Key findings

- Building based day service models are being redesigned to offer more flexible and personalised opportunities for support in the community, facilitated through self-directed support. These alternative opportunities are considered to enable greater choice, independence and participation in community life. Evaluated alternative models to day services identified in the literature include peer advocacy groups, supported employment and partnership based initiatives.

- A valued aspect of day services according to user and carer perspectives is how they provide a safe and familiar place to spend time with peers and form friendships. At the same time, users report wanting greater choice of activities and the opportunity for paid employment.

- People with mild to moderate learning disabilities are considered to occupy an 'in-between space' – meaning that they can be too able to receive formal day support but at the same unable to participate in community life. Work by the voluntary organisation Mencap suggests that people in this group are spending more time at home without meaningful opportunities for social interaction as access to formal support has declined.

- The evidence is relatively limited to support the effectiveness of alternative models of support compared with traditional day services. There was wide ranging examples described in the literature of how people had moved from daily single service use to participating in a choice of activities in the community.

- Self-advocacy groups have been also studied in the context of declining formal day services and reported to provide key opportunities for social interaction and informal learning in way that is more integrative than traditional day services.

- Evidence from small scale observational studies finds that being in supported employment is associated with higher quality of life and community integration than compared with attending day services. Personalised approaches as part of employment support such as vocational profiling, peer mentoring and ongoing support were reported as having higher levels of satisfaction and employment outcomes.

Purpose

This is a summary of the literature that focuses on day support services and their alternatives models for adults with a mild to moderate learning disability. The following questions informed the identification and selection of relevant literature:

- What are the different models of day support services and their outcomes for people with a mild to moderate learning disability?
- How do user and carer perspectives inform models of support and their outcomes?

Definitions

Day services for people with mild to moderate learning disability vary in their function, structure and setting (centre/community based). Building or centred based services are increasingly being redesigned to offer alternative opportunities in the community that are more flexible, personalised and provide fuller opportunity to participate in community life. These alternative opportunities can include sport and leisure, further education and support with gaining employment.

Methodology

A systematic search of the literature was carried out during August and September 2020 including key databases and websites (Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews, Medline). The search was limited to the English language publications from the last 10 years. A full list of resources searched and terms used are available on request.

There were 29 publications identified (a further two are included from 2007 as these are the most recent from the Foundation for People with Learning Disabilities). These results were sifted for relevance. A list of publications ranked according to relevance is provided in appendix 1. In total, there were 11 publications directly relevant to the review questions which are included in the summary.

What we found

Background to changes in learning disability day services

The modernisation of services for people with a learning disability has focused on reducing or replacing building-based day centres with more flexible and personalised support that provides greater opportunity for participation in community life. A review of published data for Scotland[1] shows a decrease in building-based day centre use both in the number of people using build-based services, as well as the amount of time spent being supported in these services by any person.

A small scale study of user and carer's views of day service provision in Fife as part of a service review[2], suggests that existing day services are valued because of how they provide a safe place to go for social interaction. For a group of older adults in Scotland participating in a study on the importance of activity in ageing and retirement for people with learning disabilities[3], day centres were also viewed as being important.

In a review of the evidence in 2007[4], research that includes perspectives of people that have participate in employment and further education supports views of day services being less positive. The review discusses how it can be important to have 'safe spaces' and established networks alongside the opportunity to participate in wider activities that would not usually be part of day service support.

Work by the voluntary organisation Mencap to capture the impact of changes in day services highlights concerns about negative outcomes for people in the context of declining access to day services and without access to suitable alternative support. The results of a small scale research study conducted by Mencap[5] suggests people are reporting spending less time receiving any formal support and more time at home.

Inclusion of people with a learning disability in how day services are redesigned and evaluated is highlighted by Mencap as being necessary for ensuring that the fuller impact of changes are understood. This is discussed as being important for people with mild to moderate learning disability since they are considered to occupy an 'in-between space' – considered too able to receive formal support but at the same time unable to participate more fully in community life without support.

Alternative day support models and their outcomes

Alternative community-based support can include wide array of settings, providers and activities. A theme identified in a study of service provision in 2007[4] identified that people were connecting with and doing things alongside people for reasons other than having a learning disability and that there was wide ranging examples of how people had moved from daily single service patterns of use that was varied across a variety of activities. The following main categories have been identified from the included literature.

