

Kent Academic Repository

Barnoux, Magali F.L. (2019) *Community Services and Transforming Care: Reflections and Considerations.* Tizard Learning Disability Review, 24 (1). pp. 33-37. ISSN 1359-5474.

Downloaded from

https://kar.kent.ac.uk/71763/ The University of Kent's Academic Repository KAR

The version of record is available from

https://doi.org/10.1108/TLDR-12-2018-0034

This document version

Author's Accepted Manuscript

DOI for this version

Licence for this version

UNSPECIFIED

Additional information

Versions of research works

Versions of Record

If this version is the version of record, it is the same as the published version available on the publisher's web site. Cite as the published version.

Author Accepted Manuscripts

If this document is identified as the Author Accepted Manuscript it is the version after peer review but before type setting, copy editing or publisher branding. Cite as Surname, Initial. (Year) 'Title of article'. To be published in *Title of Journal*, Volume and issue numbers [peer-reviewed accepted version]. Available at: DOI or URL (Accessed: date).

Enquiries

If you have questions about this document contact <u>ResearchSupport@kent.ac.uk</u>. Please include the URL of the record in KAR. If you believe that your, or a third party's rights have been compromised through this document please see our <u>Take Down policy</u> (available from https://www.kent.ac.uk/guides/kar-the-kent-academic-repository#policies).



Tizard Learning Disability F

Community services and transforming care: reflections and considerations

Journal:	Tizard Learning Disability Review
Manuscript ID	TLDR-12-2018-0034
Manuscript Type:	Commentary on Service and Research Feature
Keywords:	Autism, Intellectual disability, Learning disabilities, Transforming Care, Community Services, Community Learning Disability Teams

SCHOLARONE™ Manuscripts

Community services and transforming care: reflections and considerations

Abstract

Purpose - The purpose of this paper is to consider the existing evidence base regarding community services for people with learning disabilities in the context of Transforming Care (TC).

Design/methodology/approach – Reflections and commentary on the provision of community services for people with learning disabilities following Washington *et al.*'s article on admissions and discharges from assessment and treatment units in England.

Findings – The existing evidence base pertaining to Community Learning Disability

Teams in the UK is dated, sparse, and methodologically weak. A greater focus on researching community services for people with learning disabilities is needed in order to inform best practice guidelines.

Originality/Value – The success of the Transforming Care Agenda is contingent on the provision of high quality community services. However, the focus has been on discharging individuals from hospital, rather than the support available to them once they leave.

Keywords Community Services, Community Learning Disability Teams, Transforming Care, Learning Disability, Autism, Intellectual Disability

Paper type – Viewpoint.

The article by Washington *et al.* in the current issue, which evaluated whether two regional intellectual disability Assessment and Treatment Units (AandT) in England were meeting the recommended length of stay in line with the Transforming Care Agenda (TC), is interesting and topical. The findings suggest that whilst average length of stay in the two units for people with ID and/or autism appeared to be greatly reduced (i.e., 5 months) compared to data from 2015 (i.e., 51 months; National Audit Office, 2015), discharge rates remained significantly below the recommended targets. Further, Washington *et al.* report a significant proportion of the admissions over the three year period were preventable (i.e., 27%) and over half experienced delayed discharge (i.e., 51%), with inadequate community service provision cited as the primary reason in both instances.

Washington *et al.* are not alone in highlighting the role of inadequate community services in the poor progress of TC. Indeed, similar comments were echoed in an earlier TLDR commentary (Sinclair, 2018) and more recently in a series of damning media reports similar to those seen in the aftermath of the Winterbourne View scandal (Ford, 2018; Kelso, 2018). Further, recent census figures from the Assuring Transformation dataset report that 28% of the 2,315 individuals with learning disabilities in hospital were deemed to not need inpatient care according to their care plan, with poor health and social care funding and a lack of community service provision cited as the primary reasons for delayed discharge (NHS Digital, 2018). Together, these findings highlight that the success of the TC Agenda is inextricably linked to the growth and development of high quality community services for people with learning disabilities discharged from hospital. Yet, existing research appears to struggle in terms of empirically evidencing best practice among community services. In order to prevent unnecessary hospital admissions and avoid delayed discharges, we need to focus on evaluating and improving

community service provision in the UK – something which the academic community appears to be neglecting.

