



“Why can’t they be in the community?” A policy and practice analysis of transforming care for offenders with intellectual disability

Journal:	<i>Advances in Mental Health and Intellectual Disabilities</i>
Manuscript ID:	AMHID-02-2015-0011.R1
Manuscript Type:	Policy Paper
Keywords:	Inpatient, Psychiatric, Forensic, Learning Disability, Intellectual Disability, Secure

SCHOLARONE™
Manuscripts

Review

1
2
3 **“Why can’t they be in the community?” A policy and practice analysis of transforming**
4 **care for offenders with intellectual disability**
5
6

7 **Abstract**
8

9 **Purpose:** This paper describes key policy and practice issues regarding a significant
10 subgroup of people with intellectual disability - those with offending behaviour being treated
11 in forensic hospitals.
12

13 **Approach:** The reasons why psychiatrists continue to be involved in the treatment of people
14 with intellectual disability and mental health or behavioural problems and the factors that
15 may lead to patients needing hospital admission are examined. Using two illustrative
16 examples, three key questions- containment versus treatment, hospital care versus
17 conditional discharge and hospital treatment versus using Deprivation of Liberty safeguards
18 (DOLS) usage in the community are explored.
19

20 **Findings:** Patients with intellectual disability, mental health problems and offending
21 behaviours who are treated within forensic inpatient units tend to have long lengths of stay.
22 The key variable that mediates this length of stay is the risk that they pose to themselves or
23 others. Clinicians work within the framework of mental health law and have to be mindful that
24 pragmatic solutions to hasten discharge into the community may not fall within the law.
25

26 **Originality/value:** The article makes practical suggestions for the future on how to best
27 integrate hospital and community care for people with intellectual disability, mental health
28 and offending behaviours.
29

30
31 **Keywords:**

32 Inpatient
33

34 Psychiatric
35

36 Forensic
37

38 Secure
39

40 Learning Disability
41

42 Mental Health
43
44
45
46
47
48

49 **Article Classification:**

50 Policy paper, Viewpoint
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 **“Why can’t they be in the community?” A policy and practice analysis of**
4 **transforming care for offenders with intellectual disability**
5
6

7 **Introduction**
8

9 Following the broadcast of BBC’s Panorama programme ‘Undercover care: the abuse
10 exposed’ in May 2011 (BBC, 2011), specialist intellectual disability hospitals came under
11 scrutiny. Describing such treatment as an outdated model of institutional care, the
12 government published The Concordat to work with other stakeholders and meet 63
13 Transforming Care commitments, with one central commitment of moving into the
14 community, anyone with an intellectual disability and challenging behaviour that does not
15 need to be in a hospital setting (Department of Health 2012a; 2012b). The dramatic
16 reduction in hospital placements that was expected did not happen (Health and Social Care
17 Information Centre, 2013). It is now acknowledged that the complexity and scale of the
18 challenge was underestimated and the scope and quality of data on inpatients with
19 intellectual disability was poor (National Audit Office, 2015).
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32

33 This paper focuses on the policy and practice issues regarding a significant subgroup of
34 people with intellectual disability - those with offending behaviour being treated in forensic
35 hospitals. Some of the issues discussed however, may be equally applicable to patients
36 treated in other bed categories.
37
38
39
40
41
42
43

44 **Intellectual disability, Psychiatrists and Psychiatric Hospitals**
45

46 The community care movement led to the closure of the long-stay institutions that used to
47 accommodate large numbers of people with intellectual disability (Kingdon, 2005).
48 Deinstitutionalisation involved moving people out of large Victorian campuses into
49 community settings, such as nursing homes, group residential homes, supported living
50 accommodations, family homes or independent living (Bhaumik, Tyrer, & Gangadharan,
51 2011). Currently in England, the vast majority of people with intellectual disability live fairly
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 independent lives in the community. Of the 900,000 adults with the condition, 191,000 (21%)
4 have any contact with specialist intellectual disability services (Emerson et al., 2012) and
5 3,035 (0.3%) receive treatment in psychiatric inpatient settings, including specialist
6 intellectual disability hospitals (Health and Social Care Information Centre, 2013; Devapriam
7 et al., 2015).
8
9
10
11
12

13
14
15 There is an argument, sometimes explicit but often implicit, that since intellectual disability is
16 not a mental illness, psychiatrists and psychiatric hospitals should have no role in the care of
17 these patients. It is this argument that leads to the position that admitting someone with
18 intellectual disability to a psychiatric hospital is a throwback to institutionalisation. This
19 position is wrong and will ultimately lead to people with intellectual disability and mental
20 health or severe behavioural problems being denied the equity of treatment outcomes that
21 they deserve (Devapriam et al., 2015). This issue is addressed in some detail in the Royal
22 College of Psychiatrists' Faculty of Psychiatry of Intellectual Disability report (2013) on
23 inpatient care for people with intellectual disability and mental health, behavioural or forensic
24 problems. While being wholly supportive of the aim of avoiding *inappropriate* hospital stays,
25 the report emphasised that it was a fundamental mistake to label all inpatient services as
26 "*assessment and treatment units for challenging behaviour*", and outlined the most common
27 reasons for admission and treatment within inpatient services.
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42

43
44 Firstly, people with intellectual disability have significantly higher rates of comorbid mental
45 health problems than the general population and this increases their vulnerability to mental
46 health crises. The majority of those who come into contact with specialist intellectual
47 disability inpatient services have complex comorbidities including mental illnesses,
48 personality disorders, substance misuse, physical disorders and behavioural problems
49 (Xentidis et al., 2004; Alexander et al., 2011). This belies the simple dichotomy of "is it
50 intellectual disability" or "is it mental health". It is often both and more. Hence the description
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 of people being in hospital only because of “intellectual disability and challenging behaviour”
4
5 (Department of Health, 2012b) may well be a gross over simplification.
6
7