Self-advocacy or peer support groups
Self-advocacy groups are an example of group based participation as an alternative to attending a day service (sometimes referred to as peer advocacy). It involves people in a similar situation, joining together to support and advocate for each other through local groups. The groups take place in existing community facilities. A co-produced research study[6] examined experiences of peer advocacy groups within the context of declining support from formal day services and found that these can provide vital opportunities for social interaction and informal learning in the local community.

Employment support
A key policy objective for improving outcomes for people with a learning disability in Scotland (Scottish Executive, 2001) and the rest of the UK relates to support with obtaining paid employment. There are a range of employment services described as being accessed by

people with mild to moderate learning disabilities but employment support is considered to be the most successful model.

A small observational study[7] reports that people with a learning disability in supported employment score higher on objective quality of life than similar adults attending day services and employment enterprises. The quality of employment opportunities and support provided in the workplace are discussed as ways of closing the gap with respect to non-learning disabled people. A further study found[8] that participants involved in community-integrated employment indicated a greater sense of integration, and reported more financial autonomy than did those who participated in adult day care programs and sheltered workshops.

A scoping review conducted by the National Development Team for Inclusion (NDTi)[9] maps the different models of employment support for people with learning disabilities in the UK and further afield and the economic evidence from a commissioning perspective. A subsequent study of the cost-effectiveness of employment support was conducted to build on this scoping review[10].

The scoping review defines paid employment as being a desirable outcome for people with learning disabilities. The ideal paid employment according this definition is "a retainable, paid role within an open, competitive employment market (which includes the option of self-employment), which provides a significant number of hours of employment (often defined as 16 hours per week or more)"[10p8]. They also included activities not within this definition including those described as sheltered employment, volunteering related to employment and day services with employment related activities as they are viewed by some providers and commissioners as a key part of transitioning to paid employment.

The review identified relatively little cost effectiveness analysis in the published literature. What models had been studied varied in their cost and outcomes. The capacity of local authority and NHS commissioners to implement an effective model was considered an important factor in this variability. The review also considered qualitative evidence that supports five system conditions for achieving cost-effective outcomes from employment support models. These are:

- Shifting the culture and prioritising employment,
- Defining what is meant by employment,
- Agreeing a strategic plan to deliver employment for people with disabilities,
- Using knowledge of best practice to develop the market, and
- Establishing systems for measuring performance.

A subsequent cost-effectiveness study which analysed information from local authorities found data about cost was very limited and that investment in different forms of employment support weren't differentiated to be able to make any comparison of their cost. The following

findings from their analysis were discussed as providing a useful starting points for commissioners:

- there is no evidence of individual budgets being used to achieve employment according to this review but an interest in identifying good practice for enabling this,

- personalized approaches being used locally including vocational profiling, peer mentoring and ongoing support were reported as having higher levels of satisfaction and employment outcomes,

- there was no obvious relationship between either scale or support levels and cost of services, and

- evidence based models of employment support indicates a cost per job outcome of £1,600 - £4,000, a reasonable job outcome rate of 30%-50% and an equal focus on job retention and new jobs.

Partnership based

Innovations in day service delivery based on partnership are briefly described as part of a review of different models that was conducted earlier in day service modernisation[4]. A recent evaluated example of a successful partnership approach identified in in the literature is the The Time to Connect project. Based on partnership between a number of different organisations including Timebanking UK the initiative supports people with learning disabilities resident in traditional care settings to increase their participation and contribution to community life.

The findings of an evaluation of the project[11] describes the impact for those that participated across six localities in England and identifies 'what works' in the delivery based on a realist evaluation approach. The report captures a number of stories and case studies of how support through the initiative from specialists such as activity coordinators has made a difference. Positive outcomes reported include having more choice over activities and where these take place, having more social connection and reduced isolation, and improved wellbeing and confidence. Care and support staff reported having more positive attitudes about what is possible for people to achieve.

References

1. Hatton C. Day services and home care for adults with learning disabilities across the UK. Tizard Learning Disability Review. 2017;22(2):109-115.

