CAMHS Learning Disability/The Family Intensive Support Service: Outcomes and Practice

Rosemary Singh – Consultant Clinical Psychologist
Corinne Davies – Specialist Speech and Language Therapist
The Team
CAMHS LD/ FISS is a multi-disciplinary team working with children with moderate to severe learning disabilities and emotional, behavioural and communication difficulties and their families. comprising:

- team leader
- clinical psychologists
- child and adolescent psychiatrist
- assistant psychologist
- speech and language therapists
- mental health nurse
- family support workers
- administration staff
**Aims**

• To work in partnership with families to provide high quality assessment and intervention and promote needs of learning disabled children.

• To support children to live valued lives & participate in community activities wherever possible.

• Focussing on the prevention of difficulties by supporting and enhancing parents’ confidence to handle current problems, and enabling them to anticipate future problems that may arise.
What does this mean in practice?

• Provide emotional support/relationship work with families & others
• Work with siblings
• Undertake detailed functional analysis of behaviour & communication
• Develop specific communication resources
• Individual therapeutic work with children
• Parents groups:
  o Positive Behaviour Support Course
  o All About Me group – focussed on resilience
• Facilitate multi-agency meetings and parent consultation sessions
• Provision of consultation, support and training to staff and parents across settings
• Contribute to CAMHS policy and strategy
Highlights from service outcome data

Hypothesis

• Is there a reduction in problem behaviours presented by children?

• Does parent perception of problem behaviours change following intervention?

• Is there an association between standardised measures of change and parents’ perceptions of behaviour change?

• Does the therapeutic alliance predict scores on outcome measures?
Method

An experimental pre-post design was used

- Measures
- DBC-P
- SDQ
- Behaviour Grids (BG)
- Time 1 = initial consultation
- Time 2 = One year review
Service Constructed Behaviour Grids

Designed to let parents specify and prioritise up to 3 behaviours of concern in relation to:

- Severity of the behaviour
- Frequency of the behaviour
- Distress caused by the behaviour
- Confidence in managing the behaviour
- Coping
Results

Was there a reduction in problem behaviours presented by the children?

Paired samples T Test (N=38)

**DBC-P**
Significant change between Time 1 and Time 2 on overall score (p<0.05)
Only 32% showed a clinically significant change (-17)
No significant change found on sub scales

**SDQ**
No significant change between Time 1 and Time 2 on overall score
Significant change on:
- Behavioural difficulties sub-scale (p<0.01)
- Impact Supplement (p<0.01)
- Hyperactivity/attention difficulties (p<0.05)
- Difficulties getting along with other children (p<0.05)
Comments

DBC-P

Sub scales not sensitive with this sample size
One year may not be long enough to find behaviour change in this population
Long measure 96 items
Good for identifying caseness

SDQ

More sensitive than expected!
Total score not sensitive enough
Sub scales more sensitive to change
Short
Limitations
Some of the questions not liked by parents/clinicians
Results

Does parent perception of behaviour problems change following interventions?

Paired samples T Test

Significant difference between Time 1 and Time 2 on all aspects of the behaviour grid

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aspect</th>
<th>p-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>p&lt;0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distress</td>
<td>p&lt;0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confidence</td>
<td>p&lt;0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coping</td>
<td>p&lt;0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Severity</td>
<td>p&lt;0.001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Results

Is there an association between standardised measures of change and parents perceptions of behaviour change?

Pearson’s correlation test

Overall difference between Time 1 and Time 2 for BG, SDQ and DBC-P

• Significant relationship between BG and DBC-P < 0.05
• No significant difference between SDQ (total score) and BG
Results

Does the therapeutic alliance predict scores on outcome measures?

Linear regression analysis

Alliance measure did not significantly predict scores on SDQ, DBC-P or BG
Alliance measure adapted from Session Rating Scale
Duncan, 2003

CYP-IAPT Tool - 6 item Visual analogue scale

Mean Alliance Score (Maximum 10):
I feel respected mean score 9.10
I feel understood mean score 8.98
I feel supported mean score 8.95
I feel I have a choice in what we work on mean score 8.98
The work is based on sharing knowledge mean score 9.06
The work feels right to me mean score 8.97
Limitations/Further Research

Missing data:

• Time gaps in data collections
• Reliance on parental report - need either clinician or teacher ratings
• Lack of comparison data
• Need longer term outcome data - are treatment gains maintained?
• Problems with both DBC-P and SDQ
• Need new LD tool to examine behaviour change