8
9 Secondly, under the current Mental Health Act in England and Wales, mental illnesses are
10
11 not the only mental disorders that warrant treatment in hospital. Other conditions like
12
13 personality disorders, disorders of sexual preference or disorders of development can also
14
15 be mental disorders. The Act specifically sees “intellectual disability associated with
16
17 abnormally aggressive and seriously responsible behaviour” as a mental disorder. This
18
19 means that people with intellectual disability can satisfy the statutory criteria for detention to
20
21 be admitted and treated in hospital in the absence of any mental illness, a point reinforced
22
23 by recent case law (Regina v Alan Fletcher, 2012).
24
25

26
27 Thirdly, challenging behaviour is a socially constructed, descriptive concept that has no
28
29 diagnostic significance and which makes no inferences about aetiology. It may be unrelated
30
31 to psychiatric disorder, but can also be a primary or secondary manifestation of it (Xeniditis
32
33 *et al.*, 2001). It would be wrong to consider it as some sort of unitary entity. For people with
34
35 intellectual disability who come into contact with health services, it can range from
36
37 stereotypies, pica, faecal smearing or mild self-injury at one end to serious sexual assaults
38
39 or unlawful killing at the other. The dividing line between challenging behaviour and
40
41 offending behaviour is often blurred, but more serious examples of the latter would be seen
42
43 by most professionals, not to speak of members of the public, as requiring treatment within a
44
45 safe hospital setting.
46
47

48
49 Fourthly, intellectual disability covers a wide range- from those with mild degrees of disability
50
51 whose adaptive functioning would only be slightly lower than the general population, to those
52
53 with severe and profound disabilities who need help from others in most aspects of adaptive
54
55 function. The public face of intellectual disability tends to be the latter, while the majority of
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 people who end up in psychiatric inpatient and forensic hospital settings tend to be in the
4 former category. This has not been sufficiently explained in the media or elsewhere.
5
6
7

8
9 Finally, all inpatient beds are not the same. Royal College of Psychiatrists' Faculty of
10 Psychiatry of Intellectual Disability (2013) proposed a classification of six different bed
11 categories that serve entirely different functions. This classification has now been adopted in
12 the National Intellectual disability Census (Health and Social Care Information Centre, 2015).
13 Category 1 is made up of beds within forensic hospitals in conditions of either high, medium
14 or low security. Categories 2 and 3 are acute admission beds, located within specialist
15 intellectual disability units or generic mental health settings. Category 4 are forensic
16 rehabilitation beds for people who continue to have enduring risk issues, but have stepped
17 down from a Category 1 bed. Category 5 is for those with a similar profile, who have stepped
18 down from a Category 2 or 3 bed. Category 6 is for the short term assessment of some
19 neuropsychiatric conditions such as epilepsy and movement disorders. It is worth noting that
20 these bed categories are not unique to those with intellectual disability and similar bed
21 provision exists in other areas of mental health (NHS Confederation, 2012). These bed
22 categories are best understood within the context of a tiered care model of service provision
23 with Tiers One (liaison working with other agencies) to Three (intensive case management in
24 the community) constituting community intellectual disability services, and Tier Four
25 constituting an inpatient element of care (Royal College of Psychiatrists' Faculty of
26 Psychiatry of Intellectual Disability, 2011).
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45

46 **Why do patients come into contact with forensic services?**

47
48 Admissions to forensic inpatient beds (Category 1 or 4) happen after incidents of offending
49 behaviour or in the words of the Mental Health Act, abnormally aggressive or seriously
50 irresponsible behaviour. The majority are admitted under Part 3 of the Mental Health Act,
51 which means they are subject to a court order with or without restrictions from the Ministry of
52 Justice. However, not all patients in these forensic beds take this route, and this can be
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 either due to the police, the crown prosecution service or other criminal justice agencies not
4 taking the case through the courts, or dropping proceedings once they see that the person
5 they are pursuing is already in hospital even if that is under Part 2 (“civil” sections).
6
7 Furthermore, carers of those with intellectual disability can be less likely to involve the police
8 when an offence is committed (Lyll et al., 1995; Clare & Murphy, 1998). These situations
9 usually result in an “upwards referral” where patients are referred to services of increasing
10 security, without going through the criminal justice system. Of the 3,230 patients included in
11 the 2014 Learning Disability Census, 2,585 patients (80%) were subject to the Mental Health
12 Act (MHA) of which 1,460 patients (45%) were detained under Part II, 425 patients (13%)
13 were detained under Part III without a restriction order, and 635 patients (20%) were
14 detained under Part III and subject to Ministry of Justice restriction order (Health and Social
15 Care Information Centre, 2015).
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

29 Almost all patients admitted to forensic beds (Category 1 or 4) have been treated in
30 community settings beforehand. The factors that mediate their admission to or contact with
31 forensic services have been examined (Devapriam, & Alexander, 2012) and are summarised
32 below:
33
34
35
36

