


SUMMER
FOUNDATION



Younger People in Residential Aged Care:
Support needs, preferences and future directions
my future my choice

Dianne Winkler
Sue Sloan
Libby Callaway



Younger people in residential aged care: *Support needs, preferences and future directions*

Dianne Winkler BAppSc(OT), Grad Dip (Neuro), Grad Dip (Comp Sci), MAppSc
Summer Foundation Ltd

Sue Sloan BAppSc(OT), MSc(Clin Neuropsych)
Osborn Sloan & Associates Pty Ltd

Libby Callaway BAppSc(OT), MOT
Neuroskills Pty Ltd

October 2007

Prepared by: Summer Foundation Limited

PO Box 486, Brentford Square, VIC 3131, Australia

Telephone: +613 8812 2511 Fax: +613 9894 1130

admin@summerfoundation.org.au

www.summerfoundation.org.au

Prepared for: Victorian Government Department of Human Services

Design by Grey Worldwide

Citation guide: Winkler, D., Sloan, S., & Callaway, L. (2007) Younger people in residential aged care: Support needs, preferences and future direction.

Melbourne: Summer Foundation Ltd

The moral right of the author has been asserted

This report is Copyright © 2007 Summer Foundation Limited and with unlimited license to the Victorian Government Department of Human Services and must not be reproduced in whole or in part without written permission from the Summer Foundation Ltd.

Acknowledgements

Thanks to the participants in the *my future my choice* planning process and their support networks, for their time, efforts and willingness to share their experience and wisdom.

Thank you to the planners from Annecto, Care Connect, Bendigo Health Care Group, Karingal Inc., Melbourne City Mission, Moreland Community Health Centre, Multiple Sclerosis Victoria Ltd, Ovens & King Community Health Service for their assistance in data collection.

A special thank you to Ami Seabrook and Conrad Truscott for their diligent work in data management, collation, analysis and the production of the final report.

Table of Contents

List of Abbreviations.....	xi
About the Authors.....	xii
About the Summer Foundation	xiii
Executive Summary.....	1
Chapter 1: Introduction.....	7
Background	7
Method.....	11
Chapter 2: Characteristics and Current Situation.....	17
Demographics and Disability.....	17
Pathways to Residential Aged Care.....	20
Health	24
Mental Health	30
Challenging Behaviour.....	32
Social Networking and Contacts	35
Recreation & Community Inclusion.....	38
Choice & Role Participation	41
Support Needs.....	44
Chapter 3: Accommodation and Support Planning.....	47
Support Needs of Three Sub-groups.....	47
Support Needs of the <i>Very High Care Needs</i> Group.....	50
Support Needs of the <i>High Care Needs</i> Group	58
Support Needs of the <i>Moderate Care Needs</i> Group	64
Summary of Individual Plans.....	70

Chapter 4: Future Directions.....	72
An Integrated Service System.....	72
A Choice of Living Options	79
Meeting the Needs of the Target Group.....	88
References.....	109
Appendix A:	114
Organisations and Individuals Consulted in Relation to this Report.....	114
Appendix B:	117
Division of Sample into Sub-groups.....	117



List of Tables

Table 2.1	Demographics	18
Table 2.2	Residence prior to admission to the current aged care facility?	20
Table 2.3	Factors leading to admissions to RAC	22
Table 2.4	Reasons for admission to RAC rather than alternative accommodation and support options	22
Table 2.5	Support services and resources that would have enabled staying at home longer	23
Table 2.6	Permanent discharges from RAC for persons aged less than 50 years (Department of Human Services, 2005)	24
Table 2.7	Specified illness or infection in the past 12 months	25
Table 2.8	Health issues identified	26
Table 2.9	Frequency of body mass index categories	27
Table 2.10	Level of severity of mental health problems	30
Table 2.11	Other mental health problems	31
Table 2.12	Frequency of overt behaviours identified	32
Table 2.13	Levels of severity for each challenging behaviour	33
Table 2.14	Frequency of visits from friends and family	35
Table 2.15	Frequency of visits to friends and family	35
Table 2.16	Frequency of participation in recreation activities	38
Table 2.17	Frequency of going outside and frequency of travel outside the RAC facility	39
Table 2.18	Frequency of participation in activities outside the RAC facility	39
Table 2.19	Community Integration Questionnaire scores	40
Table 2.20	Areas of life that people are supported to make choices	42
Table 2.21	Frequency of role participation	43
Table 2.22	Residential Classification Scale (RCS)	44
Table 2.23	Length of time person can be left alone (CANS Section 2)	45

Table 2.24	Support needs of the whole groups	45
Table 3.1	Characteristics, support needs and health issues that vary across the three sub-groups	47
Table 3.2	Health issues that vary between the three sub-groups	48
Table 3.3	RCS and CANS levels of the three sub-groups	48
Table 3.4	Mobility of the three sub-groups	48
Table 3.5	Support Needs of the three sub-groups	49
Table 3.6	<i>Very High Care Needs</i> group distribution of disabilities	52
Table 3.7	Positioning and mobility support needs of the <i>Very High Care Needs</i> group	52
Table 3.8	Personal care support needs of the <i>Very High Care Needs</i> group	53
Table 3.9	Consumables and equipment requirements of the <i>Very High Care Needs</i> group)	54
Table 3.10	Supports required in a community setting for the <i>Very High Care Needs</i> group	57
Table 3.11	<i>High Care Needs</i> group distribution of disabilities	59
Table 3.12	Positioning and mobility support needs of the <i>High Care Needs</i> group)	60
Table 3.13	Personal care and communication support needs of the <i>High Care Needs</i> group	60
Table 3.14	Consumables and equipment required by the <i>High Care Needs</i> group	61
Table 3.15	Additional supports required by the <i>High Care Needs</i> group in a community setting	63
Table 3.16	<i>Moderate Care Needs</i> group distribution of disabilities	66
Table 3.17	Positioning and mobility support needs of the <i>Moderate Care Needs</i> group	66
Table 3.18	Consumables and equipment required by the <i>Moderate Care Needs</i> group	67
Table 3.19	Supports required in a community setting for the <i>Moderate Care Needs</i> group	69
Table 4.1	Key support needs of the three sub-groups identified	82

List of Figures

Figure 2.1	Age of participants	17
Figure 2.2	Disability types	18
Figure 2.3	Level of awareness	19
Figure 2.4	Pathways to the current RAC facility	21
Figure 2.5	Number of aged care facilities lived in	21
Figure 2.6	Number of health problems	27
Figure 2.7	Number of mental health problems per person	30
Figure 2.8	Number of challenging behaviours identified	34
Figure 3.1	Level of awareness for <i>Very High Care Needs</i> group	53
Figure 3.2	<i>Very High Care Needs</i> group original DHS location	55
Figure 3.3	People requiring background support	56
Figure 3.4	<i>High Care Needs</i> group original DHS location	61
Figure 3.5	People requiring background support	62
Figure 3.6	<i>Moderate Care Needs</i> group original DHS location	67
Figure 3.7	People requiring background support	68
Figure 4.1	Service system pathways to community living	73
Figure 4.2	Key elements to successful accommodation and support for people with complex care needs	81
Figure 4.3	Potential accommodation and support models	83

List of Abbreviations

<i>ABI</i>	<i>Acquired brain injury</i>
<i>BMI</i>	<i>Body Mass Index</i>
<i>CANS</i>	<i>Care and Needs Scale</i>
<i>CIQ</i>	<i>Community Integration Questionnaire</i>
<i>CHART</i>	<i>Craig Handicap Assessment and Reporting Technique</i>
<i>COAG</i>	<i>Council of Australian Governments</i>
<i>DHS</i>	<i>Department of Human Services</i>
<i>HoNOS</i>	<i>Health of the Nation Outcome Scale</i>
<i>HoNOS-ABI</i>	<i>Health of the Nation Outcome Scale – Acquired Brain Injury Version</i>
<i>OBS</i>	<i>Overt Behaviour Scale</i>
<i>PEG</i>	<i>Percutaneous endoscopic gastrostomy</i>
<i>RAC</i>	<i>Residential aged care</i>
<i>RC</i>	<i>Roles Checklist</i>
<i>RCS</i>	<i>Residential Classification Scale</i>
<i>SCSI</i>	<i>Secondary Conditions Surveillance Instrument</i>
<i>SPSS</i>	<i>Statistical Package for the Social Sciences</i>
<i>WHIM</i>	<i>Wessex Head Injury Matrix</i>

About the Authors

Dianne Winkler, Sue Sloan and Libby Callaway have extensive experience in the areas of occupational therapy, case management, neuropsychology, teaching, research and publication. Our vision for developing alternative community based accommodation and support options for people with high care and complex needs commenced in 1994 when we first worked together at Ivanhoe Private Rehabilitation Hospital. At that time, we facilitated the deinstitutionalisation of long term residents, working collaboratively with individuals, families and funding bodies to develop innovative solutions.

In 2003 we developed the Planning for Living Manual, which provides an individualised and flexible approach to planning accommodation and support solutions for people with a severe disability. This framework and its underlying principles were presented at a Victorian Brain Injury Recovery Association conference in 2003. The Planning for Living Manual has been used by 8 occupational therapists from two occupational therapy practices (Osborn Sloan & Associates and Neuroskills) specialising in community-based rehabilitation for people with neurological conditions. These therapists have used the Planning for Living Manual to assess and plan accommodation and support solutions for over 30 people with an acquired brain injury, 20 people with an intellectual disability, 3 people with a congenital neurological disability, and 4 people with multiple sclerosis. Osborn Sloan & Associates and Neuroskills clinicians have assisted 8 individuals with complex neuropsychiatric conditions to transition from the Brain Disorders Unit at Royal Talbot Hospital to community settings. The assessment and planning framework utilised in this report is based on the Planning for Living Manual.

As part of her PhD at Monash University, Dianne Winkler has completed three studies focussing on people under 60 residing in residential aged care in Victoria. Both Libby Callaway and Sue Sloan hold lecturing positions at Monash University in the departments of Occupational Therapy and Psychology, respectively. Libby and Sue are regularly involved in the training of health professionals and attendant carers.



The Authors: *(left to right)*
Libby Callaway,
Sue Sloan and Dianne Winkler.

About the Summer Foundation

The Summer Foundation is dedicated to overcoming the concerns of a section of our society that is overlooked, namely younger people living in residential aged care. Our foundation focuses on practical research and seeks to provide workable solutions to improve the health and well-being of this group.

Vision

That younger people with acquired and late onset disabilities and complex care needs will have inherent value as members of our society, with access to services and accommodation that support their health and well-being.

Mission

To foster the development of the next generation of services and solutions that promote the health and well-being of people with acquired and late onset disabilities and empower them to participate in the community.

History

The perplexing issue of younger people living in residential aged care is a challenge which has faced Dianne Winkler throughout the 15 years of her career as an Occupational Therapist working with people with severe disabilities. Further work in this area through PhD research at Monash University revealed that younger people in aged care and their families are frequently very isolated, with limited access to information about alternative accommodation and support options. While reports and information has been produced by various bodies, it is often inaccessible or impossible to locate.

Dianne initiated the formation of the Summer Foundation in January 2006 to meet the clear need for ongoing practical research focussing on younger people in aged care and to work towards better options and outcomes for these people. In June 2007 the Summer Foundation launched a DVD and information booklet called *From a home to their home*. This information pack provides alternatives to living in aged care and enables younger people with disabilities and families to make informed choices about their future accommodation and support.

The Summer Foundation is endorsed by the Australian Taxation Office as a Deductible Gift Recipient, and is funded by private donors and charitable trusts. You are invited to visit www.summerfoundation.org.au for more information.



Executive Summary

Approximately 221 people under 50 years live in residential aged care (RAC) in Victoria (Commonwealth Department of Health and Aging, 2006). At its February 2006 meeting, the Council of Australian Governments (COAG) agreed that the Australian Government, states and territories would, from July 2006, work together to reduce the number of younger people with disabilities in RAC. Governments jointly established and funded a five-year program, providing \$244 million, with the initial priority being people aged less than 50 years. The Victorian initiative, *my future my choice* aims to provide better living options for younger people in, or at risk of entry to, RAC.

As part of the *my future my choice* initiative in Victoria, people less than 50 years of age living in RAC were offered an individualised planning and assessment process to assist them and their family or key others to consider their specific healthcare and accommodation needs, aspirations and other important lifestyle factors. It provided an opportunity to explore options and consider models of care to best meet each individual's needs and preferences.

Eight organisations were engaged to undertake individual planning and assessment across Victoria. The Summer Foundation Ltd was engaged by the Department of Human Services to:

- develop a planning and assessment framework
- train the planners from the eight organisations
- support the planners during the planning and assessment process
- aggregate the data obtained from all of the assessments and plans.

Approximately 140 people consented to meet with planners to discuss their participation in the *my future my choice* planning and assessment process. Of these, approximately 126 underwent an assessment of their support needs and had an individual plan developed. This report details the findings from the first 105 people who had individual plans and assessments completed between February and August 2007 as part of the *my future my choice* initiative.

A comprehensive profile of the types of individuals under 50 years of age living in residential aged care (the target group) across the state of Victoria is included in this report. Chapter 1 provides some background on the issue of younger people living in residential aged care and outlines the method used for collecting information. Significant overall

CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION

- Background
- Method

CHAPTER 2: CHARACTERISTICS & CURRENT SITUATION

- Demographics & Disability
- Pathways to Residential Aged Care
- Health
- Mental Health
- Challenging Behaviour
- Recreation & Community Inclusion
- Choice & Role Participation
- Support Needs

characteristics of the 105 individuals and their support needs are described in Chapter 2. Chapter 3 provides data relating to accommodation and support planning including the estimated level of support the people with complex care needs would require in a community setting. Key themes from the Individual Plans developed with participants are also discussed in this section. Finally, Chapter 4 outlines the implications for service planning and development and systemic change emerging from the information obtained during the planning and assessment process.

The majority of the 105 individuals in this sample are in the 40 to 50 year age group with only 28 people under 40 years of age. Of the 105 individuals in this population, 61 are male and 44 are female. Fourteen people are from a non-English speaking background. The majority of individuals (66) lived in metropolitan Melbourne while the remaining resided in regional and rural areas.

Information obtained about the factors leading to each person's initial and current RAC admission revealed a variety of pathways to RAC. Preceding their first placement in a RAC facility, 58 people had an interim stay in an acute or rehabilitation hospital and, prior to the current RAC placement, people were living in their own home (36 people), their parents' home (8 people), another RAC facility (24 people), or other supported accommodation (11 people). Some of these people were in acute care before their transfer to RAC and seventeen individuals were in hospital for more than six months prior to their placement in the current RAC facility.

The people in the sample have a diverse range of disabilities, health issues and support needs with the most common disability type being acquired brain injury (61 people), followed by multiple sclerosis (14 people) and Huntington's disease (9 people). In addition to these disabilities, many people had sensory impairments, symptoms of mental health issues and secondary health conditions. Secondary health conditions commonly experienced by this sample included pressure areas (33 people), contractures (33 people), urinary tract infections (24 people) and chest infections or pneumonia (19 people).