2. Campbell M. Changing day services: do you agree? Journal of intellectual disabilities: JOID. 2012;16(3):205-15.

3. Cole A, Williams V, Lloyd A, Major V, Mattingly M, McIntosh B, Swift P and Townsley R. Having a good day? A study of community-based day activities for people with learning disabilities. 2007 [cited 2020 Sep 03]; Available from: https://www.scie.org.uk/publications/knowledgereviews/kr14.pdf

4. Judge J, Walley R, Anderson B and Young R. Activity, aging, and retirement: The views of a group of Scottish people with intellectual disabilities. Journal of Policy and Practice in Intellectual Disabilities. 2010;7(4):295-301.

5. Mencap. Stuck at home: the impact of day service cuts on people with a learning disability no date [cited 2020 Sep 03]; Available from: https://www.mencap.org.uk/sites/default/files/2016-08/Stuck_at_home.pdf

6. Power A, Bartlett R and Hall E. Peer advocacy in a personalized landscape: The role of peer support in a context of individualized support and austerity. Journal of intellectual disabilities: JOID. 2016;20(2):183-93.

7. Beyer S, Brown T, Akandi R and Rapley M. A Comparison of Quality of Life Outcomes for People with Intellectual Disabilities in Supported Employment, Day Services and Employment Enterprises. Journal of Applied Research in Intellectual Disabilities. 2010;23(3):290-295.

8. Blick RN, Litz KS, Thornhill MG and Goreczny AJ. Do inclusive work environments matter? Effects of community-integrated employment on quality of life for individuals with intellectual disabilities. Research in developmental disabilities. 2016;53-54(358-66.

9. National Development Team for Inclusion. A Scoping Review of Economic Evidence around Employment Support. 2016 [cited 2020 Sep 03]; Available from: https://www.ndti.org.uk/uploads/files/Scoping_Review_of_Economic_Evidence_Around_Employment_Support.pdf

10. Greig R, Chapman P, Eley A, Watts R, Love B and Bourlet G. The Cost Effectiveness of Employment Support for People with Disabilities: Final Detailed Research Report. 2014 [cited 2020 Sep 03]; Available from: https://www.ndti.org.uk/uploads/files/The_cost_effectiveness_of_Employment_Support_for_People_with_Disabilities%2C_NDTi%2C_March_2014_final_v2.pdf

11. Carrier J and Clifford C. Time to Connect: Final Evaluation. 2020 [cited 2020 Sep 03]; Available from: https://www.ndti.org.uk/uploads/files/TTC_Final_Evaluation_Report,_9th_April_2020.pdf

Appendix 1

Literature summary table

Author(s)	Year	Title	Topic	Publication type	Priority
Hatton C.	2017	Day services and home care for adults with learning disabilities across the UK.	Day services	Journal article	1
Campbell M.	2012	Campbell M. Changing day services: do you agree?	Day services	Journal article	1
Mencap	No date	Stuck at home: the impact of day service cuts on people with a learning disability. Available from: https://www.mencap.org.uk/sites/default/files/2016-08/Stuck_at_home.pdf	Day services	Online article	1
Power A, Bartlett R and Hall E.	2016	Peer advocacy in a personalized landscape: The role of peer support in a context of individualized support and austerity.	Peer advocacy	Journal article	1
National Development Team for Inclusion	2016	A Scoping Review of Economic Evidence around Employment Support.	Employment support	Online report	1
Greig R, Chapman P, Eley A, Watts R, Love B and Bourlet G.	2014	The Cost Effectiveness of Employment Support for People with Disabilities: Final Detailed Research Report.	Employment support	Online report	1
Blick RN, Litz KS, Thornhill	2016	Do inclusive work environments matter? Effects of community-integrated employment on	Employment support	Journal article	1

MG and Goreczny AJ.		quality of life for individuals with intellectual disabilities.			
Beyer S, Brown T, Akandi R and Rapley M.	2010	A Comparison of Quality of Life Outcomes for People with Intellectual Disabilities in Supported Employment, Day Services and Employment Enterprises.	Employment support	Journal article	1
Carrier J and Clifford C.	2020	Time to Connect: Final Evaluation. Available from: https://www.ndti.org.uk/uploads/files/TTC_Final_Evaluation_Report,_9th_April_2020.pdf	Community-based activities	Realist evaluation report	1
Judge J, Walley R, Anderson B and Young R.	2010	Activity, aging, and retirement: The views of a group of Scottish people with intellectual disabilities.	Older adults	Journal article	1
Cole A, Lloyd A, McIntosh B, Mattingley M, Swift P, Townsley R and Williams V.	2007	Having a good day? A study of community-based day activities for people with learning disabilities. 2007 [cited 2020 Sep 03]; Available from: https://www.scie.org.uk/publications/knowledgereviews/kr14.pdf	Community-based activities	Online review	1
Anderson KA, Park JH, Monteleone RG and	2014	Heterogeneity within adult day services: a focus on centers that serve younger adults with intellectual and developmental disabilities.	Day Services	Journal article	2