- 37 1. For some people, psychiatric co-morbidity and behavioural problems remain
38 persistent in spite of adequate treatment. The assumption that all behaviours were a
39 consequence of institutional lifestyles, which would diminish once community care
40 was introduced, may be flawed (Holland et al., 2002).
41
42
43
44
- 45 2. Behaviours that were previously hidden or indeed tolerated within institutions become
46 more visible in the community and lead to adverse consequences (Moss et al.,
47 2002).
48
49
50
51
- 52 3. There is an increased societal aversion to any degree of risk that makes the first two
53 drivers more potent (Carroll, Lyall, & Forrester, 2004; Denney, 2009).
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
- 2
- 3 4. The assumption that these problems could be adequately catered for within generic
- 4 mental health services is impeded by a lack of specialist skills in the diagnosis and
- 5 treatment of mental disorders in people with intellectual disabilities (Cumella, 2010).
- 6
- 7
- 8
- 9 5. Staff working within Community Intellectual Disability Teams (CIDTs) may not have
- 10 the specialist skills to deal with the assessment and management of offending
- 11 behaviour and forensic issues (Devapriam, & Alexander, 2012).
- 12
- 13
- 14
- 15 6. Community intellectual disability services are limited still further both by a shortage of
- 16 beds for short-term admissions and difficulties in moving people through these beds
- 17 into appropriate long-term accommodation (Jaydeokar, & Piachaud, 2004).
- 18
- 19
- 20
- 21 7. Inpatient intellectual disability forensic services provide an environment that
- 22 emphasises care and treatment rather than punishment (Hollins, 2000) and should
- 23 really only be for a small number of patients who present risks above threshold for
- 24 safe management in the community. However some of the above drivers can
- 25 sometimes result in an inappropriate “forensicisation” of challenging behaviour
- 26 (Douds, & Bantwal, 2011).
- 27
- 28
- 29
- 30
- 31
- 32
- 33
- 34
- 35

36 By giving two illustrative examples, we highlight the complex interface between clinical and
37 legal issues that exists for patients placed in Category 1 or 4 forensic beds. These examples
38 are not of real patients, but are representative of the sort of the clinical presentations that
39 one sees in this area. The legal framework referred to in these examples is the Mental
40 Health Act 1983 (amended 2007) for England and Wales.
41
42
43
44

45 46 **Case Example 1:**

47
48 Mr A is 43 years old, with mild intellectual disability and “challenging behaviour” including
49 physical and sexual aggression that started from late childhood and early adolescence. His
50 victims included children of both genders as well as people with intellectual disability less
51 able than him. After many incidents that did not result in prosecution, he was convicted at
52 the age of 30, of a serious sexual offence against a child. He received a Section 37/41 order
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 and spent four years in a high secure and three years in a medium secure hospital (i.e.,
4 Category 1 beds). While in secure care, the treatment plan followed the principles of the 10
5 point treatment plan described by Alexander et al. (2011) and included:
6
7
8

- 9
10 1. A multi-axial diagnostic assessment that covered the degree of intellectual disability,
11 cause of intellectual disability, pervasive developmental disorders, other
12 developmental disabilities, mental illnesses, substance misuse or dependence,
13 personality disorders, physical disorders, psychosocial disadvantage and types of
14 behavioural problems
15
16
- 17 2. A collaboratively developed psychological formulation
18
19
- 20 3. Risk assessments
21
22
- 23 4. A Management of Aggression Care Plan
24
25
- 26 5. Pharmacotherapy, targeting both co-morbid mental illnesses and physical conditions
27
28
- 29 6. Individual and group psychotherapy, guided by the psychological formulation
30
31
- 32 7. Offence-specific therapies, particularly targeting violent and sexual offending
33
34
- 35 8. Education, skills acquisition and occupational / vocational rehabilitation
36
37
- 38 9. Community participation through a system of graded leave periods
39
40
- 41 10. Preparation for transition
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

His primary clinical diagnosis was mild intellectual disability associated with significant impairment of behaviour requiring attention or treatment (ICD-10 code F70.1). In addition he was considered to have a recurrent depressive disorder (ICD-10 code: F33) and a disorder of sexual preference (ICD-10 code: F65). After initial reluctance, he engaged in a range of therapies including the Adapted Sex Offender Treatment programme. Although his behaviour within supervised settings improved, professionals were unanimous that on-going supervision was an integral part of his treatment plan. At the same time, it was felt that he could be in a less restrictive setting that guaranteed an adequate level of therapeutic input, albeit with less physical security. He was hence transferred from the medium secure unit to a

1
2
3 locked rehabilitation setting (a Category 4 bed). Within this setting, the same treatment plan
4
5 continues. It includes monitoring of his mental state, treatment of depression when relevant,
6
7 nursing support, psychological therapy with a relapse prevention focus, regular supervised
8
9 access to the community, an occupational therapy-led rehabilitation service and a voluntary
10
11 work placement with staff supervision. Unescorted leave remains problematic; there were
12
13 two incidents when he was the subject of complaints from members of the public, although it
14
15 did not lead to prosecution. Psychology work continues to focus on these issues. He has
16
17 been in this setting for six years and is still detained under the Mental Health Act. He has not
18
19 offended during this time, but behavioural observations indicate the sexual interest in
20
21 children remains in spite of treatment.
22

23 24 **Case Example 2:**

25
26 Mr B has a similar clinical history as Mr A, except that he is detained under a Section 3
27
28 rather than Section 37/41. This is because while his behavioural and psychiatric presentation
29
30 was exactly the same as Mr A, the Crown Prosecution Service (CPS) decided not to
31
32 prosecute him because they felt he was already receiving treatment in a hospital under
33
34 Section 3 and there was little public interest in pursuing him through the courts.
35

36
37
38 There are three key questions that practising clinicians have to consider in these patients'
39
40 care.
41