Many people in the sample had periodic admissions to acute health services. In total, 44 of the 105 participants had an admission to an acute hospital in the preceding 12 month period, with some people experiencing multiple admissions. Of the total sample, 17 people were reported to have had an elective admission in the preceding 12 months. Reasons for elective admissions included orthopaedic issues (4 people), PEG (percutaneous endoscopic gastrostomy) related issues (3 people), catheter insertions

CHAPTER 3: ACCOMMODATION & SUPPORT PLANNING

- Three Sub-groups with Different Needs
 - Very High Care Needs Group
 - High Care Needs Group
 - Moderate Care Needs Group
- Summary of Individual Plans

CHAPTER 4: FUTURE DIRECTIONS

- An Integrated Service System
- A Choice of Living Options
- Meeting the Needs of the Target Group
 - Basic Needs
 - Enhancing Quality of Life
- Systemic Issues & Potential Solutions

(2 people) and gynaecology related issues (2 people). Thirty-one people were reported to have had a non-elective admission to an acute hospital in the past 12 months resulting from PEG related issues (4 people), chest infections or pneumonia (4 people), seizures (3 people) and psychiatric issues (3 people).

Many people in the sample (63 people) were fully aware of their environment and oriented to time, place and person. Thirty-three people were assessed as partially aware – they were conscious and awake but had profound memory difficulties and significant levels of confusion. Nine people were minimally aware of their environment. Fifty people had difficulty communicating their basic needs and seven people were prone to wandering or getting lost.

Many people were highly physically dependent with 42 people requiring assistance with moving in bed and 49 people needing assistance with mobility inside the RAC facility. Seventy people required assistance to get in and out of the place they live and 75 people required assistance to get around in their local community. A large proportion of the sample required specialised equipment such as hoists, wheelchairs and pressure care overlays.

Eighty-two people displayed at least one challenging behaviour of varying severity. Challenging behaviour is behaviour causing distress to the person with the disability or is disruptive to other people causing them distress or making them feel uncomfortable. Many people displayed complex combinations of challenging behaviours with 41 people having three or more challenging behaviours. Lack of initiation and verbal aggression were the most common behaviours identified. A holistic approach to behaviour management, focussing on developing communication skills, enhancing participation in meaningful activity and improving living environments is likely to make a significant difference to the levels of challenging behaviour observed in the target group. However, for behaviours at the more severe end of the spectrum, this holistic approach will need to be supplemented with formal behavioural programs.

Many people in the sample were effectively excluded from participation in community life. Thirty two people never participated in community-based activities such as shopping, recreation or leisure. Many people did not participate in activities organised by the RAC facility either, with 30 people participating in these activities less often than once per month. Many people in the sample had very limited opportunity to make everyday choices such as the time they go to bed or the content of their meal and the majority had lost several valued life roles such as friend, caregiver, worker and home maintainer. One person was working part-time and a few people had maintained roles such as part-time student (4 people), volunteer worker (3 people) or caregiver (6 people). The caregiver role maintained by some people is likely to be related to the fact that 28 people were parents of children under the age of 17 years.

Sixty three percent of this group were receiving one or more additional services from external providers with the most common additional supports being attendant care (39%), case management (37%), physiotherapy (33%), occupational therapy (31%), speech pathology (27%) and community based

recreation groups (11%). Thirty two percent of the participants accessed additional services funded by Disability Services such as Support & Choice or Assisted Community Living packages, and 23% had additional services funded by the ABI Slow to Recover Program.

In addition to information regarding current health, participation, and support needs, data was obtained and analysed specifically to inform service planning and development. Sixty eight people and their support networks indicated that they would like to explore alternative accommodation and support options while 27 people indicated that they would prefer to remain living in the current RAC facility. The preferences of ten people were not known at the time of finalising this report. Of the people who were interested in moving, nine people indicated they would like to live in a private or family residence, 56 would like to live in shared supported accommodation and three people indicated a preference for other options. Other options included living independently in a unit with individual support and living in a unit attached to a hospital.

Planners were asked to estimate the level of support each person would require in a community based setting. The support needs of the sample were diverse so, rather than describing the average support needs for the whole sample, the sample was divided into three homogenous sub-groups: a *Very High Care Needs* group (52 people); a *High Care Needs* group (35 people); and a *Moderate Care Needs* group (16 people). The *Very High Care Needs* group generally required 24 hour supervision, daily nursing support and a high level of physical assistance for basic daily activities, often by more than one staff member. The *High Care Needs* group also had significant support needs but overall were less complex to manage and most did not require regular nursing care. The *Moderate Care Needs* group had minimal physical support needs and few medical complications but required assistance with more complex household activities, day to day problem solving and financial management.

In addition to the data gathered on health, participation and support needs, each planner worked with the younger person and their support network to facilitate the development of individualised person-centred plans. Key issues identified in the individualised plans and recommended strategies to address these issues are detailed in the report.

The final chapter of this report describes the implications of the aggregate data obtained for service development and systemic change. Although the disability service system is not currently geared to divert people from RAC and support the target group in the community, there are pockets of specialist skills that can be harnessed to train and build the capacity of the rest of the disability and health sectors. A model of an integrated service system designed to achieve and sustain community living for the target population is outlined and most of the elements and services in this system already exist in Victoria in some form. These services are currently being utilised by some people in the target group who are funded by the ABI Slow to Recover program and people with disabilities who have compensation through the Transport Accident Commission or WorkSafe. An opportunity exists to partner with these service providers to expand, modify or duplicate services in different locations to meet the specific needs of the target group.

Clearly there are not adequate existing shared supported accommodation facilities to provide the type of support to meet the specific needs of the target population and more community based accommodation places need to be provided offering a broad range of options and innovative solutions. Accommodation options need to be available in a range of locations so people can remain connected or reconnect with family, friends and their local community. Some outreach services are restricted to particular disability types, funding bodies or regions and the target group require access to these services regardless of their disability type, where they live or how they obtained their disability. Step down and step up units in acute health care need to be more widely available to people in the target group. Currently these services provide care to people with recently acquired injuries who require an extended opportunity to recover, however these units could also be used when people in the target group are readmitted to acute health or when reassessment is required due to changing needs or life circumstances.

The assessment and planning process revealed a range of support needs in the target group and while some of these relate to meeting the basic care needs of the group, others focus on enhancing their quality of life. The report describes each of these support needs and identifies opportunities and potential solutions for meeting the needs of the target group. The four areas of support relating to meeting the basic needs of the target group include: health; equipment and consumables; eating, swallowing and communication; and behaviour. The three support areas relating to enhancing quality of life involve: role participation; community inclusion; and social and family relationships.

Finally, systemic themes emerging from the data collected are examined. These themes include workforce issues; rural and regional issues; and information. Each of the systemic issues is identified and potential solutions described. A key step for developing an effective service system is to conduct an audit of the eligibility criteria of existing services relevant to the target population. Information obtained from this audit can be converted into an accessible resource for people with disabilities, families, workers and service providers to ensure that everyone in the target population is aware of, and able to access, the available services. The information from the audit will also identify services that can be modified to meet the needs of the target group and to identify gaps in the service system.

To date, decisions about service planning and development for the target population have been based on limited quantitative data and anecdotal evidence. The information in this report paints a clear picture of the characteristics and lives of younger people living in RAC in Victoria and offers a range of pragmatic solutions to prevent future admissions to RAC, enabling people in the target population to participate in the life of the community and pursue a lifestyle of choice. The specialist skills and innovative services developed in Victoria over the past fifteen years can be harnessed and utilised to build the capacity of the wider disability and health care sectors to effectively address the unmet needs of the target population.

Given the relatively small numbers involved, the detailed knowledge of the target group, the expertise available in Victoria and the joint resources provided by the State and Federal Governments there is an

opportunity to provide better health and quality of life outcomes for younger people with complex care needs and, over the next decade, to resolve the issue of younger people in aged care.

Chapter 1: Introduction

Background

Approximately 3770 people under 60 years of age reside in aged care facilities throughout Australia (Australian Institute of Health and Welfare, 2007). The recent Senate Inquiry into Aged Care asserted that it was deleterious for young people with disabilities to be housed in residential aged care (RAC) (Senate Community Affairs References Committee, 2005, p. 1). Reflecting this, research in Victoria found that younger people who lived in RAC led impoverished lives, characterised by loneliness and boredom (Winkler, Farnworth, & Sloan, 2006). Winkler et. al. (2006) concluded that younger people in aged care were often socially isolated from peers and effectively excluded from community life. Despite such findings, the Senate report noted that the numbers of young people with disabilities accommodated in RAC across Australia increased significantly over the past decade (Senate Community Affairs References Committee, 2005, p.1).

At its February 2006 meeting, the Council of Australian Governments (COAG) agreed that from July 2006, the Australian Government, states and territories will work together to reduce the number of younger people with disabilities in RAC. Governments jointly established and funded a \$244 million five-year program, with the main focus being people under 50 years. The Victorian initiative, *my future my choice* aims to provide better living options for younger people in, or at risk of entry to, RAC. This will be achieved through the development of innovative support models that respond to complex clinical and health care needs, whilst also enabling people to participate in the community and pursue a lifestyle of choice. The initial priority is to achieve this for people aged less than 50 years. In Victoria, there are approximately 221 people under 50 years currently living in RAC. (Commonwealth Department of Health and Ageing, 2006).

The initiative has three strategic objectives:

- *To provide alternative supports:* Provide better living options for younger people with a disability in RAC settings, where these can be made available and where this is what the younger person chooses.
- *To enhance disability supports within RAC:* Promote a more age appropriate response to those younger people with a disability who choose to remain in RAC, or for whom RAC remains the most suitable supported accommodation option available.
- *To minimise future admissions to RAC:* Provide alternative responses, where possible, for younger people with a disability who are at risk of admission to RAC (Department of Human Services, 2006).

Little is known about the specific support needs and preferences of younger people living in RAC.

The Australian Institute of Health and Welfare provides only limited data about this population, such as age, location and length of stay (Australian Institute of Health and Welfare, 2006). There have been three State-based postal surveys, one in Victoria (Winkler, Farnworth, & Sloan, 2006), one in Queensland (Cameron, Pirozzo, & Tooth, 2001) and another in New South Wales (Moylan, Dey, & McAlpine, 1995) where managers of RAC facilities have provided information specific to their younger residents. The Victorian study included 330 residents under 60 years and found that younger people in RAC experienced increased levels of social isolation from peers (44% received a visit from a friend less than once a year or never) and limited community access (21% went outside seldom or never). Moreover, many people in the sample were effectively excluded from life in the community (34% almost never participated in community-based activities such as shopping, leisure activities, or visiting friends and family) (Winkler, Farnworth, & Sloan, 2006).

Winkler, Farnworth, Sloan & Brown (2006a) completed a qualitative investigation into the perspectives of seven people with ABI who had made this transition from RAC to community living in Victoria. Five people had funding from the ABI Slow to Recover Program and two individuals were funded by the Transport Accident Commission (TAC). At the time of the interviews, two people were living with their spouse, two people were living with their parents and three people were living in shared supported accommodation. Results from a series of semi-structured interviews with individuals and their support networks identified positive outcomes in seven key areas of their lives including improved continence, getting about more, decreased challenging behaviour, increased occupation, increased community participation and more contact with friends and family. Individuals and their support networks were also asked to specify the factors in their living environment that facilitated these positive outcomes. Informants reported that a key difference between the RAC environment and community based living was that they had more 1:1 support and more consistent support from paid workers in their community based accommodation. Individuals and their families also reported that living in close proximity to family friends and their local community was a key factor in improving their quality of life.

Recent research into people with ABI living in shared supported accommodation in Victoria found residents were generally more involved in community life than people with ABI living in RAC. Winkler, Farnworth, Sloan and Brown (2006b) surveyed 40 supported community housing



facilities for people with ABI to obtain information about the characteristics and lives of the residents. Information was obtained about 131 residents, most of whom had compensable injuries funded by the TAC, with 8 hours of attendant care each week to assist them to access the community. The data obtained about the life circumstances of this group were compared to the data collected on 166 people with an ABI living in RAC (Winkler, Farnworth, & Sloan, 2006). The two groups required similar levels of support yet, despite this, results indicated a number of statistically significant differences between the two groups. People with ABI living in RAC were visited by relatives more often than those living in the community while residents in community-based facilities were more likely to go outside, access the community, participate in recreational activities, and visit family and friends in the community. This study also found nothing intrinsic in the severity of people's disability that meant they needed to be cared for in RAC, as people with similar clinical needs were being supported in alternative living environments, a conclusion also supported by research in New South Wales (Strettles, Bush, Simpson, & Gillet, 2005).

Other Government and Non-Government reports have largely relied on qualitative data and anecdotal evidence to outline the problems and offer some potential solutions to the issue of younger people in RAC (Fyffe, McCubbery, & Honey, 2003; Strettles et al., 2005; Stringer, 1999). Some of these reports document existing services providing housing and support solutions for this population (Department of Human Services, 2005; Disability ACT, 2006) while others provide a critique of specific existing projects developed as alternatives to younger people living in aged care (Cox, 2003; Gallop, 2001; Jones & Lawn, 1999a, 1999b).

Given the limited detailed information about the characteristics, needs and preferences of younger people in aged care, a key focus of the *my future my choice* initiative was individualised planning and assessment. People less than 50 years of age living in RAC were offered individualised planning and assessment to assist them and their family or key others to consider specific healthcare and accommodation needs, aspirations and other important lifestyle factors. It was an opportunity to explore options and consider models of care to best meet each individual's needs and preferences. Eight organisations were engaged to undertake planning and assessment across Victoria: Care Connect Ltd, Melbourne City Mission Inc, Moreland Community Health Service Inc, Multiple Sclerosis Ltd, Annecto Inc, Bendigo Health Care Group, Karingal Inc and Ovens and King Community Health Service Inc. The Summer Foundation Ltd was engaged by the Department of Human Services to develop a planning and assessment framework, train the planners from the eight organisations and support the planners during the planning and assessment phase. The Summer Foundation Ltd was also responsible for aggregating all of the data obtained from the assessments and plans in order to provide an evidence base for service planning and development.

The individualised planning and assessment process had three key objectives:

- *Assessment of current situation:* Planners gathered very detailed information about the issues faced by each individual including their care and support needs.
- *Individualised planning for the future:* Based on the discussions with the individual and their support network, planners assisted them to develop a plan for the future outlining aspirations, goals, preferred options and strategies to achieve these. It also included some immediate actions towards achieving these goals.
- *Inform new service development:* The planner collected data on each individual that could be aggregated to provide direction for future service planning and development on a regional and State-wide basis.