Dabelko-Schoeny HI.					
Engeland J, Strand BH, Innstrand ST and Langballe EM.	2020	Employment and attendance in day care centres for people with mild intellectual disabilities - do age, gender, functional level or hospital admissions matter?	Day Services	Journal article	2
Cole A, Lloyd A, McIntosh B, Mattingley M, Swift P, Townsley R and Williams V.	2007	Community-based day activities and supports for people with learning disabilities: How we can help people to 'have a good day'. Available from: https://www.scie.org.uk/publications/guides/guide16/files/guide16.pdf	Community-based activities	Online guide	2
Graham H.	2010	How the tea is made; or, the scoping and scaling of 'everyday life' in changing services for 'people with learning disabilities'.	Experiences of day services	Journal article	2
Health Foundation	2017	Health Foundation. Using technology and an evidence-based, outcome-led approach to reduce health inequalities for people with learning disabilities: final report. 2017 [cited 2020 Sep 03]; Available from: https://www.health.org.uk/sites/default/files/8.%20Hft_tech%20for%20reduction%20of%20health%20inequalities.pdf	Health inequalities	Online research report	2

Howie EK, Barnes TL, McDermott S, Mann JR, Clarkson J and Meriwether RA.	2012	Availability of physical activity resources in the environment for adults with intellectual disabilities.	Physical activity	Journal article	2
Hussein S and Manthorpe J.	2010	The adult day care workforce in England at a time of policy change: implications for learning disability support services. Journal of Intellectual Disabilities. 2010;14(2):95-110.	Day care workforce	Journal article	2
Mahoney-Davies G, Dixon C, Tynan H and Mann S	2017	An evaluation of the effectiveness of a 'Five Ways to Well-being' group run with people with learning disabilities. British Journal of Learning Disabilities. 2017;45(1):56-63.	Well-being	Journal article	2
Lindahl J, Stollon N, Wu K, Liang A, Changolkar S, Steinway C, Trachtenberg S, Coccia A, Devaney M and Jan S.	2019	Domains of planning for future long-term care of adults with intellectual and developmental disabilities: Parent and sibling perspectives. Journal of applied research in intellectual disabilities.	Care planning	Journal article	2
Keesler JM.	2016	Trauma-informed Day Services for Individuals with Intellectual/Developmental	Day services trauma informed	Journal article	2

		Disabilities: Exploring Staff Understanding and Perception within an Innovative Programme. Journal of applied research in intellectual disabilities.			
All-Party Parliamentary Group on Adult Social Care.	No date	The Future of Adult Social Care. no date [cited 2020 Sep 03]; Available from: https://static1.squarespace.com/static/5cab2514d24e55000163e258/t/5d1dc1d499ed3b0001333bd8/1562231263477/FINAL+APPG+ASC+Report+July+2019+web.pdf	Adult social care	Report	3
Cartwright L, Reid M, Hammersley R, Blackburn C and Glover L.	2015	Food choice by people with intellectual disabilities at day centres: A qualitative study.	Day services quality	Journal article	3
Fleming P, McGilloway S and Barry S.	2017	Day service provision for people with intellectual disabilities: A case study mapping 15-year trends in Ireland.	Day service mapping	Journal articles	3
Johnson H, Douglas J, Bigby C and Iacono T.	2012	A model of processes that underpin positive relationships for adults with severe intellectual disability. Journal of Intellectual & Developmental Disability. 2012;37(4):324-336.	Relationship models	Journal article	3

Samuel M.	2011	Good practice in residential care for people with learning disabilities [online]. Available from: https://www.communitycare.co.uk/2011/06/17/good-practice-in-residential-care-for-people-with-learning-disabilities/	Residential care	Online article	3
Meuris K, Maes B and Zink I.	2014	Key Word Signing Usage in Residential and Day Care Programs for Adults With Intellectual Disability. Journal of Policy and Practice in Intellectual Disabilities.	Residential and day care	Journal article	3