Community Services in the UK for People with Learning Disabilities

Community services in the UK are delivered in a variety of settings such as homes, schools, clinics, and community centres (NHS Providers, 2018). The services offered are diverse in nature, including physical health, mental health, and social care (NHS Providers, 2018). The large majority of their activities pertain to long-term condition nursing (e.g., diabetes), planned community services (e.g., physiotherapy), children's services (e.g., school nurses), health and wellbeing services (e.g., family planning), general practitioner teams, and specialist adult community services (e.g., mental health (NHS Providers, 2018). Existing within the specialist community services are Community Learning Disability Teams (CLDTs), their role being to provide dedicated support to individuals with learning disabilities living in the community, including those who have been discharged from hospital. Of course many of the people who are discharged will receive direct support from residential care/supported living providers whose services will be commissioned and funded by local authority and/or local health commissioners. For the purposes of the current commentary, however, the focus will be on CLDTs.

CLDTs can be traced back to the 1970s, emerging as a result of deinstitutionalisation and the move to community based services for people with learning
disabilities (DoH, 1971; Mountain, 1998). However, it was more recent government
initiatives such as *Valuing People* (DoH, 2001), *Valuing People Now* (DoH, 2009), *Transforming Care* (DoH, 2012), the *Care Act* (DoH, 2014), and *Building the Right Support* (BRS; Houlden, 2015) that increasingly placed the spotlight on CLDTs. These

policies advocate that CLDTs should reside within local authorities and act as the first point of specialist contact for people with learning disabilities living in the community, enabling and supporting them to live ordinary and meaningful lives (Department of Health, 2007; NHS England, LGA, and ADASS, 2015).

However, despite a coherent policy directive, existing research regarding the roles of CLDTs is comparatively scant and under-developed. Early research identified the role of CLDTs as a combination of coordinating, providing, and monitoring services for people with learning disabilities (Brown and Wistow, 1990; Mansell, 1990). In a later literature review, Slevin *et al.* (2008) concluded that CLDTs were responsible for providing highly specialist treatment (i.e., for challenging behaviour, mental health problems and complex health needs) (Hassiotis *et al.*, 2000; Roy *et al.*, 2000), supporting professionals in primary healthcare settings to meet individuals' needs, liaising with local providers to coordinate services, facilitating access to healthcare services, and providing educational and advisory support to individuals and those supporting them. However, there has been no known comprehensive empirical evaluation to date examining the roles and responsibilities of CLDTs, thus further indicating our understanding of the internal mechanisms of these teams is extremely limited (Clare *et al.*, 2017).

There appears to be little consensus within existing research regarding the structure, size, or composition of CLDTs in the UK (Walker *et al.*, 2003). Considerable variability in team sizes has been reported (i.e., 2-11 members of staff) (Plank, 1982) and membership may typically include community learning disability nurses, social workers, consultant psychiatrists, clinical psychologists, occupational therapists, physiotherapists, speech therapists, and general practitioners (Cooper and Bonham,

1987; O'Hara and Sperlinger, 1997; Slevin *et al.*, 2008). However, research indicates the multi-disciplinary/multi-agency approach is lacking in practice, with CLDTs composed predominantly of social workers and community learning disability nurses with little input from other professions (Slevin *et al.*, 2007; Boahen, 2016; Cooper and Bailey, 1998; McKenzie *et al.*, 2000). Further, a robust empirical evaluation is needed as much of the literature is descriptive, lacking in quantitative data focusing on organisational structures and professional practice (Boahen, 2016).

