

Kent Academic Repository

Tomlinson, Serena Rose Louisa (2021) Commentary on 'A logic model for the implementation of a regional workforce strategy in Positive Behavioural Support'. Tizard Learning Disability Review . ISSN 1359-5474.

Downloaded from

https://kar.kent.ac.uk/90998/ The University of Kent's Academic Repository KAR

The version of record is available from

https://doi.org/10.1108/TLDR-07-2021-0020

This document version

Author's Accepted Manuscript

DOI for this version

Licence for this version

CC BY-NC (Attribution-NonCommercial)

Additional information

This is the accepted version of a paper accepted for publication by the journal indicated in the bibliographic reference and is distributed here under the terms of the licence indicated.

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 ResearchSupport@kent.ac.uk. 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 Take Down policy (available from https://www.kent.ac.uk/guides/kar-the-kent-academic-repository#policies).



Tizard Learning Disability F

Commentary on 'A logic model for the implementation of a regional workforce strategy in Positive Behavioural Support'

Journal:	Tizard Learning Disability Review
Manuscript ID	TLDR-07-2021-0020
Manuscript Type:	Commentary on Service and Research Feature
Keywords:	Positive behaviour support, Intellectual disability, Training, Evaluation, Developmental Disability, Behaviours that challenge

SCHOLARONE™ Manuscripts

Commentary on 'A logic model for the implementation of a regional workforce strategy in Positive Behavioural Support'

Whilst system-wide implementation of Positive Behaviour Support (PBS) is well established (e.g., Horner et al., 2005; Horner et al., 2010; McGill et al., 2018). Noone et al. (2021) provide the first demonstration of an extensive system-wide approach to workforce development in PBS (see, for further information, Denne et al., 2015), offering accredited programmes for staff, training for family carers and awareness training for the wider system that supports people with intellectual and developmental disabilities (IDD) in one region in England. This system wide approach to PBS training is novel and a welcome development for the field, particularly given the relative lack of research focusing on PBS training and the importance of systems change to facilitate effective implementation of PBS (Allen et al., 2013; Denne et al., 2015; Denne et al., 2020). Noone et al. (2021) do, however, highlight challenges in relation to implementing this approach to training and in evaluating the training itself, including participant attrition, challenges to ongoing data collection (due in part to the coronavirus pandemic), logistical issues (e.g., resource requirements, administrative burden) and course design (e.g., the requirement for written assignments). These challenges are unlikely to be unique and similar issues are often reported in the literature (e.g., participant attrition in McGill et al., 2018). However, evidencing the effectiveness of training programmes is of paramount importance for the field and will be key to achieving good outcomes for those supported within a PBS framework, given the range of stakeholders and settings involved in this support.

As a result, this commentary aims to outline key challenges in evaluating the outcomes of PBS training and encourages practitioners and researchers to find solutions to these in order to enhance our understanding of what effective training in PBS involves and ways to maximise this effectiveness. It is beyond the scope of this commentary to offer a comprehensive overview of the literature in this area (interested readers should consult existing reviews of PBS training research, e.g., MacDonald and McGill, 2013; Mahon *et al.*, 2021) or an exhaustive list of issues and their possible solutions, rather the intention is to provide a springboard for the field to begin considering and overcoming these issues in future research / practice. Three main areas will be considered here; the necessary diversity and breadth of PBS training (particularly when utilising a system-wide model), the outcome domains to be evaluated and wider systemic issues that may influence PBS training and evaluation of its effectiveness.

Diversity and breadth of PBS training

PBS may be implemented in a range of ways; by individual practitioners (collaborating with relevant professionals), by teams, or across entire systems (Gore *et al.*, 2013). Each of these implementation models will likely require slightly different approaches to training, although the core content should remain the same and be based on current conceptualisations of PBS and its key competencies (e.g., Gore *et al.*, 2013; Positive Behavioural Support Coalition (UK), 2015). Furthermore, training may vary in level / intensity depending on the target audience (e.g., those who are leading PBS within an organisation will typically receive more intense training than those who are supporting implementation on a day-to-day basis). As a result, a wide range of PBS training initiatives have emerged in the UK from University level courses that are externally accredited and often focus on the PBS model more broadly (rather than in reference to a particular setting), courses offered by specific organisations within the field usually focused on particular stakeholders (e.g., support staff, family carers), courses offered by individual practitioners for specific services, and in-

house training developed by organisations that support people with IDD. As noted by Denne *et al.* (2015) there are no systematic accreditation processes or national standards relating to training in PBS within the UK, therefore it is likely that the content, emphasis and quality of training varies significantly. This variability is also evident within the literature, for example Gore and Umizawa (2011) utilised brief workshop-based training for family carers and teachers, Rose *et al.* (2014) evaluated one day group training for care staff, and McGill, Bradshaw and Hughes (2007) examined outcomes following an extended University based course in PBS.