Method

Participants

The Australian Government Department of Health and Ageing disclosed data to the Department of Human Services, including the names and contact details of everyone under 50 in Victoria living in RAC. The information disclosed is protected under the Aged Care Act 1997 and was released for the purpose of contacting residents in relation to this initiative. All younger people currently living in RAC under the age of 50 were sent a letter from the Department of Human Services (DHS) inviting them to participate in the *my future my choice* assessment and planning process. Consent was obtained from the younger person in RAC, their next of kin or guardian prior to providing planners with their contact details. The planners then met with the younger person in RAC and their support network to explain the planning and assessment process and obtain their informed consent to participate. Information about the *my future my choice* initiative and planning process was also provided to RAC providers, relevant peak bodies, other stakeholder groups, family members and guardians. Family members, carers and friends were encouraged to be involved.

The participants in this study were the first 105 people under 50 years of age living in RAC in Victoria who underwent the assessment and planning process as part of the *my future my choice* initiative. Planning continues for others at the time of publication. As of the 1st September 2007, there were approximately 140 people who initially responded to the letter from DHS and agreed to meet with a *my future my choice* planner. Six people decided not to participate in the planning process after meeting with the planner. Four people had died in between responding to the letter and the planner making contact with the person and their family. Two people were found to be ineligible for Disability Services and therefore ineligible for the *my future my choice* planning process; one person was funded by the Transport Accident Commission and one person had a psychiatric disability with no other disability.

There were an estimated 81 younger people in RAC who did not respond to the letter inviting them to participate. Some people or their families replied to the letter from the DHS letter and indicated that they did not want to participate. However, many of these 81 people did not respond at all to the DHS letter. Follow-up phone contact was made with the managers of RAC facilities of people who did not respond to the letters. The recruitment process has therefore introduced some potential biases into the sample. It is possible that the people who did not respond to the letter of offer had less social support to facilitate their response to the invitation. It is also likely that people who were already in receipt of additional services were more likely to respond, as service providers reported anecdotally that in many instances they supported and encouraged people to participate in the initiative.

Measures

The Summer Foundation planning and assessment tool (Winkler, Sloan & Callaway, 2007) developed for the *my future my choice* planning process is a customised battery of measures drawing

on published instruments, supplemented with targeted questions and functional assessments, aiming to capture key information pertinent to individualised accommodation and support planning with people with complex needs.

The assessment and planning tool was developed after extensive review of the literature and analysis of current clinical practice. In considering the use of an assessment and planning framework, it was found that existing tools were largely developed for people with congenital disabilities (Bruininks, Hill, Weatherman, & Woodcock, 1986; Department of Human Services, 2004; Morreau & Bruininks, 1991). They did not capture the multiple complex care, medical, and behavioural support needs specific to the initiative's target group (i.e. people with acquired or late onset disabilities, primarily neurological in nature). Our clinical expertise and past research of younger people living in RAC offered a working knowledge of the complexities of this group and their support needs. Given this knowledge, and the need to offer an assessment and plan to people with a range of different disability types, often with dual diagnosis, a customised battery of measures was developed. The development of this assessment and planning tool was undertaken in consultation, and checked at various stages of development, with consumers, clinical experts and key stakeholders.

Health

Younger people are often placed in RAC because there are limited number of established community based service models to meet high levels of health and clinical care needs (Department of Human Services, 2005). As part of the *my future my choice* assessment and planning process, it was essential to identify the specific health issues experienced by the target group to inform service development.

Health was measured using a number of indicators. Body weight and height were used to calculate body mass index (BMI). Other health indicators included information such as the number of admissions to an acute hospital in the past 12 months and the number of days in bed in the past week due to illness or injury. The Secondary Conditions Surveillance Instrument (SCSI) (Ravesloot, Seekins, & Walsh, 1997), measuring the prevalence, severity and interference of 40 secondary conditions, was considered for use in this project. Secondary conditions are those conditions that may be experienced by an individual after they have a primary (or first) disability (Marge, 1988). The SCSI emphasises secondary conditions associated with people with spinal cord injury. In consultation with a medical practitioner and a nursing practitioner, both specialised in working with younger people in aged care, we expanded the range of conditions listed on the SCSI to reflect the medical issues commonly experienced by people in the target group. The SCSI rating scale, which specifies the number of hours per day that activities are limited by each condition, provided a level of detail that was not useful in the context of accommodation and support planning. The Summer Foundation planning and assessment tool asked the planner to indicate if the health issue was present or not and to elicit some qualitative information about the current and recommended management of the health issue and the implications for support in the community.

Mental Health

The Health of the Nation Scale - Acquired Brain Injury (HoNOS-ABI) (Fleminger et al., 2005) was used to measure the mental health of participants, covering 12 dimensions of health and wellbeing. The HoNOS scales are a collection of clinician-completed measures of health and social functioning. Versions have been tailored to different populations such as the aged and people with an intellectual disability. The HoNOS-ABI (Fleminger et al., 2005) is a measure of neuropsychiatric sequelae in people with ABI. The ABI version was utilised because ABI is the largest disability type represented in the target group. Using the HoNOS-ABI, each participant was scored from 0 (no problem) through to 4 (severe to very severe problem) on each of the 12 dimensions, where scores of 2, 3 or 4 indicate the need for clinical intervention. The HoNOS-ABI is a relatively new scale for which initial data regarding psychometric properties is limited but promising (Coetzer & DuToit, 2001; Fleminger et al., 2005).

Behaviour

The Overt Behaviour Scale (OBS) (Kelly, Todd, Simpson, Kremer, & Martin, 2006) was used in this study to measure the range of challenging behaviours frequently observed following neurological conditions. These behaviours include:

- verbal aggression
- physical aggression against objects
- physical acts against self
- physical aggression against other people
- inappropriate social behaviour
- perseveration (repetitive behaviour)
- wandering or absconding
- inappropriate sexual behaviour
- lack of initiation.

The OBS was selected over other measures of challenging behaviour because it is suitable for use in a community setting and with a range of disability groups, and it covers a broad spectrum of challenging behaviours.

Resident Choice

One of the key limitations of institutional living is the limited opportunity to make everyday choices. The Resident Choice Scale (RCS) (Hatton et al., 2004) was designed for use with people with intellectual disabilities to assess service practices for promoting choice. This scale has 26 items and is administered by interview with a key informant. This study reports on the 13 items most relevant to younger people living in RAC.

Role Participation

The Role Checklist (RC) (Oakley, Kielhofner, Barris, & Reichler, 1986) was utilised to elicit information about participation in everyday roles (e.g. friend, family member, hobbyist). The RC lists ten life roles and elicits information regarding the person's past, present and future participation in each role (Part 1) and the degree to which each of these is valued by the person is measured on a three point scale (Part 2). This study gathered data from Part 1 of the RC only.

Pathways to Residential Aged Care

In order to assist in developing strategies for diverting younger people from admission to RAC, the Summer Foundation planning and assessment tool elicits information about the causes and pathways leading to admission to RAC and is based on questions from a recent survey of younger people in RAC (Australian Healthcare Associates, 2006).

Community Inclusion

The Community Integration Questionnaire (CIQ) (Willer, Rosenthal, Kreutzer, Gordon, & Rempel, 1993) was used to measure community integration. The CIQ is the most widely used and researched measure of community inclusion in the rehabilitation literature (Cusick, Gerhart, & Mellick, 2000; Hall, 1996; A. M. Sander et al., 1999; A. M. Sander et al., 1997; Seale, 2002; Tepper, Beatty, & DeJong, 1996; Willer, Ottenbacher, & Coad, 1994). Responses on the CIQ can be used to derive a total score and a score on each of three subscales: home integration, social integration and productivity to determine the level of community integration experienced by the individual.

Social Integration

In addition to obtaining information from the social integration subscale of the CIQ, this study also used the social integration subscale of the Craig Handicap Assessment and Reporting Technique (CHART) (Whiteneck, Charlifue, Gerhart, Overholser, & Richardson, 1992). The CHART was designed to provide a simple, objective measure of the degree to which impairments and disabilities result in handicaps (participation restrictions). The social integration subscale measures the person's ability to participate in and maintain customary social relationships. The CHART, originally developed for use with people with spinal cord injuries, has since been found to be an appropriate measure for use with individuals with a range of physical or cognitive impairments (Walker, Mellick, Brooks, & Whiteneck, 2003).

Support Needs

The Care and Needs Scale (CANS) is an eight-category scale, which measures the type and extent of support needed in daily life and was developed specifically for application with people with ABI in the post-acute rehabilitation stage (Tate, 2004).

The CANS has two sections. Using a checklist of 24 items, grouped in accordance with International Classification of Functioning, Disability and Health (2001), Section One elicits information about support needed in a range of everyday activities necessary for a person to live in the community. Specific items range from tracheostomy management, nasogastric feeding and personal hygiene through to medication, money management and the provision of informational and emotional supports. Subjects are assigned to one of five groups (Groups A to E) based on the type of activities in which they require support.

Section Two of the CANS indicates the level of support needed, ranging from a very high level of care and support (i.e. Level 8 – ‘cannot be left alone’) to very low levels (i.e. Level 2 – ‘can be left alone for more than a week’ or Level 1 – ‘can live in the community, totally independently’). Responses within the activity checklist in Section One of the CANS are used as the basis upon which to determine, using clinical judgement, the length of time that the person can be left alone and, therefore, the level of support required.

Level of Awareness

The assessment of people who have neurological conditions and present with altered consciousness and awareness can be extremely challenging. However, in providing people with appropriate support it is vital to tailor input to the individual's awareness and capacity to understand and respond. A review of recent literature (Barker, 2005; Bates, 2005; Coleman, 2005; Giacino & Kalmar, 2005; National Health & Medical Research Council, 2003; Shiel et al., 2000) and available tools was undertaken. On the basis of this review, the planning and assessment tool provided guidance for planners in making the distinction between 3 three key levels of awareness. Planners were asked to assign people to one of the following descriptive rather than diagnostic categories:

Fully Aware: The individual is awake and alert and consistently demonstrates an awareness of themselves and their environment, and is oriented to time, place and person.

Partially Aware: The individual is conscious and awake but may demonstrate rapid forgetting, disorientation to time and place and significant levels of confusion.

Minimally Aware: The individual's conscious state is severely reduced. There may be inconsistent behaviours that suggest some awareness of self and/or environment. This includes people variously described as in a minimally conscious state, vegetative state and post-coma unresponsiveness.

Unable to Assess: The individual could not be assessed/relevant data could not be obtained.

This distinction was made through:

- The observations of staff and family members
- Questions and answers (e.g. relating to knowledge of time, place and person) and if the individual was able to communicate (verbally or via assisted means)

- Behavioural indicators of awareness and orientation (e.g. wandering, agitation and social behaviours)
- Administration of the Wessex Head Injury Matrix (WHIM) (Shiel et al., 2000) by a neuropsychologist as necessary. Both the highest (most advanced) behaviour noted on the 62 items and the total number of behaviours observed were recorded.

Procedure

The Department of Human Services engaged eight different organisations across Victoria to undertake the *my future my choice* planning and assessment with the target group. Some planners from these organisations were allied health professionals and most had some experience in the case management of people with disabilities. In February 2007, during two half-day sessions, the Summer Foundation trained 24 planners in the administration of the planning and assessment tool. Planners were allotted 40 hours of planning time for each participant.

The *my future my choice* assessments and plans were completed between February and August 2007. People from Non-English speaking backgrounds, or who had limited support participating in this process, were offered interpreting or advocacy (via Action for Community Living) services. Not all of the participants in this study had the cognitive and communication abilities to be their own informants. The informants for the assessment and planning process also included family members, RAC staff and external service providers with the consent of the individuals.

Data analysis

Planners entered quantitative data from the planning and assessment tool into a custom built internet based survey (Zoomerang, 2007). The data from this survey was exported to the Statistical Package for Social Sciences software package (SPSS, 2005), which was used to produce descriptive statistics. The sample was also divided into three homogenous sub-groups using a statistical method called k-means cluster analysis.

The answers to open ended questions from 50 of the completed planning and assessment tools and 40 individual plans were exported into NVivo (QSR International Pty Ltd, 2002) for qualitative analysis. Data was coded into meaningful conceptual units then each category was examined for shared tenets. Key themes identified from the workbooks were integrated into the results section alongside relevant quantitative information. The key themes identified in the individual plans are summarised at the end of Chapter 3.

Chapter 2: Characteristics and Current Situation

This chapter provides detailed information about the demographics, health needs and life circumstances of the 105 people in the sample. A small amount of missing data accounts for some Tables and Figures displaying a smaller sample size. The percentages in the tables have been rounded so that some columns may not add up to exactly one hundred percent.

Demographics and disability

FINDINGS

- The mean age of the 105 participants was 42 years
- 58% of participants had an acquired brain injury and 31% had a degenerative neurological condition
- 60% of participants were oriented and fully aware of their circumstances

The participants in this study were the first 105 people under 50 years of age living in RAC in Victoria who participated in the *my future my choice* planning process. The total population of people under 50 living in residential aged care in Victoria at this time was 211 (Commonwealth Department of Health and Ageing, 2006).

Fifty eight percent of participants were male and the mean age of participants was 42.2 years (SD \pm 6.9). Thirteen percent of participants were from a non-English speaking background with eight languages represented. Nearly all participants (93%) were on the Disability Support Pension. Most people were single (52%), with 31% divorced and 12% either married or in a defacto relationship.





Table 2.1 – Demographics (N=105)

Demographics	n	%
Sex		
Male	61	58%
Female	44	42%
Language		
English speaking background	91	87%
Non-English speaking background	14	13%


Acquired brain injury (ABI) was the most common disability type (61 people) (Figure 2.2). There was a higher percentage of people with ABI than previous studies (Moylan et al., 1995; Winkler, Farnworth, & Sloan, 2006). ABI is defined as any type of brain damage that occurs after birth and includes trauma, hypoxia, and infection. Neurodegenerative diseases such as multiple sclerosis and Huntington's disease were identified separately. Thirty one percent of people had a neurodegenerative disease.

Figure 2.2 - Disability Types

Most people had one disability type (88%), 10% had two disability types and 3% had three disability types. In addition to the disabilities outlined above, 64% of participants had one or more sensory losses such as vision impairments (46%), hearing impairments (5%) and hypersensitivity to sensory stimuli (21%).

Sixty percent of the sample was assessed as fully aware (alert and oriented to time, place and person). Thirty-one percent were partially aware (awake but had profound memory difficulties, were disoriented and had significant levels of confusion). Nine percent of the sample were minimally aware. The category of minimally aware included people who may have variously been described as being in a minimally conscious state, vegetative state or post-coma unresponsiveness.

Figure 2.3 - Level of Awareness



Health care decisions were most often made by a family member (46%) though 28% of participants made their own decisions relating to health care and 11% had a medical power of attorney appointed. Sixty three percent of this group were receiving one or more additional services from external providers with the most common additional supports being attendant care (39%), case management (37%), physiotherapy (33%), occupational therapy (31%), speech pathology (27%), and community based recreation groups (11%).

Thirty two percent of the participants accessed additional services funded by Disability Services such as Support & Choice or Assisted Community Living packages and 23% had additional services funded by the ABI Slow to Recover Program.