Research pertaining to the performance of CLDTs (Walker *et al.*, 2003) or the nature of service utilisation by people with IDD (Spiller *et al.*, 2007) is equally limited. Early studies suggested CLDTs were highly effective and deemed invaluable for people with learning disabilities and their families (Aylott and Toocaram, 1996; Brown and Wistow, 1990; McGrath, 1991; McGrath and Humphries, 1990; Slevin *et al.*, 2007). However, more recent empirical work by Walker *et al.* (2003) and Slevin *et al.* (2008) in the UK reported CLDTs lacked in consistency across regions in terms of structure, management, caseload, and discharge procedures, with little evidence that a multidisciplinary team was more effective compared to a uni-disciplinary team. Needless to say, research evaluating the cost-effectiveness of CLDTs is urgently needed, particularly against the backdrop of increasing austerity measures in the UK economic climate, yet there have been few efforts to date to do so.

However, there has been a small body of research devoted to identifying barriers to the success of CLDTs. Poor staffing, excessive caseload levels, inadequate staff training, ineffective teamwork, and stringent eligibility criteria have all been reported to negatively impact the effectiveness of CLDTs (Messent, 2003; Pimental and Ryan, 1996; Slevin *et al.*, 2007; Walker *et al.*, 2003). These barriers are likely to adversely impact the

amount of time staff can dedicate to service users (Walker *et al.*, 2003), appropriate case prioritisation (Todd and Caffrey, 2002), the ability to meet more complex needs of service users (McKenzie *et al.*, 2000; Slevin *et al.*, 2008), the provision of rapid high quality services for all service users (Clare *et al.*, 2017; McInnis *et al.*, 2012), and the improvement of services in line with government directives (Messent, 2003). As a consequence, CLDTs have reported increasing role rigidity, low morale, diminished personal well-being, and increasingly bureaucratic working practices (Clare *et al.*, 2017; Farrington *et al.*, 2015; Millward and Jeffries, 2001; Slevin *et al.*, 2008). Whilst this small body of research is undoubtedly extremely useful, in the absence of recent, larger-scale research, we have no way of knowing the extent to which CLDTs today are experiencing and/or overcoming these barriers or indeed any other unidentified barriers.

Best Practice Guidelines for CLDTs

Given the paucity of existing research pertaining to CLDTs, recommendations for best practice are equally scant. Much of the literature suggests CLDTs need to be clear and transparent in their roles, responsibilities, and service coordination at all levels (Hudson, 1995). A multi-disciplinary, multi-agency approach appears to be preferred, where the teams are locally accessible, cohesive, supportive of their members, effective in their performance, and adopt a person centred approach to care planning with service user involvement (Clare *et al.*, 2017; Hudson, 1995; McKenzie *et al.*, 2000; Slevin *et al.*, 2008). Practical suggestions include the provision of specialist clinical psychology and psychiatry services for those with complex needs (e.g., mental health problems, challenging behaviour, contact with the criminal justice system), accessible information packs, a keyworker system, clear eligibility criteria, small caseloads (i.e., 10-15 service

users), the capacity to deliver intensive support (e.g., through daily visits), and out of hours operation (Hudson, 1995; McKenzie *et al.*, 2000; Shepherd, 1998).

Summary

The progress and success of TC is contingent on the growth of high quality, specialised community service provision for people with learning disabilities. Where community provision is poor, discharges from inpatient settings are invariably hindered. However, beyond clear and direct policy guidelines, the best practice evidence base for CLDTs is dated, sparse, and methodologically limited. Worryingly, despite government policy initiatives, there has been no known comprehensive national evaluation of CLDT provision in the UK. This dearth of research serves to highlight a poor understanding of how to implement and run a high quality CLDT in terms of role, structure, composition, cost, and performance. Unless significant efforts are made to establish a robust evidence base to inform good practice in this area, the complete success of the TC Agenda seems unlikely.

