

Using Medication to Manage Behaviour Problems in Adults with a Learning Disability: A Multi-Centre Audit

Gemma Unwin
Research Associate
University of Birmingham

Overview

- Aims
- Methods
- Results
- Conclusions

Aims

- Current adherence to guideline audit criteria.
- Baseline data.
- Identify areas for improvement.

Methods

- Retrospective case note review.
- Data collection proforma.
- Detailed protocol.
- Multi-centre – 10 sites
 - East and West Midlands
 - Oxford
 - North East England.

Inclusion/ Exclusion Criteria

- Aged 18 or over when initially referred.
- Learning disability.
- Received medication to manage a behaviour problem.
- Referred to service within 3 years from date of proforma completion.
- Medication not prescribed for treatment of epilepsy, brain injury, substance addiction or major psychiatric illness (e.g. depression, schizophrenia or bipolar disorder).

Results

- 154 cases identified.
- 66% male.
- 81% outpatient.
- Mean age 34 years (range 18-69).

Results – Target Behaviour

- 73% cited aggression
 - 17% physical aggression
 - 10% verbal aggression
 - 19% physical and verbal aggression
 - 28% unspecified aggression.
- 18% cited self-injurious behaviour.

Results – Time Until Review

- 68% specified time until review
 - Median time 3 months (range 3 days – 1 year)
 - 4% specified review ‘as needed’
 - 11% discharged.
- Inpatients reviewed at shorter intervals.

Results – Audit Criteria

- 94% treatment plan communicated with other relevant professionals (including the GP)
 - cc clinic letter.
- 94% assessed behaviour.
- 92% assessed behavioural, medical, psychiatric/psychological and social issues.
- 92% defined the target behaviour.
- 91% set up date for review at time of last appointment.

Results - Audit Criteria 2

- 82% considered non-medication based intervention
 - 72% implemented non-medication based intervention
 - 4% non-medication based intervention not appropriate.
- 80% passed relevant information to the key person.
- 70% documented a differential diagnosis.
- 64% described the rationale for treatment.

Results - Audit Criteria 3

- 44% completed a risk assessment.
- 43% described use of objective outcome measure.
- 34% documented assessment of capacity issues.
- 30% provided a written treatment plan to service user and/ or carer.

Results - Audit Criteria 4

- 26% secured and documented consent/ assent to treatment.
- 5% referred to Best Interests Principle where lacked capacity to consent.
- 5% provided written information on adverse effect to service user and/ or carer.

Conclusions

- Adherence varied.
- Consent and capacity issues still poorly discussed and documented.
- Provision of written information to service user and/ or carer infrequent.
- Recording deficit.