Whilst diversity across courses enables flexibility to develop training that meets a range of needs and that can be tailored to specific organisational contexts or settings, this also leads to challenges in evaluating the evidence base relating to PBS training and in comparing outcomes across training models. As noted by Denne *et al.* (2015) many training initiatives do not routinely evaluate the outcomes of the training (beyond basic measures of participants' experiences of the training), resulting in a lack of research focusing on PBS training outcomes, and even where this evaluation does take place, it is difficult to compare outcomes when training models vary so widely. It is notable that there is little information about the minimum requirements for effective PBS training (e.g., in terms of core content, delivery model, intensity etc.) therefore this must be a key focus for the field in order to move towards a clearer understanding of the core components of training that is likely to be effective for different stakeholders / purposes.

Training outcomes

Perhaps the most significant challenge to evaluating PBS training is identifying the most appropriate and sensitive outcome measures, given the broad range of outcomes targeted by PBS approaches (an issue also relevant to the evaluation of PBS more generally, Gore *et al.*, 2020; Hagiliassis and Di Marco, 2019). This is reflected in the range of outcomes examined in PBS training literature, including those for service users and staff (see MacDonald and McGill, 2013). As noted above, the focus of PBS training may vary from intensive externally accredited courses, to more general awareness raising training for a wide range of stakeholders who may or may not use PBS directly in their work (as in Noone *et al.*, 2021). This means that the evaluation of training must necessarily vary and focus on outcomes at different levels (e.g., service user outcomes, outcomes for other stakeholders such as family carers, trainee outcomes, and organisational outcomes) and carefully consider the outcomes that can reasonably be expected to change based on the training delivered (Denne *et al.*, 2015).

Each of these outcome levels are also likely to pose their own challenges when considered as measures for evaluating PBS training, not least because the link between training and outcomes for those not directly involved in the training is less direct and other factors may account for any observed changes (MacDonald and McGill, 2013). These issues are not unique to training in PBS specifically, but are particularly important for practitioners / researchers within this field, given the diversity of potential outcomes when utilising PBS to support people with IDD. Even where a more direct link can be made between the training and outcomes (e.g., where outcomes for the trainee themselves are evaluated, such as knowledge / confidence changes) it may be difficult to identify an appropriate and sensitive measure for this purpose and attention within the field should be given to developing robust, psychometrically valid outcome measures. Finally, the extent to which outcomes for trainees are translated into changes in practice may be important to consider, particularly for training that does not include practice-based elements and is more didactic in nature. Evidence in relation to other training courses suggests that a practice element is imperative (Jones *et al.*, 1999; Jones *et al.*, 2001; see MacDonald and McGill, 2013) and it is therefore important to consider the extent to which PBS training can influence practice where this is not directly targeted by the training

itself. It is beyond the scope of this commentary to consider the evidence relating to specific outcome measures but building on the existing work in this area (e.g., Gore *et al.*, 2020; Hagiliassis and Di Marco, 2019) and extending this to evaluation of PBS training will aid our understanding of key outcome domains for training, and support comparisons between training courses where a core set of outcome domains are targeted.

Wider systemic issues

In addition to issues relating to evaluating the training itself, there are a range of systemic issues within the field that may influence the extent to which it is possible to robustly evaluate a training course. For example, Noone *et al.* (2021) highlighted issues relating to staff illness/turnover which is common in the field and may mean that training is not fully completed or those who complete training do not remain within the same organisation long enough for evaluation of medium- to long-term outcomes (an issue also highlighted by McGill *et al.*, 2018). This may also result in inconsistent implementation of PBS and influence any conclusions relating to service user or organisational outcomes following staff training in PBS. Linked to this, these outcomes may be influenced by the extent to which organisations and their service user population change over time (MacDonald and McGill, 2013), making longitudinal evaluation of outcomes difficult.

In addition, as noted by many authors (e.g., Allen *et al.*, 2013; Denne *et al.*, 2015; Denne *et al.*, 2020; Gore *et al.*, 2013) PBS involves more than just changes in the practice of individual staff members, and requires organisational culture change and significant commitment from every member of an organisation. This extensivity of outcome may be difficult to achieve as a result of short or low intensity training initiatives and this may therefore impact on outcomes relevant to the application of PBS in services which should be taken into account when evaluating the impact of training on service user or organisational outcomes. It will be useful for the field to investigate effective methods for achieving organisational culture and practice change, which to date has been notoriously hard to evidence (Denne *et al.*, 2020).

Conclusion

Noone *et al.* (2021) present a blueprint for system wide training in PBS across a large region in England, involving multiple stakeholders, multiple organisations, and training at a range of levels. Replications of this model and robust evaluations are needed in order to build an evidence base for training at this scale. However, as noted throughout this commentary, there are a number of challenges inherent in the evaluation of practice focused training, many of which are unique to or particularly problematic for training in PBS. Whilst the evidence base for PBS grows, it will be important for the field to also focus on demonstrating effective methodologies for scaling up delivery of PBS to those who would most benefit, which will necessarily involve training at a number of levels. Accreditation of training providers and the development national standards is likely to be helpful (Denne *et al.*, 2015), as well as identification of the minimum components necessary for effective outcomes at a number of levels. Achieving this will involve consideration of a range of issues to evaluating training, including those identified here, and is likely to be an ongoing aim for this developing field.