IMPLICATIONS FOR SERVICE DEVELOPMENT AND DELIVERY

- Support systems need to be flexible in order to cater for people with both stable and degenerative conditions as well as those with the potential to benefit from slow stream rehabilitation
- Care and support needs to be individualised and tailored to manage varying levels of orientation and awareness
- Services need to cater for people from many different cultural backgrounds

Pathways to Residential Aged Care

FINDINGS

- 59% had an interim stay at an acute or rehabilitation hospital immediately prior to their first admission to a RAC
- 38% of participants were residing in their own home prior to moving to the current RAC
- 33 people indicated that provision of increased support at home would have enabled them to stay in the community longer

Prior to their first admission to a RAC, most of the participants (59%) had an interim stay in an acute hospital or rehabilitation centre. The mean combined length of stay in acute and rehabilitation hospitals was 27.32 weeks (SD \pm 34.42). Ten people were in hospital for less than six weeks and 20 people were in hospital for more than 6 months. These admissions provide an opportunity to partner with acute hospitals and rehabilitation facilities to implement strategies to divert people from RAC. Practical initiatives may include increasing the number of step-down facilities that may enable the individual to more fully recover and obtain rehabilitation; increasing the number of community based supported accommodation options; and informing families and discharge planners about the service system, options and possibilities (Department of Human Services, 2005, p. 43).


Table 2.2 summarises where people resided prior to their admission to the current RAC facility and Figure 2.3 outlines the pathways people took to enter the current RAC facility. This study had complete data for 96 people.

Table 2.2 – Residence prior to admission to the current aged care facility? (N=96)

Residence prior to admission to RAC	n	%
Home	36	38%
In hospital longer than six months	17	18%
Other aged care facility (high care)	17	18%
Other supported accommodation	11	12%
Parent's home	8	8%
Other aged care facility (low care)	7	7%


Prior to their current RAC placement, 36 people were living at home. Sixteen people had an interim stay in a hospital prior to the RAC admission while others went directly from home to RAC. Eight people were living in their parent's home prior to the current admission, four people went to RAC via hospital and four people went directly to the current RAC facility. Seventeen people had a hospital stay of longer than 6 months prior to their admission to the current RAC facility. Eleven people were living in other supported accommodation services prior to their current admission and four of these entered RAC via hospital. Twenty-four people were admitted to RAC from other RAC facilities.

Figure 2.4 – Pathways to the current RAC facility



In Figure 2.4, a total of 41 people entered the current RAC via hospital. At first this figure appears to be lower than expected because earlier data showed that 59% of people had an interim hospital admission prior to their first RAC placement. However these figures are consistent because Figure 2.4 focuses on pathways to the current RAC facility and the 59% figure refers to admissions to their first RAC facility.

Figure 2.5 - Number of Aged Care facilities lived in



Many (55%) of the participants in this study had only lived in one RAC facility, while 26% had lived in two and 19% had resided in between three and eight different facilities (Figure 2.5). The mean time since admission to their first RAC was 4.3 years (SD \pm 3.7 years) with one person residing in aged care for 15 years.

“Prior to living in the current RAC, where he has resided for the past 11 years, Hayden lived with his parents in Croydon. Hayden relied on his mother to meet all of his care needs. However his mother, due to ageing and health issues, was unable to continue caring for him and, as a result, he was initially placed in the current RAC for respite. At that time the general practitioner advised the family that given the mother’s ailing health, Hayden should not return to the family home.”

Anecdotal evidence suggests that younger people move from one aged care facility to another either to be closer to family members or because the person has challenging behaviour that cannot be contained or managed in a particular facility (Department of Human Services, 2005, p. 20).

In order to understand the pathways into RAC and identify opportunities for preventing admissions, this study asked the individual and their support network “What led to the move to an aged care facility?” The two key reasons for admissions (Table 2.3) related firstly to a change in support needs through the onset of disability (e.g. ABI) or an exacerbation of an existing condition (e.g. MS); or secondly through a change in circumstances, in particular a reduction in available support (e.g. ageing parents).

Table 2.3 – Factors leading to admissions to RAC (N=99)

Factors leading to admission to RAC	n	%
They experienced an increase in care needs as a result of a degenerative condition, injury or illness	58	58%
Someone who previously cared for them was no longer able to provide the support required	16	16%
They previously lived in some other type of residential accommodation facility (not an aged care facility) however this place was no longer able to accommodate them	16	16%
They were previously receiving support from a community or disability support service in their own home, however this support was no longer available, or was insufficient to enable them to continue to live at home	6	6%
They developed a need for equipment that was not available in their previous place of residence	3	3%

Planners asked informants why people were admitted to RAC rather than alternative accommodation and support options (Table 2.4). The most common reason (51%) for choosing RAC was the lack of alternative options in the local area and that living in RAC allowed people to remain close to family, friends and their local community. For thirty-five percent of people the key issue was that other types of residential facilities in the area could not offer the type or level of support required. For 23% of participants, the possibility of living in another type of residential facility was not explored.

Table 2.4 – Reasons for admission to RAC rather than alternative accommodation and support options (N=99)

Reason	n	%
There were no other types of residential facilities in the local area and living in RAC allowed them to remain close to their family and friends	53	54%
Other types of residential facilities in the area could not offer the type or level of care required	37	37%
The possibility of living in another type of residential facility was not explored	24	24%
Other residential facilities in the area did not have any places available	13	13%
There were other types of residential facilities in the area, with places available, however moving to RAC was preferred	1	1%

Participants living in the community with a disability and supports prior to their admission to RAC were asked if increased support and resources would have enabled them to stay in their home longer. Thirty three people responded in the affirmative and Table 2.5 outlines the types of services and supports that participants and their support networks reported would have enabled them to remain at home for longer.

Table 2.5 – Support services and resources that would have enabled staying at home longer (n=33)

Support services and resources	n
Case management	30
Physiotherapy	25
Provision of an attendant care program	23
Domestic services	22
Respite	21
Activity program outside the home	21
Occupational therapy	21
General practitioner	18
Continence advisor	18
More attendant care hours	17
Community nurse	17
Neuropsychology	16
Speech pathology	16
Home maintenance	15
Medication	15
Dietician	14
Laundry	13
Gardening	13
Administrator	7
Podiatry	6
Medical specialist	4
Guardian	3

IMPLICATIONS FOR SERVICE DEVELOPMENT AND DELIVERY

- Acute and rehabilitation hospitals are a key focus for developing strategies to divert people from admission to RAC
- Increased support in the home and community could prevent one third of admissions into RAC
- Case management, physiotherapy and attendant care were the key supports identified to enable people to remain living at home

FINDINGS

- 44% of participants had an admission to hospital in the past 12 months
- 36% of participants had an accidental injury in the past 12 months, the majority of which were falls
- 67% of participants had an illness or infection in the past 12 months, with 22% of those contracting chest infections or pneumonia

Younger residents typically experience a range of health issues that significantly impact on their need for medical and nursing support. One of the key systemic reasons why younger people are admitted to RAC is that there are not enough community-based alternatives that combine residential support with complex clinical care (Department of Human Services, 2005).

Younger people with very high care needs living in RAC have, potentially, many years of life ahead of them. However, some people in this population have been described as having a 'narrow margin of health'. This means that they are highly susceptible to secondary conditions that can make them critically ill or result in premature death.

A recent Department of Human Service report (2005) found that between July 1999 and June 2005, 150 people under 50 living in RAC died, with an average of 21.4 deaths per year. During the same time period, a further 101 people had 'other reasons' for permanent discharge, including discharge to an acute hospital (Table 1.1). It is probable that death was the outcome of some of these other permanent discharges. Degenerative conditions and cancer are likely to account for some of these deaths; however a recent study found that less than 28% of people under 60 years in RAC had a degenerative condition such as Huntington's disease and only 1% had cancer (Winkler, Farnworth, & Sloan, 2006). Given the relatively small incidence, these conditions alone do not account for the high rate of death.

**Table 2.6 – Permanent discharges from RAC for persons aged less than 50 years
(Department of Human Services, 2005)**

Discharge Type	FY1999	FY2000	FY2001	FY2002	FY2003	FY2004	FY2005
Death	17	23	19	23	28	23	17
Return to Family Home	11	7	6	11	10	11	5
Other Reason (e.g. hospital)	16	26	13	6	16	11	16
Total	44	56	38	40	54	45	38

Sixty seven percent of participants in the current study had developed an illness or infection within the past 12 months and of those, 15% had been unwell in the last week. Of the 68 participants who had a specified illness or infection in the past 12 months, the most common ailments were chest infections (22%), and urinary tract infections (15%). In the past 12 months 36 people had accidental injuries, with over 50% of these injuries resulting from falls.

Table 2.7 – Specified illness or infection in the past 12 months (N = 68)

Illness or infection	n	%
Chest infection or pneumonia	15	22%
Urinary tract infection	10	15%
Cold or flu	7	10%
Skin infection	5	7%
Cellulitis	4	6%
Allergic reaction	4	6%
Seizure	3	5%
Tooth abscess, decay or disease	2	3%
Bladder infection	2	3%
Eye infection	2	3%
Other	14	21%

In total, 44 of the 105 participants had an admission to an acute hospital in the preceding 12-month period, with some people experiencing multiple admissions. Of the total sample, 17 people were reported to have had an elective admission. Orthopaedic issues (4 people), PEG related issues (3 people), catheter insertion (2 people) and gynaecology related issues (2 people) were reasons given for elective admissions. Thirty one people were reported to have had a non-elective admission to an acute hospital in the past 12 months.

Non-elective admissions resulted from PEG related issues (4 people), chest infections or pneumonia (4 people), seizures (3 people), and psychiatric issues (3 people). Several families reported that acute hospital admissions are often distressing for people with limited communication, behavioural problems or complex care needs; and one family reported spending many hours in acute hospital facilities to provide additional support and to ensure the person could communicate their basic needs.

Most participants were reported to get out of bed every day in the past seven days (72 people). One person only got out of bed one day in the past seven days and two people did not get out of bed at all. Of the people (n=28) who did not get out of bed every day, the most common reason for remaining in bed all day was illness or physical injury (11 people). Other reasons for people remaining in bed included individual choice (8 people), pain or fatigue management (5 people), pressure care and neuropsychiatric or behavioural issues (3 people). It was reported that four people remained in bed because of a lack of equipment or seating and two people remained in bed due to lack of staff assistance.

Lack of appropriate equipment such as hoists and pressure care mattresses and lack of appropriate seating were issues consistently raised in the qualitative data recorded as part of the *my future my choice* planning process. Younger people in aged care facilities are not eligible for the Victorian Aids & Equipment Program because they are accommodated in RAC (Hogan, 2004). It is currently the responsibility of RAC facilities to provide equipment for residents. However, as will be described throughout this section many participants have high and complex needs that necessitate specialised equipment not generally required by the rest of the aged care population and therefore not commonly provided in RAC settings (e.g. wheelchairs with customised supported seating @ \$15,000).

Planners asked informants about the presence of a range of health conditions common in this population (Table 2.8).


Table 2.8 – Health issues identified (N = 105)

Health Issue	n	%
Heart and circulation		
Heart or blood pressure problems	20	19%
Limb swelling	21	20%
Swallowing, eating or drinking		
Swallowing difficulties	44	42%
Saliva management	21	20%
Special dietary needs	35	33%
Problems with appetite regulation	17	16%
Weight problems	44	42%
Breathing		
Recurrent chest infection	19	18%
Difficulty coughing, clearing secretions or sputum	15	14%
Muscles and Bones		
Altered muscle tone, spasticity or muscle spasm	62	59%
Contractures	33	31%
Involuntary movements	35	33%
Paralysis, loss of movement of arms or legs	34	32%
Osteoporosis	18	17%
Fatigue	45	43%
Pain		
Chronic pain problems	31	30%
Skin Problems		
Pressure areas or pressure care	33	31%
Skin rashes	40	38%
Bladder		
Urinary incontinence	72	69%
Urinary tract infections (UTI)	24	23%
Bowel		
Faecal incontinence	49	47%
Diarrhoea or Colitis	57	54%

Health Issue	n	%
Other		
Epilepsy or seizures	30	29%
Sleep disturbance	13	12%
Arousal problems	9	9%
Diabetes – non-insulin dependent	11	11%
Diabetes – insulin dependent	8	8%
Shunt inserted	8	8%
Thyroid problems	5	5%
Dysreflexia/Dysautonomia	3	3%

The planning and assessment process identified a wide range of health conditions in participants and found that most people had complex combinations of health needs (Figure 2.6). Ninety-two people had three or more health problems.

Figure 2.6 - Number of Health Problems



Planners recorded the participant's height and weight to calculate their body mass index (BMI) to determine whether people were underweight or overweight. Data was available on both height and weight for 77 participants. BMI was found to range from 15 to 44, with a mean of 27.6 (SD \pm 7.01). Of the 77 participants 32 had weight problems, with six people underweight and twenty-six people obese.

Table 2.9 – Frequency of body mass index categories (N=77)

BMI Category	n	%
Underweight	6	8%
Acceptable	30	39%
Overweight	15	20%
Obese Class 1	11	14%
Obese Class 2	10	13%
Obese Class 3	5	7%

Of the six people who were underweight, five were reported to have difficulties with swallowing including three people who were PEG fed. At present there is limited information to guide long-term enteral nutrition services for younger people with neurological conditions to assist them to reach or maintain a healthy weight range (Voevodin & Haala, 2007). There are significant pressure care implications for people who are underweight and this was found to be an issue for two participants. During the planning process it also became evident that being significantly overweight has implications for the provision of support. There were 26 people who were in the obese range. Obesity, combined with high levels of physical dependence, requires more staff for manual handling and specialised equipment such as reinforced wheelchairs and hoists.

Thirty three people had contractures and 19 of these people managed increased tone with thermoplastic splints, positioning wedges or lycra splints. Four people had intrathecal baclofen pumps and eight people had insulin dependent diabetes. Of these, at least two participants were noted to have brittle diabetes, requiring nursing care for blood tests and insulin injections several times a day. All participants had prescribed medication but only 11 people were able to administer their own medication.

Planners reported that some younger people, dependent for their personal care in RAC, did not have their teeth cleaned regularly. Support staff found it particularly difficult to provide good oral care for people with oral hypersensitivity, swallowing difficulties or minimal levels of awareness. Few very physically dependent people had regular dental check-ups.

An added complication for many younger people in RAC is the interaction between their various health conditions. For example poor oral hygiene and dental care can increase the risk of chest infections (Azarpazhooch & Leake, 2006). Increased tone and contractures combined with the lack of appropriate supported seating meant that some people spent most of their time lying down. Lack of movement and opportunities to sit upright also increases the risk of chest infections (Diab & Johnston, 2004). Many people had swallowing difficulties and were prone to aspirating. Lack of appropriate supported seating and poor positioning increases the risk of aspiration, resulting in chest infections (Mackay, Morgan, & Bernstein, 1999).