- 42
43
44 *1. Are Mr A and B having treatment or are they being contained in hospital?*
45
46

47
48 In hospital, Mr A and B have a structured programme of daily activities coordinated by
49
50 occupational therapy and nursing departments. The psychiatrist monitors their mental state,
51
52 particularly for any depressive symptoms, and treats it accordingly. At present, neither are
53
54 on any medication. They have progressed through the Adapted Sex Offender Treatment
55
56 Programme and the current psychology and nursing input focuses on relapse prevention.
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 They are encouraged to maintain diaries that are monitored regularly. This includes Section
4
5 17 leave preparation and debriefing. These debriefs are then discussed within the
6
7 psychology support sessions. The Code of Practice suggests that treatment consisting only
8
9 of nursing and specialist day-to-day care under the clinical supervision of an approved
10
11 clinician, in a safe and secure therapeutic environment with a structured regime may
12
13 constitute appropriate medical treatment. Mr A and Mr B have more than that. Their
14
15 participation in psychology led interventions, the monitoring of their psychiatric state, nursing
16
17 observations, the use of appropriate medication when needed and the occupational therapy
18
19 led rehabilitation activities are over and beyond the minimum standard proposed by the
20
21 Code of Practice, or “milieu therapy” that is sometimes referred to in similar cases (MD v
22
23 Nottinghamshire Healthcare NHS Trust, 2010).
24
25
26

27
28 Saying that there is no treatment or that treatment has not been effective would be accurate
29
30 only if one assumed that the only measure of success is being unsupervised in the
31
32 community. That is not and should not be the case. Mr A and B have made progress during
33
34 these treatments, particularly around sexual knowledge and awareness of social rules and
35
36 behaviour. The uncontained, aggressive and indiscriminate sexual behaviour that
37
38 characterised them for many years is no longer there and it is now possible to have
39
40 supervised community leaves to a range of settings without incident, thus increasing their
41
42 degree of community participation. However, unsupervised access to the community is not
43
44 considered appropriate because of the considerable risk of sexually aggressive behaviour
45
46 towards children. Under the Mental Health Act, there is no requirement that appropriate
47
48 treatment reduce the risk posed by an individual (MD v Nottinghamshire Healthcare NHS
49
50 Trust, 2010). It is sufficient if the treatment prevents a deterioration of the symptoms or
51
52 manifestations of the disorder and this has indeed happened in their cases.
53
54
55

- 56 2. *Why can't Mr A be conditionally discharged from the Section 37/41 or why can't Mr B*
57
58 *be on a Community Treatment Order from his Section 3?*
59
60

1
2
3
4
5 At present, both Mr A and B satisfy statutory criteria for detention under the Mental Health
6 Act. The clinical diagnosis is one of mild intellectual disability, a recurrent depressive
7 disorder and a disorder of sexual preference. While they have not offended, diaries and
8 behavioural observations evidence an enduring sexual interest in children. Within the
9 meaning of the Mental Health Act 1983, Mr A and Mr B have a mental disorder that is of a
10 nature and degree that makes it appropriate for them to receive treatment in hospital. The
11 mental disorder includes intellectual disability that is associated with abnormally aggressive
12 and seriously irresponsible behaviour including the sexual targeting of children. Treatment in
13 hospital is necessary for their health, safety and the protection of others. Appropriate
14 treatment remains available for them in the hospital setting.
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26

27 A conditional discharge (for Mr A) or a discharge under a Community Treatment Order
28 (CTO) (for Mr B) was considered carefully. However the level of risk is such that, wherever
29 they are placed, they cannot be allowed to go anywhere at all without supervision from a
30 member of staff. This supervision is for the protection of others, particularly children. If
31 placed in a residential setting with more vulnerable peers, they will need staff supervision
32 within the residence. While they may not need supervision within a residence with less
33 vulnerable peers, it will have to be ensured that there are no opportunities whatsoever for
34 them to leave the residence without staff knowledge; which means the residence will have to
35 be locked. These conditions are so restrictive and absolute that they effectively deprive them
36 of their freedom and amount to de facto detention.
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49

50 There is the pragmatic view that being in a residential home (albeit de facto detained) would
51 perhaps be better than being in a hospital. This was examined, particularly if Mr A and B
52 were to voluntarily agree to accept these terms. However, whether driven by conceptions of
53 patient's best interest or indeed costs for commissioning bodies, this option is effectively
54 detention in an institution other than a hospital (e.g.: a residential home). What is more, it
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 could potentially be detention other than for the purpose of treatment (i.e., pure
4 containment). These considerations would make this option untenable (Secretary of State for
5 Justice v RB and Lancashire Care NHS Foundation Trust, 2011).
6
7
8
9

10
11 3. *Why can't they be on a Deprivation of Liberty Safeguards (DOLS) order and*
12 *managed in the community?*
13
14
15
16

17 Although Mr A and B have a mental disorder that includes intellectual disability, they have
18 the capacity to decide where and how they want to live. They understand that approaching
19 children for sex, or indeed having sex with them is wrong and against the law. Since they
20 have this capacity, the issue of DOLS shouldn't arise at all. The severe restrictions
21 suggested are not because they lack capacity, but because they have a mental disorder and
22 pose a risk to the safety of others.
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30