References

- Aylott, J. and Toocaram, J. (1996), "Community learning disability teams", *British Journal of Nursing*, Vol. 5 No. 8, pp. 488-492.
- Boahen, G. (2016), "Generic or specialist profession? Identifying social work in community learning disability teams", *Journal of Integrated Care*, Vol. 24 No. 4, pp. 214-224.
- Brown S. and Wistow G. (Eds., 1990), *The Roles and Tasks of Community Mental Handicap Teams*, The Press Office, Aldershot.
- Caffrey, A. and Todd, M. (2002), "Community learning disability teams: the need for objective methods of prioritization and discharge planning", *Health Services Management Research*, Vol. 15 No. 4, pp. 223-233.
- Clare, I.C.H., Madden, E.M., Holland, A.J., Farrington, C.J.T., Whitson, S., Broughton, S., Lillywhite, A., Jones, E., Wade, K.A., Redley, M. and Wagner, A.P. (2017), "What vision?': experiences of team members in a community service for adults with intellectual disabilities", *Journal of Intellectual Disability Research*, Vol. 61 No. 3, pp. 197-209.
- Cooper, S. A. and Bailey, N. M. (1998), "Psychiatrists and the learning disabilities health service", *Psychiatric Bulletin*, Vol. 22 No. 1, pp.25-28.
- Cooper, D. A. and Bonham, K. G. (1987), "A study of two community mental handicap teams in Scotland", *British Journal of Mental Subnormality*, Vol. 33 No. 65, pp. 117-130.

- Department of Health and Social Security (1971), *Better Services for the Mentally Handicapped*, HMSO, London.
- Department of Health (2001), Valuing People: A New Strategy for Learning Disability for the 21st Century, HMSO, London.
- Department of Health (2007), Services for People with Learning Disabilities and

 Challenging Behaviour or Mental Health Needs (Revised Edition), The Stationery

 Office, London.
- Department of Health (2009), Valuing People Now: A New Three-year Strategy for People with Learning Disabilities, Department of Health.
- Department of Health, (2012), Transforming Care: A National Response to Winterbourne View Hospital.
- Department of Health, (2014), Care and Support Statutory Guidance Issued under the Care Act 2014.
- Farrington, C., Clare, I. C. H., Holland, A. J., Barrett, M. and Oborn, E. (2015), "Knowledge exchange and integrated services: experiences from an integrated community intellectual (learning) disability service for adults", *Journal of Intellectual Disability Research*, Vol. 59 No. 3, pp. 238-247.
- Ford, R. (2018), "Autistic teenagers 'locked in padded cells and abused'", retrieved 02 Dec 2018, from The Sunday Times: https://www.thetimes.co.uk/article/autistic-teenagers-locked-in-padded-cells-and-abused-b9pbchtkz.

- Hassiotis, A., Barron, P. and O'Hara, J. (2000), "Mental health services for people with learning disabilities A complete overhaul is needed with strong links to mainstream services", *BMJ*, Vol. 321 No. 7261, pp. 583-584.
- NHS England (2015), Building the Right Support: A National Plan to Develop Community

 Services and Close Inpatient Facilities for People with a Learning Disability and/or

 Autism who Display Behaviour that Challenges, including those with a Mental Health

 Condition. NHS England, London.
- Hudson, B. (1995), "A seamless service? Developing better relationships between the national health service and social services departments", in Philpot, T. and Ward, L. (Eds.), Values and Visions: Changing Ideas in Services for People with Learning
 Difficulties, Butterworth-Heinemann, Oxford, pp. 106–22.
- Kelso, P. (2018), "Deaths in secure hospitals reviewed by government after Sky investigation", available at: https://news.sky.com/story/deaths-in-secure-hospitals-reviewed-by-government-after-sky-investigation-11546371 (accessed 02 Dec 2018).
- Mansell, J. (1990), "The natural history of community mental handicap teams", in Brown, S. and Wistoe, G. (Eds.), *The Roles and Tasks of Community Mental Handicap Teams*, The Press Office, Aldershot, pp. 1-9.
- McGrath, M. (1991), Multi-Disciplinary Teamwork, Avebury, Aldershot.
- McGrath, M. and Humphreys, S. (1990), "CMHTs at Work: The Welsh Experience", in Brown, S. and Wistow, G. (Eds.), *The Roles and Tasks of Community Mental Handicap Teams*, The Press Office, Aldershot, pp. 45–71.