There is an assumption that younger people with complex care needs are 'safer' in RAC where they have access to 24 hour nursing care. However, given the frequency of falls and hospital admissions outlined in this study, and the high death rate outlined in a previous



report (Department of Human Services, 2005), our conclusion is that RAC facilities may not provide the level of support required to manage the health care needs of some people in the target group. Many of the episodes of illness and the resultant hospital admissions appear to be predictable and preventable and further research is required to determine if health promotion and preventative measures can improve the health outcomes for this population. This presents an opportunity to work with general practitioners, nurses and acute health outreach services in order to develop medical care plans aiming to prevent secondary conditions or, at least, ensure early intervention. A co-ordinated approach to managing these conditions has the potential to decrease hospital admissions and improve the health and longevity of both younger people who move out of RAC and those who remain living in RAC.

IMPLICATIONS FOR SERVICE DEVELOPMENT AND DELIVERY

- Participants have high levels of complex health conditions which require daily care and a range of specialist expertise and equipment
- Accommodation services need to develop strategies and supports to integrate management of complex health needs with residential support
- Acute health care needs may be managed within the person's own home or community accommodation settings by a combination of proactive care plans and outreach medical services to avoid admissions to hospital

Mental Health

FINDINGS

- 71% of participants displayed symptoms of recent mental health problems
- 52 people displayed clinically significant symptoms relating to depression
- Mental health problems were found to be complex as evidenced by high levels of co-morbidity

Scores on the HoNOS-ABI provide descriptive indicators of mental health issues rather than specific diagnoses. Responses on the HoNOS-ABI indicated that 71% of participants displayed evidence of mental health issues of varying severity in the two-week period preceding the assessment. Nine people in the sample resided in a facility specifically for people with the dual disabilities of brain impairment and psychiatric disturbance.

Table 2.10 – Level of severity of mental health problems

Mental health symptoms	Level of Severity			
	Minor	Mild	Moderate	Severe
Depressive symptoms (n = 67)	15	31	14	7
Self-directed injury (n = 5)	2	2	0	1
Problems associated with hallucinations/delusions/confabulations (n = 13)	4	7	1	1
*Other (n = 39) See Table 2.11	6	16	9	8
		Clinically significant range		
TOTALS	27	56	24	17

Figure 2.7 - Number of Mental Health Problems per Person




Table 2.10 provides a breakdown of the incidence of specific mental health symptoms and reveals that 67 people displayed behaviours indicative of depression in the two weeks prior to administration of the HoNOS-ABI. For 21 of those participants, depression was rated as moderate or severe. Clinically significant symptoms associated with hallucinations, delusions or confabulations were evident in 9 people and there was a high incidence of 'Other' problems (n=39). The level of severity of mental health issues was wide ranging, with 27 mental health problems rated as minor and 97 falling within the clinically significant range, of which 41 were rated as moderate or severe.

Table 2.11 provides the incidence for the range of mental health symptoms noted under the 'Other' category in Table 2.10. It can be seen that anxiety and stress were most common mental health issue identified.

Table 2.11 – Other mental health problems (n = 39)

Other mental health symptoms	n	%
Anxiety and panics	21	20%
Stress	10	10%
Obsession and compulsive problems	6	6%
Sexual problems	4	4%
Eating disorder	2	2%
Somatisation†	2	2%
Dissociative ('conversion') problems	2	2%
Sleep problems	1	1%
Phobic	1	1%

† Persisting physical complaints in spite of full investigation and reassurance that no disease is present

Incidence of co-morbidities was found to be high with 35% of the participants displaying two or more mental health problems.

Data from the HoNOS-ABI suggests a high prevalence of mental health issues in the sample. Problems at the milder end of the spectrum could, no doubt, be managed conservatively and may well respond to positive changes in the person's living environment, including support to address their underlying social isolation and occupational deprivation. However, for others with more severe mental health conditions (e.g. psychosis, major depression and obsessive-compulsive disorders), or where co-morbidities complicate treatment, specialist neuropsychiatric input is warranted.

IMPLICATIONS FOR SERVICE DEVELOPMENT AND DELIVERY

- Specialist expertise is required for the diagnosis and management of mental health issues
- Mental health issues compound the management of other disability related impairments
- Some mental health issues (e.g. stress and anxiety) may arise from environmental factors and could be improved by provision of more appropriate accommodation and support options

Challenging Behaviour

FINDINGS

- 78% of participants displayed evidence of challenging behaviours, with lack of initiation and verbal aggression being the most common
- Complexity of challenging behaviours was also common, with 56% of participants displaying two or more behaviours
- Despite the high incidence of challenging behaviours only one quarter of participants had received specialist behavioural intervention

In a recent survey of younger people in RAC, Winkler et al (2006) found challenging behaviour the most common complex care need identified. This was endorsed for 63% of people in the sample and a recent investigation of accommodation options available in New South Wales for people with ABI found that within nursing home environments, cognitive problems and challenging behaviours were the most common difficulties faced by staff (Strettles et al., 2005).

“Mary had past issues with wandering but it is no longer an issue because the facility is locked. Mary says she tries to escape because she doesn’t like the older residents or the smell.”

There was a very high incidence of challenging behaviour reported in the current sample, with 69% of the total sample displaying one or more of the behaviours assessed on the Overt Behaviour Scale (OBS). Challenging behaviour is behaviour that causes distress to the person with the disability or is disruptive to other people, causing them distress or making them uncomfortable. Table 2.12 provides a breakdown of the frequency of specific behaviours identified with lack of initiation (56%), verbal aggression (44%) and inappropriate social behaviour (42%) being the most frequently noted.

Table 2.12 – Frequency of overt behaviours identified (n = 99)

Overt Behaviour	n	%
Lack of initiation	55	56%
Verbal aggression	44	44%
Inappropriate social behaviour	42	42%
Perseveration / repetitive behaviour	25	25%
Inappropriate sexual behaviour	20	20%
Physical aggression against other people	17	16%
Physical aggression against objects	9	9%
Wandering / absconding	9	9%
Physical acts against self	4	4%


Table 2.13 provides a breakdown of the level of severity of each of the behaviours and demonstrates that Level 1 behaviours were the most frequently recorded (110 instances), followed by Level 2 behaviours (67 instances). These less severe behaviours are often successfully addressed by managing the background factors and associated triggers. For instance, providing people with choice and control over their day to day lives, supporting engagement in meaningful occupation, providing less stressful living environments as well as managing underlying mental health issues will all assist to reduce the incidence of these behaviours.

Table 2.13 – Levels of severity for each challenging behaviour

Verbal aggression (n = 44)			
Level 1 (e.g. shouts angrily)	Level 2 (e.g. mild personal insults)	Level 3 (e.g. moderate threats)	Level 4 (e.g. threats of violence)
25	18	16	5
Inappropriate social behaviour (n = 42)			
Level 1 (e.g. socially awkward)	Level 2 (e.g. nuisance / annoyance)	Level 3 (e.g. oppositional)	Level 4 (e.g. unlawful behaviour, risk to self or others)
18	22	22	6
Perseveration (n = 27)			
Level 1 (repetition of non-harmful behaviour)	Level 2 (behaviour causes minor physical harm)	Level 3 (behaviour causes serious harm)	N/A
22	2	0	
Inappropriate sexual behaviour (n = 24)			
Level 1 (sexual talk/ touching others, non-genital)	Level 2 (exhibitionism/ masturbation)	Level 3 (touching others, genital)	Level 4 (coercive sexual behaviour)
17	6	5	0
Physical aggression against others (n = 17)			
Level 1 (threatening gestures)	Level 2 (strikes, kicks)	Level 3 (attack causing mild/ moderate injury)	Level 4 (attack causing severe physical injury)
13	6	2	1
Physical aggression against objects (n = 9)			
Level 1 (e.g. slams doors)	Level 2 (e.g. throws objects)	Level 3 (e.g. breaks objects / smashes windows)	Level 4 (e.g. sets fire/ throws objects dangerously)
6	7	1	1
Physical acts against self (n = 4)			
Level 1 (e.g. hits self)	Level 2 (e.g. bangs head, throws self)	Level 3 (e.g. inflicts small cuts or bruises)	Level 4 (e.g. mutilates self)
3	2	0	0
Wandering / absconding (n = 9)			
Level 1 (e.g. goes to prohibited areas, low risk of harm)	Level 2 (e.g. leaves safe environment, high risk of harm)	Level 3 (e.g. leaves secure premise, may physically resist attempts to stop)	N/A
6	4	1	
Total Level 1 Behaviours = 110	Total Level 2 Behaviours = 67	Total Level 3 Behaviours = 47	Total Level 4 Behaviours = 13

Overt behaviours at the more severe end of the spectrum (60 instances of Level 3 and 4 behaviours) place the safety of the individual and others at risk and also contribute to the loss of opportunities to participate in social and recreational activities. Although primarily organic in origin, these behaviours can usually be traced to the presence of significant unmet needs. Often the behaviour is the only mechanism for the person to express and attempt to have their needs met (e.g. for pain relief, comfort, control). For those displaying such behaviours interventions as noted above need to be supplemented by more formal behavioural programs to provide carers with guidance on how to respond in challenging situations.

Figure 2.8 - Number of Challenging behaviours identified (n=105)



The need for specialised input is further emphasised by the finding that only 22% of participants displayed one type of challenging behaviour, while 56% of participants displayed two or more behaviours (Figure 2.8). This data points to the complexity of the behaviour change and the challenges in developing effective individualised management strategies.

Sixty nine percent of participants with challenging behaviour had a written behaviour plan and only 25% received specialist behavioural intervention. Referral for such services was recommended for a further 21% of participants.

IMPLICATIONS FOR SERVICE DEVELOPMENT AND DELIVERY

- Specialist expertise is required for the development of individualised strategies to manage challenging behaviours, particularly where complex combinations of more severe levels of behaviour are present
- Staff require ongoing training to effectively implement behaviour management plans
- Improving living environments, enhancing participation in meaningful occupation and developing communication skills is likely to lead to long-term behavioural change

Social Networking and Contacts

FINDINGS

- 53% received a visit from a friend less often than once per year
- 23% were visited by a relative on most days
- 11% received a visit from a relative less often than once per year

A previous study (Winkler, Farnworth, & Sloan, 2006) found that younger people living in RAC were extremely isolated from peers, with 44% receiving a visit from a friend less often than once per year. The current study also found that participants were socially isolated with 53% of participants receiving a visit from a friend less than once per year.

“Family and friends have had to confront not only their family member’s issues, but challenging behaviour being displayed by other residents.”

Table 2.14 – Frequency of visits from friends and family (N = 105)

Frequency of visits	Friends *		Relatives †	
	n	%	n	%
Most days	2	2%	24	23%
1-3 times per week	10	10%	44	42%
1-3 times per month	17	16%	13	12%
5-11 times per year	13	12%	4	4%
1-4 times per year	7	7%	9	9%
Less than once per year	11	11%	4	4%
Never	44	42%	7	7%

* “On average, how often are you visited by a friend?”

† “On average, how often are you visited by a relative?”

Also indicative of the social isolation experienced in this group, 82% of residents surveyed reported that they seldom or never visited friends in their home (Table 2.15). Participants and/or their informants were asked “Do you have a best friend in whom you can confide?”; and for 34% of the sample the answer was “yes”.

Table 2.15 – Frequency of visits to friends and family (n = 101)

Response	Visit relatives in their home Ω		Visit friends in their home §	
	n	%	n	%
5 or more times per month	5	5%	0	0%
1-4 times per month	24	24%	4	4%
5-11 times per year	3	3%	7	7%
1-4 times per year	12	12%	7	7%
Seldom/Never	57	56%	83	82%

Ω “Approximately how often do you usually visit relatives in their home?”

§ “Approximately how often do you usually visit friends in their home?”

Similar to the previous study, considerable variation exists in the frequency of visits by relatives. Twenty three percent were visited by a relative on most days, 11% received a visit from a relative less often than once per year (Table 2.14) and the frequency of visits to relatives in their home was low, with 56% of residents seldom or never visiting relatives (Table 2.15). The high frequency of relatives visiting on most days represents the high burden of care experienced by some families who feel the need to be at the RAC one or more times per day to complement the care provided by paid staff. Some families are actively involved in the physical care of their family member (e.g. meal assistance) because they perceive that paid staff do not have enough time to provide the care required. Some families also feel that they need to visit daily to compensate for the lack of stimulation experienced by many younger people in the RAC environment. Participants and informants were asked “Is it important for you to live close by to your friends and family?”; 85% of respondents said “Yes”.

“Seeing Sarah in a nursing home is difficult in terms of loss of what might have been.”

“The only visitor Simon has had over the past couple of years is me (his mother) – I visit him every day to feed him a home-cooked meal.”

From qualitative analysis of data and planner feedback, several key themes were identified in relation to social contact with family and friends. Informants reported that relationships with family and friends were often complicated by grief and loss issues related to acquired or late onset disabilities. This was most evident when family or friends were present or involved in the cause of the injury.

People with hereditary disorders (e.g. Huntington’s disease) sometimes had one or more family members who were experiencing a similar or increasing level of disability or had died, thus further reducing social networks.



Limitations in the expressive communication levels of the individual, and their capacity to participate in shared activities, was reported as making visiting difficult. A progressive deterioration in communication skills or physical capacity was seen to further impede the frequency and success of visiting. Some complex care needs (e.g. PEG feeds or insulin regimes) also had an impact on the timing of social contact and community access. Planners reported that the provision of suitable wheelchairs, affordable and accessible transport and access to augmentative communication would enhance social contact.

“I visit once a month for about 10 to 15 minutes – I find it very awkward, I don’t know what to say.”

Lack of space and privacy during visits at the RAC facilities was reported. Additionally, an aged care environment was seen as off-putting or threatening for some visitors and as a barrier to the facilitation of age-appropriate social relationships, including that of parents with young children.

Four key strategies for fostering social contact were identified in the qualitative data.

- Ensuring the individual lives close to family, friends and their local community
- Ensuring the individual lives within walking distance to an accessible café or other community facility (e.g. library)
- Providing paid supports, accessible transport and mobility equipment to facilitate social contact in the community or the homes of family and friends
- The provision of private meeting spaces for visits by family and friends (both in RAC and shared supported accommodation)

IMPLICATIONS FOR SERVICE DEVELOPMENT AND DELIVERY

- Funding and support services need to actively support social relationships including assistance with transport or support to visit family at home
- Services need to be actively involved in supporting any existing friendships and fostering new friendships
- Funding for communication assessment, resources, and support for family and friends regarding communication
- Support to assist family and friends identify suitable shared activities either in the RAC facility or local community

Recreation & Community Inclusion

FINDINGS

- 30% participated in recreation activities organised by the RAC facility less often than once per month
- 32 people seldom or never participated in shopping or leisure activities outside the RAC facility
- 13% of participants seldom or never went outside (e.g. into the garden of the RAC)

Participation and level of independence in home or community-based recreation and leisure was restricted by a range of issues. These included the physical abilities of the person, their access to 1:1 support, suitable transport or mobility or adaptive recreational equipment, and limited disposable income to spend on leisure.