31 Secondly, even if one were to stretch legal imagination and assume that because of their
32 difficulties in areas of sexual behaviour, they lack the capacity to decide where they should
33 live, they would still be individuals who meet statutory criteria for detention under the Mental
34 Health Act. That being the case, decision makers will have to recognise the primacy of the
35 Mental Health Act and take all practical steps to ensure that this primacy is recognised and
36 given effect to, rather than attempting to pick and choose between the two statutory regimes
37 as they think fit. In other words, the Mental Health Act trumps the Mental Capacity Act (GJ V
38 Foundation Trust, 2009). Within the framework of the Mental Health Act, it is important that
39 they are in the least restrictive setting possible, and that is what the Category 4 bed
40 provides.
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50

51
52
53
54 **Suggestions for the future**

55 Patients treated within forensic inpatient units tend to have long lengths of stay. Quite often
56 the variable that mediates this length of stay is the risk that they pose to themselves or
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 others. Clinicians work within a legislative framework in all Western democracies. So while it
4 may be tempting to blame clinical decisions or inertia for people remaining in hospitals (Roy,
5 2015), those decisions are taken within the framework of the law. As indicated in the
6
7 illustrative examples above, what appears to be a common sense or pragmatic solution may
8
9 not necessarily be within the law.
10
11
12
13
14

- 15 1. Improving training of community intellectual disability teams on issues of risk
16 assessment and management and enabling them to manage safely people with
17 intellectual disability and offending behaviours can reduce hospital admissions. It can
18 also facilitate the discharge of people from units into the community. Practical ways
19 of training teams for this purpose have been summarised elsewhere (Devapriam, &
20 Alexander, 2012; Royal College of Psychiatrists' Faculty of Psychiatry of Intellectual
21 Disability, 2014).
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
- 31 2. However, even with the best trained community teams, it would be a mistake to
32 assume that one can manage without any inpatient beds whatsoever. There is a
33 tendency among those responsible for health planning and indeed some clinicians to
34 see forensic beds as somehow completely different from the other inpatient
35 provision. This is wrong because the way the criminal justice system manages law-
36 breaking behaviour by people with intellectual disability is variable. A person with a
37 more severe intellectual disability is unlikely to ever come before the courts unless
38 the criminal act is very serious. Even for those with a milder degree of intellectual
39 disability, only some end up being formally charged, prosecuted or convicted. This
40 means that the decision whether a person becomes a 'forensic patient' or not often
41 depends on clinical judgements about risks and the attitudes of professionals working
42 in the criminal justice system. These attitudes and decisions are inevitably shaped by
43 the availability of resources. If less restrictive inpatient facilities are unavailable,
44 either because they were shut down or not commissioned, these patients end up in
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 far more restrictive forensic beds, a fair demonstration of the law of unintended
4 consequences. Similarly, an absence of appropriate step-down facilities including
5 less restrictive inpatient provision can also result in patients remaining for longer
6 periods than necessary in medium or low secure settings. It is therefore important to
7 consider and commission all inpatient beds, whether 'forensic' or 'non-forensic', as a
8 whole while planning for future provision (Royal College of Psychiatrists' Faculty of
9 Psychiatry of Intellectual Disability, 2013; 2014).
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18

- 19 3. Many patients in these beds have a mild intellectual disability and fall between the
20 boundaries of 'mainstream' mental health and specialist intellectual disability
21 services- too disabled for one and too disordered for the other. Although admission to
22 'mainstream' units may achieve the aim of equity of access, that achievement is
23 meaningless in the absence of equity of outcome. A low IQ often excludes people
24 from treatment programmes. This happens not necessarily because these
25 'mainstream' units are overcome by prejudice, but because for those with intellectual
26 disability the treatment content needs to be delivered in a way that is appropriate for
27 their developmental and intellectual level. Economies of scale, as well as availability
28 of a critical mass of expertise may mean that these developmental-level specific
29 treatment programmes are best delivered in specialised intellectual disability units
30 (Royal College of Psychiatrists, 2013 2014).
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45

- 46 4. Service cultures can be faulted both for a lack of positive risk taking (Morgan, 2004;
47 2010) and for adverse events when positive risk taking goes wrong (Ellicott, 2011;
48 Nottingham Post, 2012). Because of this, there is a need for greater clarity on how
49 governments perceive risk and risk management for people with intellectual disability
50 who are detained under the Mental Health Act. Is it that if the type of mental disorder
51 is intellectual disability, statutory criteria should include one on patient rights and this
52 should trump those for the protection of others. That would be a significant change
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 that amounts to seeing intellectual disability as having different statutory criteria for
4 detention and treatment. If that is indeed what the government intends, it has to be
5 made clear through new legislation or clarification, rather than be left in a state of
6 constructive ambiguity with little concrete guidance.
7
8
9

- 10
11
12
13 5. The option of allowing more intrusive supervision regimes in the community for
14 patients can be considered as an alternative to hospital treatment. This would involve
15 a further strengthening of the provisions of community treatment orders, a step that
16 was considered when the Mental Health Act was last reviewed, but abandoned in the
17 face of adverse comment. If the government is so inclined, this may well be worth
18 revisiting for those people with intellectual disability and a mental disorder under the
19 Mental Health Act, who are deemed to have the capacity to decide where they want
20 to live, but need safeguards for the protection of others. That could then address the
21 concerns over de facto detention that would be a problem with the community
22 treatment orders in the current legislative framework.
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32

- 33
34
35 6. A National Institute of Health Research funded study currently under way has
36 highlighted the practice elsewhere in Europe- particularly Germany and Netherlands
37 (NIHR Evaluation, Trials and Studies Coordinating Centre, 2015). The latter has a
38 national strategy for long-stay forensic care and have provided specific long-stay
39 forensic units since 1999. Patients admitted to these facilities are those thought to
40 have no realistic prospect of discharge after treatment of at least six years duration in
41 two different treatment units. The focus in such units is not on treatment to reduce
42 risks, but on improving quality of life, while managing entrenched risks. These
43 models have demonstrated advantages in terms of both service user satisfaction and
44 service costs. Differences in funding, service provision, governance and legal
45 frameworks would make the implementation of these international service models in
46 the UK context challenging, but a systematic exploration of this options is required. If
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 this approach is accepted, you could quite conceivably do away with the majority of
4
5 the current Category 4 beds.
6
7