- Allen, D., McGill, P., Hastings, R.P., Toogood, S., Baker, P., Gore, N.J., et al (2013), "Implementing positive behavioural support: Changing social and organisational contexts", *International Journal of Positive Behavioural Support*, Vol. 3 No. 2, pp. 32-41.
- Denne, L.D., Gore, N.J., Hughes, J.C., Toogood, S., Jones, E. and Brown, F.J. (2020), "Implementing evidence-based practice: The challenge of delivering what works for people with learning disabilities at risk of behaviours that challenge", *Tizard Learning Disability Review*, Vol. 25 No. 3, pp. 133-143.
- Denne, L.D., Jones, E., Lowe, K., Brown, F.J. and Hughes, J.C. (2015), "Putting positive behavioural support into practice: The challenges of workforce training and development", *International Journal of Positive Behavioural Support*, Vol. 5 No. 2, pp. 43-54.
- Gore, N.J., Jones, E. and Stafford, V. (2020), "Building core domains for the evaluation of PBS: A consensus-based approach", *International Journal of Positive Behavioural Support*, Vol. 10 No. 1, pp. 4-15.
- Gore, N.J., McGill, P., Toogood, S., Allen, D., Hughes, J.C., Baker, P., et al (2013), "Definition and scope for positive behavioural support", *International Journal of Positive Behavioural Support*, Vol. 3 No. 2, pp. 14-23.
- Gore, N.J. and Umizawa, H. (2011), "Challenging behavior training for teaching staff and family carers of children with intellectual disabilities: A preliminary evaluation", *Journal of Policy and Practice in Intellectual Disabilities*, Vol. 8 No. 4, pp. 266-275.
- Hagiliassis, N. and Di Marco, M. (2019), "PBS outcomes measurement: A new taxonomy to support organisational implementation", *International Journal of Positive Behavioural Support*, Vol. 9 No. 2, pp. 16-24.
- Horner, R., Sugai, G. and Anderson, C.M. (2010), "Examining the evidence base for school-wide positive behavior support", *Focus on Exceptional Children*, Vol. 42 No. 8, pp. 1-14.
- Horner, R., Sugai, G., Todd, A. & Lewis-Palmer, T. (2005) School-wide positive behavior support. In: Individualized Supports for Students with Problem Behaviors: Designing Positive Behavior Plans (eds. L.M. Bambara & L. Kern), pp. 359-391. The Guildford Press, .
- Jones, E., Felce, D., Lowe, K., Bowley, C., Pagler, J., Gallagher, B., et al (2001), "Evaluation of the dissemination of active support training in staffed community residences", American Journal on Mental Retardation, Vol. 106 No. 4, pp. 344-358.
- Jones, E., Perry, J., Lowe, K., Felce, D., Toogood, S., Dunstan, F., et al (1999), "Opportunity and the promotion of activity among adults with severe intellectual disability living in community residences: The impact of training staff in active support", *Journal of Intellectual Disability Research*, Vol. 43 No. 3, pp. 164-178.
- MacDonald, A. and McGill, P. (2013), "Outcomes of staff training in positive behaviour support: A systematic review", *Journal of Developmental and Physical Disabilities*, Vol. 25 No. 1, pp. 17-33.
- Mahon, D., Walsh, E., Holloway, J. and Lydon, H. (2021), "A systematic review of training methods to increase staff's knowledge and implementation of positive behaviour support in residential and

- day settings for individuals with intellectual and developmental disabilities", *Journal of Intellectual Disabilities*, Vol. [EPub] pp. 1-26.
- McGill, P., Bradshaw, J. and Hughes, A. (2007), "Impact of extended education/training in positive behaviour support on staff knowledge, causal attributions and emotional responses", *Journal of Applied Research in Intellectual Disabilities*, Vol. 20 No. 1, pp. 41-51.
- McGill, P., Vanono, L., Clover, W., Smyth, E., Cooper, V., Hopkins, L., *et al* (2018), "Reducing challenging behaviour of adults with intellectual disabilities in supported accommodation: A cluster randomized controlled trial of setting-wide positive behaviour support", *Research in Developmental Disabilities*, Vol. 81, pp. 143-154.
- Noone, S., Branch, A. and Sherring, M. (2021), "A logic model for the implementation of a regional workforce strategy in positive behavioural support", *Tizard Learning Disability Review*, Vol. [In Print].
- Positive Behavioural Support Coalition (UK) (2015), *Positive Behavioural Support: A Competence Framework*, available at www.pbsacademy.org.uk.
- attric, y and challe, No. 1, pp. 35-. Rose, J., Gallivan, A., Wright, D. and Blake, J. (2014), "Staff training using positive behavioural support: The effects of a one-day training on the attributions and attitudes of care staff who work with people with an intellectual disability and challenging behaviour", International Journal of Developmental Disabilities, Vol. 60 No. 1, pp. 35-42.