“Don would like to be more involved in previous hobbies. His sister described his love of reading, doing puzzles, listening to music and watching movies and documentaries. When discussed with Don, he expressed a real interest in having the chance to do these things again.”

Younger people living in RAC tend to be uninvolved in the in-house recreation activities offered. Thirty percent of the sample participated in recreation activities organised by the RAC facility less often than once per month while 25% of the group undertake recreation independently of the RAC most days and 33% are involved in recreation activities organised independently of the RAC less than once per month (Table 2.16).

“He’s on the Disability Support Pension so he can’t access leisure activities he has to pay for himself.”

A common theme identified in individualised planning was the desire to share accommodation with younger people so that home and community social and recreational opportunities could be shared.

Table 2.16 – Frequency of participation in recreation activities (n=101)

Response	Recreation organised by aged care facility *		Recreation independent of aged care facility †	
	n	%	n	%
More than once a day	5	5%	4	4%
Almost every day	21	21%	25	25%
Almost every week	34	34%	29	29%
Almost every month	11	11%	10	10%
Seldom/never (less than once per month)	30	30%	33	33%

* “On average, how often do you participate in recreation activities organised by the aged care facility?”

† “On average, how often do you participate in recreation activities organised independently of the aged care facility?”

In this sample, over half of the group (55%) went outdoors almost every day or more often. However, in contrast, 12% seldom or never went outside. While 31% of the sample reported travelling out of the RAC almost every day or more often, 23% seldom or never travelled (Table 2.17).

“Grant is ‘trapped’ inside the facility as he does not have a modified wheelchair to access the outside. He spends most of his time in a tub chair, which is inappropriate for his needs.”

Table 2.17 – Frequency of going outside and frequency of travel outside the RAC facility (n=101)

Response	Going outside *		Travel outside RAC †	
	n	%	n	%
More than once a day	25	25%	4	4%
Almost every day	32	32%	27	27%
Almost every week	26	26%	34	34%
Almost every month	3	3%	13	13%
Seldom/never	13	13%	23	23%

* “On average, how often does the person go outside (e.g. into the garden)?”

† “On average, how often does the person travel outside the aged care facility?”

Many younger residents seldom or never participated in shopping (47%) or leisure activities (45%) outside the RAC facility (Table 2.18). Thirty-two people seldom or never travelled outside the RAC for shopping or leisure.

Table 2.18 – Frequency of participation in activities outside the RAC facility

Response	Shopping * n=99		Leisure Activities † n=101	
	n	%	n	%
5 or more times per month	14	14%	17	17%
1-4 times per month	21	21%	18	18%
5-11 times per year	10	10%	8	8%
1-4 times per year	8	8%	13	13%
Seldom/Never	46	47%	45	45%

* “Approximately how often do you participate in shopping outside the aged care facility?”

† “Approximately how often do you usually participate in leisure activities such as movies, sports, restaurants outside the aged care facility?”

The scores on the Community Integration Questionnaire (CIQ) (Table 2.19) show that the people in this study were effectively excluded from participation in the community. It is difficult to find a comparison group to assist in the interpretation of these scores. To date, most studies have only included people with ABI. The mean score for this sample of young people living in RAC is much lower than the total means scores for any samples from previous studies, which range from 13.02 – 19 (Colantonio, Dawson, & McLellan, 1998; Corrigan & Deming, 1995; Corrigan, Smith-Knapp, & Granger, 1998; Fleming, Tooth, Hassell, & Chan, 1999; Sander, Kreutzer, Rosenthal, Delmonico, & Young, 1996; A. M. Sander et al., 1997; Schmidt, Garvin, Heinemann, & Kelly, 1995; Willer et al., 1993). All of these samples included people with severe traumatic brain injury more than one year post-injury.

Table 2.19 – Community Integration Subscale Scores and Total Scores (N=105)

CIQ score	Min	Max	Mean (SD)
Home integration (out of 10)	0	7.25	0.94 (± 1.03)
Social integration (out of 12)	0	7	2.38 (± 1.77)
Productivity (out of 7)	0	5.0	1.59 (±1.18)
CIQ total score (out of 29)	0	13.25	4.92 (±3.00)

IMPLICATIONS FOR SERVICE DEVELOPMENT AND DELIVERY

- Younger people who remain in RAC require support to access outdoor areas and their local community
- Limited financial resources can be a barrier to participation
- Recreation support and adaptive recreation equipment is required to assist people to develop and pursue interests both at home and in their local community
- Consideration of geographical location and proximity of local accessible community services is an important component of accommodation planning



Choice & Role Participation

FINDINGS

- Many people in the sample had very limited opportunity to make everyday choices such the timing of everyday activities
- Most people in the sample experienced the loss of several valued life roles and very few people had replaced these roles with other life roles

Providing the support people with complex care needs require to make everyday choices and life choices is crucial to fostering dignity and self-determination (Department of Human Services, 2002). There is enormous potential for making a significant difference to the lives of the people in the target group by increasing their sense of control making and their participation in every day activities.

Qualitative data analysis identified two main areas in which participants and their support network desired greater choice:

“I would like to dictate times I can get up in the morning, and when I go to bed. I would like a shower every day, as (the) current facility policy is once every two days.”

- the timing and frequency of personal care routines (e.g. showering, mealtimes)
- choice regarding meaningful occupation undertaken within both the RAC facility and community settings.

Table 2.20 provides information about the level of support and opportunity people in the sample were given to make choices with regard to various areas of life. The planners conducted interviews with informants (the individual, their support network and paid staff) about the person's participation in making choices. Based on this information, the planner rated the person's level of participation in making choices in each area of life listed in Table 2.20. A score of 1 indicates that the individual had no opportunity to make choices in this area, or the informants considered the person was unable to make choices in this area. This study found that many younger people in RAC have very limited opportunity to participate in even basic everyday choices such as the timing of meals, when they go to bed and their participation in daytime activities. The sample's ability to participate in making choices is clearly influenced by the fact that 9% of people were minimally aware and 48% had difficulty communicating their everyday needs. However this highlights the need for formal support to ensure people have maximum opportunities for choice making.

Table 2.20 – Areas of life that people are supported to make choices (N=99)

Area of Life	No opportunity *	Unlikely to give real choice †	Final say doesn't rest with person §	Procedures in place Δ	NA
	1	2	3	4	
The content of their evening meal	48%	29%	10%	10%	3%
The timing of their evening meal	71%	15%	6%	5%	3%
The leisure activities they take part in indoors	23%	18%	10%	49%	
Going out (e.g. pub, cinema)	40%	11%	19%	29%	
The time they go to bed in the evening	34%	22%	20%	21%	2%
The clothes they wear each day	29%	16%	8%	46%	1%
Keeping pets	72%	8%	6%	2%	12%
Removal of unsuitable staff	79%	10%	5%		6%
Involvement with girlfriends or boyfriends	55%	7%	9%	14%	14%
Their daytime activities	23%	23%	22%	31%	1%
The time they spend in the bath or shower	51%	26%	10%	13%	1%
Access to a private area	40%	12%	11%	37%	
The furnishings in their bedroom	25%	25%	22%	27%	

* Nothing mentioned, no opportunity, person considered by informant to be incapable of making choices in this area

† Some procedure(s) mentioned but nothing likely to give the person much real choice

§ Some procedure(s) mentioned through which person can express preferences but final say does not rest with the person

Δ Procedures in place for person to express preferences and these are final unless clearly inappropriate or dangerous

It is essential that everyone has the same opportunities to participate in the life of the community and choose the role they want to play in society alongside other citizens (Department of Human Services, 2002). A role is defined as the expected pattern of behaviour associated with occupation of a distinctive position in society (Heard, 1977). Adult occupational, family, avocational and social roles allow people to participate in society and satisfy human needs (Oakley 1982). This study examined roles utilising the Roles Checklist (Oakley 1982) and found that most people in the sample had lost many valued life roles. Life roles that were most often lost included the role of worker, student, home maintainer and

“The most important role Susan identified is a continued and improved role in her son’s life, including room for her son to stay within her accommodation and available funds to entertain him and an opportunity to holiday with him.”

caregiver. Life roles that were most often preserved included family member and friend. Role gains were very limited however some people (24%) increased their involvement in hobbies and small gains were made by some people who took on roles such as volunteer worker, religious participant and participant in an organisation. In the sample, four people were students, three were attending adult training support services and one person was studying part-time at TAFE. One person was doing some part-time paid work in a supported environment.

Table 2.21 – Frequency of role participation (N = 99)

Role	Role Loss	Role Maintained	Role Gain	Never Performed
Student: Attending school on a part or full-time basis	91%	4%		5%
Worker: Part-time or full time paid employment	90%	1%		9%
Volunteer: Donating services, at least once a month, to a hospital, school, community, political campaign, and so forth	27%	3%	2%	68%
Caregiver: Responsibility at least once a month for the care of someone such as a child, spouse, relative or friend	54%	6%		40%
Home maintainer: Responsibility at least once a month, for the upkeep of the home such as housecleaning or yard work	77%	1%		22%
Friend: Spending time or doing something, at least once a month, with a friend	44%	50%		6%
Family Member: Spending time or doing something at least once a month, with a family member such as a child, spouse parent or other relative	14%	85%		1%
Religious Participant: Involvement at least once a month, in groups or activities affiliated with one's religion (excluding worship)	18%	22%	2%	58%
Hobbyist or Amateur: Involvement at least once a month in a hobby or amateur activity such as sewing, playing a musical instrument	18%	22%	24%	37%
Participant in Organisations: Involvement at least once a month, in organizations such as Rotary, Guides, Book Club, Freemasons, Football club and so forth	25%	11%	1%	63%

IMPLICATIONS FOR SERVICE DEVELOPMENT AND DELIVERY

- There is an opportunity to make a significant difference to people's lives by increasing their participation in making everyday choices and decisions about their lives
- Younger people who remain in RAC and those who move require support and resources to enable them to live lives of connectedness by participating in valued life roles and community life

Support Needs

FINDINGS

- There is tremendous variation in support needs of this group
- 43% require the highest level of physical support on the Residential Classification Scale
- 37% of people cannot be left alone and require supervision 24 hours per day (CANS)
- 23% require a 'hostel' level of care

Overall support needs were assessed using the Residential Classification Scale (RCS) (Ageing and Aged Care Division, 2005) and the Care and Needs Scale (CANS) (Tate, 2004). Results on these two measures identified tremendous variations in the support needs of this sample. The RCS is an instrument used by the Department of Health and Ageing to measure the relative care needs of each resident and allocate funding to RAC facilities. This instrument was designed for use with the frail elderly and does not capture all the support needs of younger people with disabilities and complex care needs. As shown in Table 2.22 most (79%) of the people under 50 in RAC required high care (RCS Level 1-4), with 43% requiring the highest level of care (RCS Level 1) and 23% requiring a 'hostel' level of care (Residential Classification Scale Level 5-7).

Table 2.22 – Residential Classification Scale (RCS) (N=105)

Level of Care	n	%
Level 1	45	43%
Level 2	21	20%
Level 3	10	10%
Level 4	6	6%
Level 5	10	10%
Level 6	9	9%
Level 7	4	4%

The CANS Section 2 provides eight levels of how long a person can be left alone for. In this sample, 36% of people required the highest level of support, indicating they cannot be left alone and require nursing care and/or surveillance 24 hours per day (Table 2.23).

Table 2.23 – Length of time person can be left alone (CANS Section 2) (n = 103)

CANS Level	n	%
Cannot be left alone. Needs nursing care, assistance and/or surveillance 24 hours per day	38	37%
Can be left alone for a few hours. Needs nursing care, assistance and/or surveillance 20-23 hours per day	20	19%
Can be left alone for part of the day but not overnight. Needs nursing care, assistance, supervision and/or direction 12-19 hours per day	18	18%
Can be left alone for part of the day and overnight. Needs a person each day (up to 11 hours) for assistance, supervision, direction and/or cueing for occupational activities, interpersonal relationships and/or living skills	20	19%
Can be left alone for a few days a week. Needs contact for occupational activities, interpersonal relationships, living skills or emotional support a few days per week	5	5%
Can be left alone for almost all week. Needs contact for occupational activities, interpersonal relationships, living skills or emotional support at least once per week	2	2%
Can live alone, but needs intermittent (i.e. less than weekly) contact for occupational activities, interpersonal relationships, living skills or emotional support	0	0%
Can live in the community, totally independently. Does not need contact	0	0%

The key elements of the day to day support needs of the whole group are outlined in Table 2.24. Many of the participants are very physically dependent on others for bed mobility (40%) and mobility inside (50%). Sixty three percent were incontinent. Forty eight percent had difficulty communicating basic care needs and 49% required assistance with meals.

Table 2.24 – Support needs of the whole groups (N=105)

Support Needs	n	%
Incontinence* (n=105)	66	63%
Assistance positioning is critical (e.g. in bed, wheelchair or chair) (n=99)	56	57%
Assistance required with mobility inside (n=98)	49	50%
Assistance required to get in and out of the place they live (n=99)	70	71%
Assistance required to get around in their local community (n=97)	75	77%
Wanders or gets lost * (N=105)	7	7%
Assistance required bed mobility (e.g. turning)* (N=105)	42	40%
Exhibits behaviours that have the potential to cause harm to self or others* (N=105)	23	22%
Has difficulty communicating basic needs* (N=105)	50	48%
Meal assistance* (N=105)	51	49%
PEG feeds* (N=105)	16	15%
Thickened fluids (N=105)	23	22%
Meals with special consistency or texture (N=105)	30	29%
Baclofen pump (N=105)	4	4%
Assistance required with taking medication (n=101)	90	89%

* Items from the Care and Needs Scale (CANS) Part A

There is tremendous variation in the level and type of support required by the whole sample. To assist with service planning and development, the sample was divided into smaller homogenous sub-groups. Chapter 3 describes the characteristics, support needs and accommodation preferences for each of these sub-groups and summarises the themes identified in the individualised plans.

IMPLICATIONS FOR SERVICE DEVELOPMENT AND DELIVERY

- Alternative accommodation and support options need to be set up to manage a range of complex care and support needs
- A range of solutions are required to meet the various sub-groups within this population



Chapter 3: Accommodation and support planning

Support Needs of Three Sub-groups

Given the wide range of support needs represented in this sample, cluster analysis was utilised to identify sub-groups of participants with similar levels of support needs. Details of this analysis are available in Appendix B.

The cluster analysis revealed three sub-groups:

- *Very High Care Needs* group
- *High Care Needs* group
- *Moderate Care Needs* group

Table 3.1 outlines the characteristics of each group. Tables 3.1 to 3.4 only contain the results of the health issues, characteristics or life circumstances that were statistically significantly different between groups. The *Moderate Care Needs* group were predominantly males with acquired brain injuries who were fully aware. The *High Care Needs* and *Very High Care Needs* groups had a more even mix of males and females and disability types. All minimally aware people were in the *Very High Care Needs* group.