- Mcinnis, E. E., Hills, A., and Chapman, M. J. (2012). "Eligibility for statutory learning disability services in the North-West of England. Right or luxury? Findings from a pilot study", *British Journal of Learning Disabilities*, Vol. 40 No. 3, pp. 177-186.
- McKenzie, K., Paxton, D., Matheson, E. and Murray, G. C. (2000), "Professional composition of community learning disability teams in Scotland: implications for service provision", *Health Bulletin*, Vol. 58 No. 3, pp. 192-197.
- Messent, P. R. (2003), "An evaluation of community learning disability nurse teams in two London boroughs", *British Journal of Community Nursing*, Vol. 8 No. 9, pp. 411-420.
- Millward, L. J. and Jeffries, N. (2001), "The team survey: a tool for health care team development", *Journal of Advanced Nursing*, Vol. 35 No. 2, pp. 276-287.
- Mountain, G. (1998), Occupational Therapy for People with Learning Difficulties Living in the Community: Review of the Evidence Base, College of Occupational Therapists, London.
- NHS Digital (2018), "Learning disability services monthly statistics provisional statistics (At: September 2018, MHSDS July 2018 Final)", available at: NHS Digital: <a href="https://digital.nhs.uk/data-and-information/publications/statistical/learning-disability-services-statistics/provisional-statistics-at-september-2018-mhsds-july-2018-final (accessed 02 Dec 2018).
- NHS England, Local Government Association, Association of Directors of Adult Social Services in England (2015), *Supporting People with Learning disability and/or*

Autism who have a Mental Health Condition or Display Behaviour that Challenges, NHS England.

- NHS Providers (2018), "Community services: taking centre stage", Available at:

 https://nhsproviders.org/state-of-the-provider-sector-05-

 18andhl=enandgl=ukandstrip=0andvwsrc=0 (accessed 12 Dec 2018).
- O'Hara, J. and Sperlinger, A. (Eds.) (1997), Adults with Learning Disabilities: A Practical Approach for Health Professionals, Wiley.
- Pimental, S. and Ryan, S. (1996), "Working with clients with learning disabilities and multiple physical handicaps: a comparison between hospital and community based therapists", *British Journal of Occupational Therapy*, Vol. 59 No. 7, pp. 313-18.
- Plank, M. (1982), *Teams for Mentally Handicapped People*, Campaign for Mentally Handicapped People, London.
- Roy, M., Clarke, D. and Roy, A. (2000), *An Introduction to Learning Disability**Psychiatry, West Midlands Learning Disability Group.
- Shepherd, G. (1998), "Models of community care", *Journal of Mental Health*, Vol. 7 No. 2, pp. 165-177.
- Sinclair, N. (2018), "Transforming care: problems and possible solutions", *Tizard Learning Disability Review*, Vol. 23 No. 1, pp. 51-55.
- Slevin, E., McConkey, R., Truesdale-Kennedy, M., Barr, O. and Taggart, L. (2007), "Community learning disability teams: perceived effectiveness, multidisciplinary

working and service user satisfaction", *Journal of Intellectual Disabilities*, Vol. 11 No. 4, pp. 329-342.

- Slevin, E., Truesdale-Kennedy, M., McConkey, R., Barr, O. and Taggart, L. (2008), "Community learning disability teams: developments, composition and good practice", *Journal of Intellectual Disabilities*, Vol. 12 No. 1, pp. 59-79.
- Spiller, M. J., Costello, H., Bramley, A., Bouras, N., Martin, G., Tsakanikos, E. and Holt, G. (2007), "Consumption of mental health services by people with intellectual disabilities", *Journal of Applied Research in Intellectual Disabilities*, Vol. 20 No. 5, pp. 430-438
- Todd, M. and Caffrey, A. (2002), "Caseload management in learning disabilities", *Nursing Times*, Vol. 98 No.14, pp. 38-39.
- Walker, T., Stead, J. and Read, S. G. (2003), "Caseload management in community learning disability teams: influences on decision-making", *Journal of Learning Disabilities*, Vol. 7 No. 4, pp. 297-321.