- 8
9 7. Finally, there is the truly radical solution of removing altogether intellectual disability
10
11 from the list of mental disorders in the Mental Health Act. Even assuming that
12
13 excellent community services reduce crisis situations and the potential for violence, it
14
15 would be impossible to eliminate them altogether. If intellectual disability is no longer
16
17 a mental disorder, then diversion from the criminal justice system, for long a
18
19 cornerstone of government policy (Department of Health, 2009), will become
20
21 problematic and there will be a real risk of many people with this condition who have
22
23 committed serious acts of violence being incarcerated. This option may not be very
24
25 politically or morally palatable.
26
27

28
29 At a recent public accounts committee hearing, the NHS Chief Executive has committed
30
31 to a hospital closure programme that will come into effect within an 18 month timeframe
32
33 (Public Accounts Committee, 2015; Brindle, 2015). The exact detail on how this is to be
34
35 achieved is unclear, but there is no doubting the political will to drive it through. If
36
37 implemented without careful consideration to the clinical realities on the ground, what
38
39 appears to be a well-intentioned initiative to prevent inappropriate hospitalisation and
40
41 abuse will result in further disadvantaging an already disadvantaged population. Policy
42
43 makers and clinicians need to move away from seeing community and hospital provision
44
45 as an “either or” situation, and instead see them as complementary services to secure
46
47 the best outcomes for people with intellectual disability and mental health or behavioural
48
49 problems. The approach set out in the tiered model of healthcare (Royal College of
50
51 Psychiatrists’ Faculty of Psychiatry of Intellectual Disability, 2011; 2013; 2014) captures
52
53 this balance and the practical steps spelt out in this paper offer a considered way
54
55 forward.
56
57
58
59
60

References

- 1
2
3
4
5 Alexander, R.T., Hiremath, A., Chester, V., Green, F.N., Gunaratna, I.J., & Hoare, S. (2011).
6
7 Evaluation of treatment outcomes from a medium secure unit for people with
8
9 intellectual disability. *Advances in Mental Health and Intellectual Disabilities*, 5(1)
10
11 22-32.
12
13
14
15 BBC One (2011), "Undercover care: the abuse exposed", Panorama, available at:
16
17 www.bbc.co.uk/programmes/b011pwt6 (accessed 31 May 2011).
18
19
20
21 Bhaumik, S., Tyrer, F., & Gangadharan, S. (2011). Assessing quality of life and mortality in
22
23 adults with intellectual disability and complex health problems following move from
24
25 a longstay hospital. *Journal of Policy and Practice in Intellectual Disabilities*, 8, 183–
26
27 90.
28
29
30
31 Brindle, (2015). NHS to shut many residential hospitals for people with learning disabilities.
32
33 *Guardian*, 10 February 2015. Available from:
34
35 [http://www.theguardian.com/society/2015/feb/10/nhs-shut-residential-hospitals-](http://www.theguardian.com/society/2015/feb/10/nhs-shut-residential-hospitals-learning-disabilities-winterbourne-view)
36
37 [learning-disabilities-winterbourne-view](http://www.theguardian.com/society/2015/feb/10/nhs-shut-residential-hospitals-learning-disabilities-winterbourne-view) (Accessed 24 February 2015).
38
39
40
41
42 Carroll, A., Lyall, M, & Forrester, A. (2004). Clinical hopes and public fears in forensic mental
43
44 health. *Journal of Forensic Psychiatry and Psychology*, 15, 407–25.
45
46
47
48 Clare I. & Murphy G. (1998) Working with offenders or alleged offenders with learning
49
50 disabilities. In: *Clinical Psychology and People with Intellectual Disabilities* (eds. E.
51
52 Emerson, C. Hatton, J. Bromley & A. Caine), pp. 154-176. Chichester: John Wiley
53
54 and Sons.
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 Cumella, S.J. (2010). Public policy in intellectual and developmental disability. *Current*
4
5 *Opinion in Psychiatry*, 23, 417–20.
6
7
8
9 Denney, D. (2009). *Living in Dangerous Times: Fear, Insecurity, Risk and Social Policy*.
10
11 Chichester: John Wiley.
12
13
14
15 Department of Health (2009). *Lord Bradley's Review of People with Mental Health Problems*
16
17 *or Learning Disabilities in the Criminal Justice System*. London: Department of
18
19 Health.
20
21
22
23 Department of Health (2012a). *Department of Health Review: Winterbourne View Hospital*
24
25 *Interim Report*. London: Author.
26
27
28
29 Department of Health (2012b). *Transforming Care: A National Response to Winterbourne*.
30
31 London: Author.
32
33
34
35 Devapriam, J., Rosenbach, A., & Alexander, R. (2015). In-patient services for people with
36
37 intellectual disability and mental health or behavioural difficulties. *BJPsych*
38
39 *Advances*, 21, 116-123.
40
41
42
43 Devapriam, J., & Alexander, R.T. (2012). Tiered Model of Learning Disability Forensic
44
45 Service Provision. *Journal of Intellectual Disabilities and Offending Behaviour*, 3(4)
46
47 175-185.
48
49
50
51 Douds, F., & Bantwal, A. (2011). The “forensicisation” of challenging behaviour: the perils of
52
53 people with learning disabilities and severe challenging behaviours being viewed as
54
55 “forensic” patients. *Journal of Learning Disabilities and Offending Behaviour*, 2(3)
56
57 110-113.
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5 Ellicott, C. (2011). Convicted paedophile molested 10-year-old boy just hours after release
6
7 from secure unit. *Daily Mail*, 5 August 2011. Available from:
8
9 [http://www.dailymail.co.uk/news/article-2022494/Convicted-paedophile-molested-](http://www.dailymail.co.uk/news/article-2022494/Convicted-paedophile-molested-10-year-old-boy-just-hours-release-secure-unit.html)
10
11 [10-year-old-boy-just-hours-release-secure-unit.html](http://www.dailymail.co.uk/news/article-2022494/Convicted-paedophile-molested-10-year-old-boy-just-hours-release-secure-unit.html) (Accessed 24 February 2015).
12