Table 3.1 – Characteristics that vary across the three subgroups

Characteristic		Very High needs (n=52)	High Needs (n=35)	Moderate Needs (n= 16)
Sex	Male	28	18	14
	Female	24	17	2
Disability Type	Acquired Brain Injury	33	15	11
	Multiple Sclerosis	9	5	
	Huntington's Disease	5	3	1
	Intellectual Disability	5	2	2
Level of Awareness	Fully aware	22	26	14
	Partially aware	21	9	2
	Minimally aware	9		

As expected, the *Very High Care Needs* group had more health issues such as altered muscle tone, swallowing difficulties and pressure care issues associated with higher levels of disability compared to the other two groups (Table 3.2).

Table 3.2 – Health issues that vary between the three sub-groups

Health Issue	Very High needs (n=52)	High Needs (n=35)	Moderate Needs (n= 16)
Diarrhoea or colitis	39	18	0
Altered muscle tone	36	21	5
Swallowing difficulties	33	9	2
Contractures	24	8	1
Pressure areas or care	20	12	1
Recurrent chest infections	16	3	0
Urinary tract infections	14	10	0

The *Very High Care Needs* group required more physical assistance than the other two groups, indicated by the RCS level of 1-3 (Table 3.3), requiring between 20-24 hours of supervision each day (CANS Level 7-8). The physical assistance required by the *High Care Needs* group is quite varied, revealing a range of 1-7 on the RCS, however, this group required less constant supervision than the *Very High Needs* group. The CANS indicated between 11 and 23 hours of supervision during the day for this group and some people in the *High Care Needs* group could manage alone overnight. The *Moderate Care Needs* group required little hands on assistance, up to 11 hours of assistance during the day and did not need support overnight.

As shown in Table 3.4 the *Very High Care Needs* are highly dependent on others for positioning, mobility, communication, and meal assistance. Some people in the two higher care groups are more prone to wandering or getting lost and more people in these two groups exhibit behaviours that have potential to cause harm to themselves or others.

Table 3.3 – RCS and CANS levels of the three sub-groups

Support Needs	Very High Needs (n=52)	High Needs (n=35)	Moderate Needs (n= 16)
Level of physical assistance (RCS range)	1-3	1-7	4-7
Level of supervision (Score on CANS Part 2)	7-8	5-7	3-5

Table 3.4 – Mobility of the three sub-groups

Support Needs	Very High Needs (n=52)	High Needs (n=35)	Moderate Needs (n= 16)
Assistance required bed mobility (e.g. turning)*	27	15	
Assistance positioning in critical (e.g. in bed, wheelchair or chair)	37	18	1
Assistance required with mobility inside	40	9	
Assistance required to get in and out of the place they live	47	20	3
Assistance required to get around in their local community	47	25	3
Wanders or gets lost *	5	2	

* Items from the Care and Needs Scale (CANS) Part A

Table 3.5 – Support Needs of the three sub-groups

Support Needs	Very High Needs (n=52)	High Needs (n=35)	Moderate Needs (n= 16)
Incontinence*	43	22	1
Exhibits behaviours that have the potential to cause harm to self or others	17	5	1
Has difficulty communicating basic needs*	37	11	2
Meal assistance*	37	14	
PEG feeds*	16		
Assistance required with taking medication	50	32	7

* Items from the Care and Needs Scale (CANS) Part A

For each subgroup, a case illustration is provided to illustrate a ‘typical’ person in each group. Any identifying information in these case illustrations has been altered. Accommodation and support preferences and characteristics are outlined for each sub-group.

Support Needs of the Very High Care Needs Group

CHARACTERISTICS OF THE VERY HIGH CARE NEEDS GROUP

- Most people require the assistance of one or two staff and specialist equipment for positioning, mobility, transfers and personal care activities
- Multiple and complex nursing and medical needs are prevalent, including PEG feeding, catheterisation, pressure care and infection management
- Communication abilities are severely limited with 71% of people having difficulties communicating basic day to day needs
- 81% of the Very High Support Needs group display one or more challenging behaviours

Case Illustration: Leanne

Leanne, a 45-year-old primary school teacher, was diagnosed with Multiple Sclerosis twenty five years ago. Leanne grew up in the outer eastern suburbs of Melbourne, where her parents and two siblings still live. Leanne's interests include current affairs and sport; in particular she is an avid supporter of the Geelong Football Club.

When Leanne was first admitted to the RAC facility her parents, on their initial visit, found her sitting by a window with a scenic view. Leanne, however, was unable to see anything because her head was bowed over looking at her chest, saturated from her own saliva. Her father decided that he and his wife would need to visit Leanne on a daily basis to ensure her care needs were fully met.

Although unable to speak, Leanne uses a communication board with all the letters of the alphabet in rows, allowing her to spell words and phrases (via eye contact with each letter in the word), supplemented with facial gestures. This method of communication is effective with people who know Leanne well and for those who have the time to spend with her. Unfortunately, nursing staff do not support her to use the communication board so her parents have taken on the role of advocating for her on a day to day basis.

Leanne is dependent upon staff to meet all her personal care needs. Due to altered muscle tone she is unable to use her limbs at all. She uses an electric wheelchair which needs to be operated by someone else. Two staff are needed to transfer her using a ceiling hoist. She receives all her fluids and nutritional needs, including all her medications, via a PEG. She is fed via the PEG eight times during a 24-hour period. The PEG tube is replaced by the Hospital in the Home Program.

Leanne also has a catheter which is routinely changed every three months, although it often becomes blocked thus requiring more frequent changes. The catheter is changed by the qualified nursing staff at the RAC facility. Leanne frequently experiences urinary tract infections, which are treated with medication

prescribed by the General Practitioner who visits her as required at the RAC facility. She has a pressure care mattress on her bed and her parents recently spent \$500 to replace the pressure care seating on her wheelchair.

Leanne's father visits in the morning and her mother visits in the afternoon for hours at a time. While they are at the RAC facility, her parents assist with Leanne's personal care needs including giving her PEG feeds and cleaning her teeth. They also read the newspaper to her, watch television together and converse. Leanne's sister, Fiona, and her brother, Steven, visit her on the weekends. She also receives regular visits from a voluntary community visitor from the Multiple Sclerosis Society.

Both Leanne and her parents do not believe she receives the amount of individual attention she requires from RAC staff. They feel that staff have limited time to complete all their work tasks and do not have time to spend with Leanne. Her father stated that when he goes home at night, he leaves notes to prompt staff to meet Leanne's basic needs, for example to change the station on her television so she can watch a particular program at night.

Leanne wants to move out of the RAC facility into supported accommodation with people of her own age. She expressed the wish to continue to receive nursing care, but preferred this to be delivered in a more personalised way by staff who have the time to communicate with her. Leanne said she would like to have more contact with her friends and people her own age. She would prefer to have a normal relationship with her parents and not be as dependent upon them for the direct care they provide during their daily visits. She also wants to remain living in the outer eastern suburbs of Melbourne so she can be close to her family.



Characteristics of the Very High Care Needs group

There are 52 people in the *Very High Care Needs* Group who require a high level of physical assistance and most require 24 hour supervision. People in this group have a mix of disability types, with 63% of this group diagnosed with an ABI (Table 3.6). Forty five people in the *Very High Care Needs* group had one disability type, six people had two disabilities and one person had three disabilities.

Table 3.6 – Disability types in the Very High Care Needs group (n=52)

Disability type	n	%
Acquired Brain Injury	33	63%
Multiple Sclerosis	9	17%
Huntington's Disease	5	10%
Intellectual Disability	5	10%
Cerebral Palsy	3	6%
Paraplegia	2	4%

Individuals in the *Very High Care Needs* group have high physical support needs and are generally very limited in their mobility. Positioning was reported as critical for 37 people of this group (Table 3.7). The reported risks of incorrect positioning were serious and included pain (26 people), pressure sores (28 people), choking (21 people), and respiratory tract infections (10 people). Forty five people required assistance with mobility and transfers and at least 38 people use a wheelchair for mobility. Forty people in this group are unable to get around inside the place they live without help, and 47 people are unable to get in and out of the place they live without help (Table 3.7). No one in this group was found to be participating in domestic and community activities of daily living. These figures point to marked limitations in access to daily activities within both accommodation and community settings, in addition to the need for high levels of staffing support (e.g. transfers or personal care).


Table 3.7 – Positioning and mobility support needs of the Very High Care Needs group (n=52)

Support Needs	n	%
Positioning		
Critical to position correctly	37	71%
Risk of incorrect positioning – pressure sore	28	54%
Risks of incorrect positioning – pain	26	50%
Risk of incorrect positioning – choking	21	40%
Risk of incorrect positioning – respiratory tract infection	10	19%
Risk of incorrect positioning – challenging behaviour	9	17%
Mobility		
Bed mobility *	27	52%
Assistance with transfers/mobility *	45	87%
Assistance required to get around inside without help	40	77%
Assistance required to get in and out of place where they live without help	47	90%

* CANS A

Forty two people in the *Very High Care Needs* group display one or more challenging behaviours on the OBS, with 13 people displaying physical aggression towards others and nine people displaying inappropriate sexual behaviour. The impact of these behaviours on other people was typically rated as moderate to extreme; understandable given the Occupational Health and Safety implications. Sedation was more often used (10 people) as a means of managing challenging behaviour in this group than in the other two groups. These findings should be considered in conjunction with the high physical support needs of this group and common triggers of challenging behaviour, including pain, reduced expressive communication, the requirement for close proximity of carers during personal care and mobility tasks, reduced access to daily activities and altered level of awareness. All people who were assessed as minimally aware (9 people in total) were in the *Very High Care Needs* group (Figure 3.1).

Figure 3.1 - Levels of awareness for *Very High Care Needs* group



Forty eight people in the *Very High Care Needs* group had urinary incontinence and 26 people experienced faecal incontinence (Table 3.8). Thirty three people had difficulties with swallowing, 37 people required mealtime assistance and 16 people required nasogastric or PEG feeds. Sixteen people had difficulties with recurrent chest infections and 12 people had problems coughing and/or clearing secretions or sputum (Table 3.6). Thirty seven people had difficulty in communicating basic needs due to language impairments.

Table 3.8 – Personal care support needs of the *Very High Care Needs* group (n=52)

Personal Care Support Needs	n	%
Urinary incontinence	48	92%
Faecal incontinence	26	50%
Difficulty swallowing	33	63%
Nasogastric / PEG feeding	16	31%
Recurrent chest infections	16	31%
Problems coughing or clearing secretions	12	23%
Contractures	24	46%
Altered muscle tone	36	69%

Thirty six people had altered muscle tone such as spasticity or muscle spasm and 24 people had contractures (Table 3.8). Three of the four people with intrathecal Baclofen pumps, used to manage severe spasticity, were in the *Very High Care Needs* group.

The *Very High Care Needs* group were high users of consumables such as absorbent bed sheets (33 people), pads or pull-ups (44 people), topicals (19 people), enteral feeds and PEG devices (16 people) and clothing protectors (16 people). This group also required a range of equipment, including shower chairs (38 people), shower trolleys (10 people), commodes (17 people), hoists (35 people), wheelchairs (38 people), specialised seating (25 people), pressure care mattresses and overlays (35 people) and environmental control units (11 people).

Table 3.9 – Consumables and equipment requirements of the *Very High Care Needs* group (n=52)


Consumables and Equipment	n	%
Absorbent bed sheet	33	64%
Pads or Pull-ups	44	85%
Topicals	19	37%
Enteral feeds and PEG devices	16	31%
Clothing protectors	16	31%
Shower chairs	38	73%
Shower trolleys	10	19%
Commodes	17	33%
Hoists	35	67%
Wheelchairs	38	73%
Specialised seating	25	48%
Pressure care mattresses and overlays	35	67%
Environmental control units	11	21%

The marked difficulty people in RAC experience in maintaining and making friends was evident in the fact that 22 people in the *Very High Care Needs* Group were never visited by a friend and a further 9 people were visited less than once a year. Only 6 people were visited weekly by friends. Forty seven people did not visit friends, further demonstrating issues within this group relating to the high physical support needs and subsequent limitations in community access and integration. To try to compensate for social isolation, some relatives reported that they visit more often. The fact that 17 people in the *Very High Care Needs* group are visited by a relative on most days and a further 21 people 1-3 times per week verifies their reflections. Only one person in the group was never visited by a relative and thirteen people in the *Very High Care Needs* group went out to visit relatives weekly or monthly. Over half of this group (34 people) never visited relatives.

Very High Care Needs Group Accommodation & Support Preferences

Four people in the *Very High Care Needs* group indicated that they would like to remain in RAC with no immediate change. Ten people would like to remain in the existing RAC but would like additional disability supports. These additional supports are described in Chapter 4.

Figure 3.2 - *Very High Care Needs* group original DHS location




Thirty-five of the people in the *Very High Care Needs* group would like to explore the possibility of moving to an alternative accommodation and support option. Four people would like to return to a private or family residence, 29 specified a shared supported accommodation option and two people specified an 'other' accommodation and support option. One person would like to live independently and one person would like to live in a unit attached to a hospital. Information regarding accommodation and support preferences was not available for 3 people because their individual plans were not complete at the time of writing this report.

Very High Care Needs Group Level & Type of Support Required in a Community Setting

Planners were asked to estimate the level of shared 'background' support that each person would require during waking hours (i.e. from 7.00am-11.00pm) for community based living. In conjunction with this background level of support, planners were also asked to estimate the level of 1:1 and 2:1 (staff:resident) support that the person would require. Planners estimated that 12 people in the *Very High Care Needs* group required a 1:5 level of background support and 8 people required a 1:4 level of background support. Seven people were estimated to require a 1:3 level of support and another six people required a 1:2 level of background support (Figure 3.3). These estimates of staff to resident ratios are consistent with the high levels of physical and medical support needs identified in this group.

In addition to this background level of support, planners estimated that the people in the *Very High Care Needs* group required an average of 18.4 hours (range 0 – 86 hours) of additional 1:1 support per week. Planners also estimated that people in this group required an average of 6.1 hours (range 0-63) additional 2:1 (staff:resident) support per week. Such high staffing ratios would be expected for personal care, transfers and positioning tasks given the high physical support needs of this group.

Figure 3.3 - People requiring background support



Planners reported that 25 people in the *Very High Care Needs* group require nursing care on a regular basis. The mean number of nursing care hours for these 25 people was 29.9 hours per week (range 1 – 168 hours). With regard to overnight support requirements, planners estimated that 9 people of the *Very High Care Needs* group required two carers awake in order to provide care overnight, 15 people require one carer awake and available overnight, 5 people require a carer to sleep overnight and provide occasional assistance during some of these shifts, and 6 people require a carer to sleep overnight.

