particularly if other consumers have to wait for a home care package?

Refer to page 17 of the discussion paper

[Click here to enter text.](#)

Questions

Until an integrated care at home program is introduced, is there a need to more clearly define or limit the circumstances in which a person receiving services through a home care package can access additional support through the CHSP? If so, how might this be achieved?

Refer to page 17 of the discussion paper

[Click here to enter text.](#)

4.8.1 Supporting specific population groups

Question

How can we make the care at home system work better for specific population groups, particularly those whose needs are not best met through current CDC models and administrative arrangements?

Refer to page 19 of the discussion paper

[Click here to enter text.](#)

4.8.2 Supporting informed choice for consumers who may require additional support

Question

What additional supports could be considered to ensure that people with diverse needs can access services and make informed choices and exercise control over their care?

Refer to page 19 of the discussion paper

[Click here to enter text.](#)

4.10 Other suggestions for reform

Question

Do you have other suggestions for care at home reform, or views on how changes might be progressively introduced or sequenced?

Refer to page 20 of the discussion paper

[Click here to enter text.](#)

Section 5. Major structural reform

5.2 What would be needed to give effect to these structural reforms?

Question

Are there other structural reforms that could be pursued in the longer-term?

Refer to page 21 of the discussion paper

[Click here to enter text.](#)

Section 6. Broader aged care reform

6.1.1 Informal carers

Question

How might we better recognise and support informal carers of older people through future care at home reforms?

Refer to page 22 of the discussion paper

[Click here to enter text.](#)

6.1.2 Technology and innovation

Question

How can we best encourage innovation and technology in supporting older Australians to remain living at home?

Refer to page 22 of the discussion paper

[Click here to enter text.](#)

Question

What are the existing barriers, and how could they be overcome?

Refer to page 22 of the discussion paper

[Click here to enter text.](#)

6.1.3 Rural and Remote areas

Question

How can we address the unique challenges associated with service delivery in rural and remote areas?

Refer to page 22 of the discussion paper

[Click here to enter text.](#)

Question

What other service delivery and funding models could we consider for providing care at home services to consumers living in rural and remote areas, including examples of innovative local community models?

Refer to page 22 of the discussion paper

[Click here to enter text.](#)

6.1.4 Regulation

Question

How can we further reduce regulation to allow for innovation while ensuring that essential safeguards remain in place?

Refer to page 23 of the discussion paper

[Click here to enter text.](#)

6.1.5 Aged care and health systems

Question

What are some examples of current gaps or duplication across the aged care and health systems, and how could these be addressed?

Refer to page 23 of the discussion paper

[Click here to enter text.](#)

Any further comments?

Other comments

Do you have any general comments or feedback?

Please see attached reports.