13
14
15 Emerson, E., & Baines, S. (2012). Health Inequalities and People with Learning Disabilities
16
17 in the UK: 2010. Learning Disability Observatory. Available from:
18
19 [http://www.improvinghealthandlivesorg.uk/uploads/doc/vid_7479_IHaL2010-](http://www.improvinghealthandlivesorg.uk/uploads/doc/vid_7479_IHaL2010-3HealthInequality2010.pdf)
20
21 [3HealthInequality2010.pdf](http://www.improvinghealthandlivesorg.uk/uploads/doc/vid_7479_IHaL2010-3HealthInequality2010.pdf) (Accessed 24 February 2015).
22

23
24
25 GJ V Foundation Trust (2009) EWHC 2972 (Fam): (2010) M.H.L.R 13). Available from
26
27 http://www.mentalhealthlaw.co.uk/GJ_v_The_Foundation_Trust_%282009%29_EW
28
29 [HC_2972_%28Fam%29](http://www.mentalhealthlaw.co.uk/GJ_v_The_Foundation_Trust_%282009%29_EW) (Accessed 25 February 2015)
30
31

32
33 Health and Social Care Information Centre (2013). Learning Disabilities Census Report:
34
35 England. Author.
36

37
38
39 Health and Social Care Information Centre (2015). Learning Disability Census Report.
40
41 Author.
42

43
44
45 Holland, T., Clare, I.C.H., & Mukhopadhyay, T. (2002). Prevalence of 'criminal offending' by
46
47 men and women with intellectual disability and the characteristics of 'offenders':
48
49 implications for research and service development. *Journal of Intellectual Disability*
50
51 *Research*, 46, 6–20.
52

53
54
55 Hollins, S. (2000). Developmental psychiatry – insights from learning disability. *British*
56
57 *Journal of Psychiatry*, 177 201–6.
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5 Jaydeokar, S., & Piachaud, J. (2004). Out-of-borough placements for people with learning
6 disabilities. *Advances in Psychiatric Treatment*. 10(2) 116-123.
7
8

9
10
11 Kingdon, A. (2005). Resettlement from secure learning disability services. In *The Handbook*
12 *of Forensic Learning Disabilities* pp. 121–214 (eds. T. Riding, C. Swann, & B.
13 Swann). Radcliffe.
14
15

16
17
18
19 Lyall I., Holland A., & Collins S. (1995) Offending by adults with learning disabilities and the
20 attitudes of staff to offending behaviour: implications for service development.
21 *Journal of Intellectual Disability Research*, 30, 501–508.
22
23

24
25
26
27 MD v Nottinghamshire Healthcare NHS Trust 2010 UKUT 59 AAC) Available from
28 [http://www.mentalhealthlaw.co.uk/MD v Nottinghamshire Health Care NHS Tru](http://www.mentalhealthlaw.co.uk/MD_v_Nottinghamshire_Health_Care_NHS_Trust_2010_UKUT_59_AAC)
29 [st %282010%29 UKUT 59 %28AAC%29](http://www.mentalhealthlaw.co.uk/MD_v_Nottinghamshire_Health_Care_NHS_Trust_2010_UKUT_59_AAC) (Accessed 25 February 2015)
30
31
32

33
34
35 Morgan, S. (2004). Positive risk-taking: an idea whose time has come. *Health Care Risk*
36 *Report*, pp. 18-19. Available from:
37 [http://practicebasedevidence.squarespace.com/storage/pdfs/OpenMind-](http://practicebasedevidence.squarespace.com/storage/pdfs/OpenMind-PositiveRiskTaking.pdf)
38 [PositiveRiskTaking.pdf](http://practicebasedevidence.squarespace.com/storage/pdfs/OpenMind-PositiveRiskTaking.pdf) (Accessed 24 February 2015).
39
40
41
42

43
44
45 Morgan, S. (2010). Positive risk-taking: a basis for good risk decision-making. *Health Care*
46 *Risk Report*, pp. 20-21. Available from:
47 [http://practicebasedevidence.squarespace.com/storage/pdfs/HCCR%2016-](http://practicebasedevidence.squarespace.com/storage/pdfs/HCCR%2016-4morgan.pdf)
48 [4morgan.pdf](http://practicebasedevidence.squarespace.com/storage/pdfs/HCCR%2016-4morgan.pdf) (Accessed 24 February 2015).
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 Moss, S., Emerson, E., Bouras, N., & Holland, A. (2002). Mental disorders and problematic
4 behaviours in people with intellectual disability: future directions for research.
5 *Journal of Intellectual Disability Research*, 41, 440-7.
6
7