Additional supports required to ensure an appropriate model of care for this group include the services outlined in Table 3.10. Although not listed, behaviour management and support (e.g. neuropsychology) would be required for some people in this group, given the presence of high levels of challenging behaviour. However it is anticipated that when people from this group move to a more home-like and stimulating environment, with staff trained to manage their specific needs and able to provide more time, many of these behaviours will reduce.

Table 3.10 – Supports required in a community setting for the *Very High Care Needs* group (n=48)

Supports required in a community setting	n	%
Case Management	34	65%
Physiotherapy	33	63%
Occupational therapy	31	60%
Speech pathology	27	52%
Dietetics	28	54%
Continence advice	26	50%

VERY HIGH CARE: SUPPORT NEEDS SUMMARY

- Extremely high physical support needs requiring the assistance of one or two people for personal care, management of incontinence, transfers and positioning
- Extensive equipment needs
- Multiple and complex medical conditions (averaging 5 but up to as many as 8) requiring frequent medical specialist input, daily nursing and complex care plans. Medical conditions are potentially unstable and may be deteriorating, requiring continual adjustment of care plan
- Generally require 24-hour daily support, including support of one to two carers awake overnight
- Domestic and community activities including management of financial affairs, performed by others
- There tends to be a high level of family involvement on a daily basis and family members are integral in the person's life
- High levels of challenging behaviour (42 people) may be compounded by additional mental health issues requiring structured behaviour programs consistently implemented by trained workers
- People who wander require a safe setting
- Minimum of 1:1 support to access community activities
- Skill development programs designed by therapists, focussing on basic needs such as communication and mealtime assistance, to maximise function
- Sub groups who require specialist assessment and input include:
 - Minimally conscious state (9 people)
 - Physical aggression towards others (12 people)
 - Physically able and wandering (5 people)
- Some people will require formal or informal administration and guardianship for decision making

Support Needs of the High Care Needs Group

CHARACTERISTICS OF THE HIGH CARE NEEDS GROUP

- Support needs of the *High Care Needs* group are significant, but overall they are less complex to manage than the *Very High Care Needs* group and most do not require nursing care
- People in this group have a greater capacity to actively participate in daily activities, to communicate and to make choices
- 86% of people in this group display one or more challenging behaviours

Case Illustration: David

David is a 43-year-old man who had a severe acquired brain injury four years ago when he was assaulted while taking his dog for a walk.

When he moved into the RAC, six weeks post-injury, he had minimal awareness and required full care in bed, PEG feeding and 24-hour supervision and support. Over the past few years David has regained full awareness and made many functional gains. Though still requiring the use of a wheelchair, he is slowly increasing his independence and can now assist in personal care activities and is independent in his mobility. He no longer requires overnight assistance, except in the case of an emergency.

David is highly motivated to regain a range of skills but, in his current RAC setting, he faces significant barriers to achieving his goals, including lack of resources and staff attitudes. David has implemented actions such as not allowing staff in his room overnight, refusing assistance if he is “not ready”, taking his medication when he feels like it, eating and drinking when he wants to and leaving the facility when he chooses. David’s behaviour is viewed as “challenging” and he has numerous clashes with certain nursing staff when scolded for his actions. He feels he is “treated like a child” and states that he likes to be seen as an “adult capable of making his own decisions”. David wants to be given choice and have his decisions respected.



David is extremely unhappy with his living situation. He said he stopped making friends with the elderly residents after he went to three funerals in one week. To insulate himself from the distress of making friends and losing them, he now isolates himself from other residents.

David described himself as desperate to move to more appropriate accommodation. David's goal is to live in a community setting with people his own age, with adequate supports so he can continue to increase his independence and access within the community. David has indicated that he would prefer to live in the Northern region, an area familiar to him and close to his siblings, who are limited in their ability to visit him at the RAC due to their other commitments. The planner emphasised that it will be extremely important to include David in managing the transition from RAC and to support him to make decisions and set his goals for his future.

Characteristics of the High Care Needs group

There are thirty five people in the *High Care Needs* group. Twenty six people are fully aware and nine people are partially aware. The *High Care Needs* group consist of a mix of disability types including acquired brain injury (15 people), multiple sclerosis (5 people), cerebral palsy (4 people), Huntington's disease (3 people) and other neurological disabilities (3 people) (Table 3.11).

Table 3.11 – High Care Needs group distribution of disabilities (n=35)

Disability type	n	%
Acquired Brain Injury	15	43%
Multiple Sclerosis	5	14%
Cerebral Palsy	4	11%
Huntington's Disease	3	9%
Other neurological disability	3	9%
Intellectual Disability	2	6%
Paraplegia	2	6%
Motor Neurone Disease	1	3%
Spina Bifida	1	3%

This group are dependent on others for their personal care and mobility, but less so than the Very *High Care Needs* group. Twenty-one people in this group have altered muscle tone, spasticity or muscle spasm, one person in this group has an intrathecal Baclofen pump to manage spasticity and spasm and eight people have contractures. Fifteen people require assistance with bed mobility (e.g. turning) and 20 people require assistance with transfers and mobility (Table 3.12). Nine people require assistance to get around inside the place they live without help. Twenty people require assistance to get in and out of the place they live without help and twenty five people require assistance to get around in the community without help. Two people were prone to getting lost or wandering. For half of the *High Care Needs* group, correct positioning by staff is critical. The consequences of incorrect positioning include: pain (11 people), challenging behaviour (3 people), pressure areas (11 people) and choking (2 people) (Table 3.12).

Table 3.12 – Positioning and mobility support needs of the *High Care Needs* group (n=35)

Support Needs	n	%
Positioning		
Critical to position correctly	18	51%
Risks of incorrect positioning – pain	11	31%
Risk of incorrect positioning – challenging behaviour	3	9%
Risk of incorrect positioning – pressure sore	11	31%
Risk of incorrect positioning – choking	2	6%
Mobility		
Bed mobility (CANS A)	15	43%
Assistance with transfers/mobility (CANS A)	20	57%
Assistance required to get around inside	9	26%
Assistance required to get in and out of place where they live	20	57%

Nine people in this group experience swallowing difficulties however no one has a PEG feed (Table 3.13). Twelve people have issues with pressure areas or care and 14 people require mealtime assistance. Twenty-two people in the *High Care Needs* group experience urinary incontinence and all except three also experience faecal incontinence. Eleven people in the *High Care Needs* Group have difficulty in communicating their basic needs due to speech or language impairments. Thirty people in the *High Care Needs* Group displayed one or more challenging behaviours on the OBS.

Table 3.13 – Personal care and communication support needs of the *High Care Needs* group (n=35)

Support Needs	n	%
Urinary incontinence	22	63%
Faecal incontinence	17	49%
Mealtime assistance	14	40%
Regular urinary tract infections	10	29%
Difficulty swallowing	9	26%
Recurrent chest infections	3	9%
Insulin dependent diabetes	3	9%
Problems coughing or clearing secretions	1	3%
Difficulty in communicating needs due to language impairments (CANS A)	11	31%


This group are also high users of consumables. Sixteen people in this group use absorbent bed sheets, 18 people use pads or pull-ups and 5 people use topicals.

Many people in this group also require equipment for personal care, transfers or mobility. Four people require a shower trolley, 22 people require a shower chair and 15 people require a hoist. Twenty-two people use wheelchairs and 7 people require specialised seating. Seventeen people require a pressure care mattress or overlay and one person requires an environmental control unit.

Table 3.14 – Consumables and equipment required by the *High Care Needs* group (n=35)

Consumables and Equipment	n	%
Absorbent bed sheets	16	46%
Pads or Pull-ups	18	51%
Topicals	5	14%
Shower chairs	22	63%
Shower trolleys	4	11%
Hoists	15	43%
Wheelchairs	22	63%
Specialised seating	7	20%
Pressure care mattresses and overlays	17	49%
Environmental control units	1	3%

Thirteen people in the *High Care Needs* group were visited by a friend weekly or monthly, with only one person receiving a visit from a friend on most days. Almost half of the group (15 people) were never visited by a friend and only 8 people went out to visit friends. Frequency of visiting by relatives remained high with 7 people visited most days and a further 20 people weekly or monthly. Only one person in this group did not receive visits from relatives. Twenty six people in the *High Care Needs* Group seldom or never went to visit friends and 14 people seldom or never visited relatives.

Figure 3.4 - *High Care Needs* group original DHS location


High Care Needs Group Accommodation & Support Preferences

Nine people in the *High Care Needs* group would like to remain in the existing RAC but would like additional disability supports (see Chapter 4). Twenty four of the 35 people would like to explore the possibility of moving to an alternative accommodation and support option. Three people would like to return to a private or family residence and 19 specified a shared supported accommodation option. Information regarding accommodation and support preferences was not available for 3 people because their individual plans were not complete at the time of writing this report.

High Care Needs Group Level & Type of Support Required in a Community Setting

Twenty four people in the *High Care Needs* group indicated a preference to move and planners estimated that one person requires 24-hour on call support, 5 people require a 1:10 level of background support and 4 people require a 1:5 level of background support. Three people were estimated to require a 1:4 level of support and four people require a 1:3 level of background support. Two people were estimated to require a 1:2 level of background support (Figure 3.5).

Figure 3.5 - People requiring background support



In addition to this background level of support, planners estimated that individuals in the *High Care Needs* group require an average of 22.8 hours (range 0-65) of additional 1:1 support per week. Planners also estimated that people in this group require an average of 1.73 (range 0-21) hours per week additional 2:1 support. Planners reported thirteen people in the *High Care Needs* group require nursing care on a regular basis. The mean number of nursing care hours for these thirteen people was 14.1 (range 2-53) hours per week.

Planners reported that one person in the *High Care Needs* group required two carers awake in order to provide overnight care, 7 people required one carer awake overnight, 5 people required a carer to sleep overnight and provide occasional assistance during some of these shifts, and 4 people required a carer to sleep overnight. Three people in this group did not require any assistance or supervision overnight.

Additional supports required to ensure an appropriate model of care for this group include the services identified in Table 3.15. As with the *Very High Care Needs* group, case management and physiotherapy were the services most often required.

Table 3.15 – Additional supports required by the *High Care Needs* group in a community setting (n=24)

Supports required in a community setting	n	%
Physiotherapy	18	75%
Case Management	18	75%
Occupational therapy	15	63%
Dietetics	14	58%
Continence advice	11	46%
Speech pathology	10	42%

HIGH CARE: SUPPORT NEEDS SUMMARY

- 24-hour on-site support required, with most people able to be left alone for short periods of time with distant on-site supervision
- Overnight support generally required but carer able to sleep, providing only occasional assistance
- High cognitive-behavioural support needs (30 people displayed one or more challenging behaviours)
- Moderate to high physical support needs (20 people require assistance with transfers and mobility, 22 people require wheelchair use and 15 people require hoist transfers). Some 2:1 (staff to resident) support is required for manual handling
- Requires 1:1 hands-on or stand-by assistance for all personal care, domestic activities and community activities as a result of cognitive and physical impairments
- Twenty five people in this group require assistance to access the community. Community inclusion maximised through opportunities for shared support to participate in social, recreational and vocational activities and close proximity of accommodation to accessible transport and community services (e.g. shopping centre)
- People in this group have an average of 4 medical conditions that require monitoring and periodic input, with thirteen people requiring some weekly nursing input
- Given potential to develop skills and reduce support needs over time, many people in this group will benefit from periodic therapy input and opportunities to integrate skills into everyday routines. Support staff will also benefit from ongoing training and support to maximise skill development, safety during manual handling, and to develop and consistently implement positive behavioural routines
- People in the *High Care Needs* group will require a significant amount of day-to-day coordination by residential staff and overarching Case Management support to coordinate care and address life crises
- Some people may require advocacy or Administration and possibly Guardianship for decision making

Support Needs of the Moderate Care Needs Group

CHARACTERISTICS OF THE MODERATE CARE NEEDS GROUP

- People in *Moderate Care Needs* group have minimal physical support needs and few complex medical issues
- The moderate group were predominantly males with acquired brain injuries who were fully aware

Case Illustration: Samantha

Samantha, a 45-year-old woman, was driving her car when she had a bleed from an aneurysm, resulting in a severe brain injury. She said she remembered feeling unwell and pulled over to the side of the road. The next thing she knew, she woke up a month later in hospital. She underwent rehabilitation at the Royal Talbot Hospital and the ABI Slow to Recover Program funded community based therapy once she was discharged back home, six months later.

When Samantha went home she received 34 hours per week of funded attendant care to assist with personal care and domestic tasks. Other care was provided by her husband on a gratuitous basis, however Samantha's husband struggled to provide her with the amount of help she needed. He was also looking after the couple's three school-aged children and did not feel that Samantha was safe to leave alone in the family home for more than one hour at a time. As a result Samantha was admitted to RAC.

During 2006, Samantha lived, for a few weeks at a time, in several RAC facilities because permanent accommodation could not be found until November 2006. She currently lives in a low care RAC where she receives the assistance she requires. Samantha has a left hemiplegia so has only the use of her right arm and hand. She eats using a spoon and a deep sided bowl and staff cut up her food to enable her to eat by herself. She is able to move herself from her bed to her wheelchair and commode chair by herself



and is able to, with extra time, shower and dress herself and clean her own teeth. To get about inside the RAC she uses a manual wheelchair which she propels with her right hand and her feet. She has an electric scooter which she uses to get about outside the RAC to go the local shopping centre, five minutes away from where she lives. However, the physiotherapist is concerned that Samantha places herself at risk when crossing roads in her scooter because of impaired vision and impulsivity. Samantha's speech is slow and difficult to understand although she is quite happy to repeat what she has said to get her message across.

Samantha likes to be independent, preferring to do what she can for herself. Two of the nursing staff describe her as "stubborn" when it comes to insisting on doing things for herself however, they also describe her as always being polite, friendly and well mannered to staff.

Samantha does not like living in an aged care facility and generally eats her meals on her own in the private dining room rather than with other residents. Samantha usually does not mix with the elderly residents in the RAC facility and spends her time in her room or playing Solitaire on a computer in one of the lounge rooms at the facility.

Samantha and her husband are now separated and he no longer supports her apart from bringing her children to visit once a fortnight. Samantha wants to move into a home on her own in Croydon close to where her children and friends live. She said that before her brain injury she went to church every week but now only attends once a month when a friend takes her. She feels that, by living in Croydon, she could attend church more frequently and have more contact with her friends.

Characteristics of the Moderate Care Needs group

There were sixteen people in the *Moderate Care Needs* group. Fourteen people were fully aware and two people were partially aware. Two people of this group had difficulty communicating their basic needs due to language impairments. Ten people in the *Moderate Care Needs* group displayed one or more challenging behaviours on the OBS and one person in this group exhibited behaviours that had the potential to cause harm to themselves or others.

This group are less dependent on others for their personal care and mobility and are more integrated into the community. People in the *Moderate Care Needs* Group were more actively involved in the domestic and community activities of daily living. The *Moderate Care Needs* group consisted of a mix of disability types shown in Table 3.16 and four people had more than one disability type.