8
9
10
11 National Audit Office (2015). Care services for people with learning disabilities and
12 challenging behaviour. London: Author. Available from: [http://www.nao.org.uk/wp-](http://www.nao.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2015/02/Care-services-for-people-with-learning-disabilities-and-challenging-behaviour.pdf)
13 [content/uploads/2015/02/Care-services-for-people-with-learning-disabilities-and-](http://www.nao.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2015/02/Care-services-for-people-with-learning-disabilities-and-challenging-behaviour.pdf)
14 [challenging-behaviour.pdf](http://www.nao.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2015/02/Care-services-for-people-with-learning-disabilities-and-challenging-behaviour.pdf) (Accessed 24 February 2015).
15
16
17

18
19
20
21 NHS Confederation (2012). Defining Mental Health Services – Promoting Effective
22 Commissioning and Supporting QIPP. NHS Confederation. Available from:
23 [http://www.nhsconfed.org/~media/Confederation/Files/Publications/Documents/Defi](http://www.nhsconfed.org/~media/Confederation/Files/Publications/Documents/Defining_mental_health_services.pdf)
24 [ning_mental_health_services.pdf](http://www.nhsconfed.org/~media/Confederation/Files/Publications/Documents/Defining_mental_health_services.pdf) (Accessed 24 February 2015).
25
26
27

28
29
30
31 NIHR Evaluation, Trials and Studies Coordinating Centre (2015). HS&DR - 11/1024/06:
32 Characteristics and needs of long-stay patients in high and medium secure
33 forensic-psychiatric care: Implications for service organisation. Available from:
34 <http://www.nets.nihr.ac.uk/projects/hsdr/11102406> (Accessed 24 February 2015).
35
36
37

38
39
40
41 Nottingham Post (2012). Mansfield doctor killed herself after patient tried to rape boy.
42 *Nottingham Post*, 24 July 2012. Available from:
43 [http://www.nottinghampost.com/Mansfield-doctor-killed-patient-tried-rape-boy/story-](http://www.nottinghampost.com/Mansfield-doctor-killed-patient-tried-rape-boy/story-16584192-detail/story.html)
44 [16584192-detail/story.html](http://www.nottinghampost.com/Mansfield-doctor-killed-patient-tried-rape-boy/story-16584192-detail/story.html) (Accessed 24 February 2015).
45
46
47

48
49
50
51 Public Accounts Committee (2015). Oral evidence: Care services for people with learning
52 disabilities and challenging behaviour, HC 973, Monday 09 February 2015.
53 Available from:
54 <http://data.parliament.uk/writtenevidence/committeeevidence.svc/evidencedocumen>
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 [t/public-accounts-committee/care-for-people-with-learning-](http://public-accounts-committee/care-for-people-with-learning-disabilities/oral/18031.pdf?dm_i=6N7,369AG,1CV97L,BE3Z9,1)
4 [disabilities/oral/18031.pdf?dm_i=6N7,369AG,1CV97L,BE3Z9,1](http://public-accounts-committee/care-for-people-with-learning-disabilities/oral/18031.pdf?dm_i=6N7,369AG,1CV97L,BE3Z9,1) (Accessed 24
5
6
7 February 2015).

8
9
10
11 Regina v Alan Fletcher EWCA Crim 2777 Case No: 2012/1145/A4 in The Court of Appeal
12
13 Criminal Division. Available from:
14
15 [http://www.mentalhealthlaw.co.uk/images/R_v_Fletcher_%282012%29_EWCA_Cri](http://www.mentalhealthlaw.co.uk/images/R_v_Fletcher_%282012%29_EWCA_Crim_2777,_%282012%29_MHLO_161.pdf)
16 [m_2777,_%282012%29_MHLO_161.pdf](http://www.mentalhealthlaw.co.uk/images/R_v_Fletcher_%282012%29_EWCA_Crim_2777,_%282012%29_MHLO_161.pdf) (Accessed 24 February 2015).
17
18

19
20
21 Roy, A. (2015). View from the Chair. Available from:
22
23 <http://www.rcpsych.ac.uk/pdf/Statement%20for%20Newsletter%20RCPSYCH.pdf>
24
25 (Accessed 24 February 2015).
26
27

28
29 Royal College of Psychiatrists' Faculty of Psychiatry of Intellectual Disability (2011). *Future*
30 *Role of Psychiatrists Working with People with Learning Disabilities*. London: Royal
31
32 College of Psychiatrists.
33
34

35
36
37 Royal College of Psychiatrists' Faculty of Psychiatry of Intellectual Disability (2013). *People*
38 *with learning disability and mental health, behavioural or forensic problems: the role*
39 *of in-patient services*. London: Royal College of Psychiatrists.
40
41
42

43
44
45 Royal College of Psychiatrists' Faculty of Psychiatry of Intellectual Disability (2014). *Forensic*
46 *Care Pathways for Adults with Intellectual Disability Involved with the Criminal*
47 *Justice System*. London: Royal College of Psychiatrists.
48
49
50

51
52
53
54 Secretary of State for Justice v RB and Lancashire Care NHS Foundation Trust, Court of
55
56 Appeal Judgement, Case No: C3/2011/0851).
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

World Health Organization. (1992). *The ICD-10 classification of mental and behavioural disorders: Clinical descriptions and diagnostic guidelines*. Geneva: World Health Organization.

Xeniditis, K., Russell, A., & Murphy, D. (2001). Management of people with challenging behaviour. *Advances in Psychiatric Treatment*, 7(2) 109.

For Peer Review