
Evaluation of home-based rehabilitation in Victoria

Final Report



National Ageing Research Institute

Prepared by Briony Dow, Kirsten Black,
Fiona Bremner & Marcia Fearn

This project was funded by the Department of Human Services

August 2004

Table of Contents

List of Abbreviations	10
Executive Summary	12
Project aims	12
Service types.....	12
Project Methodology	13
Key Findings.....	14
Recommendations.....	21
Study Critique	22
Chapter 1: Introduction.....	23
1.1 Background to the project	23
1.2 Victorian context	23
1.3 Aims and objectives of this study	24
1.4 Definitions of rehabilitation	25
1.5 Definitions of different team approaches.....	26
1.6 The World Health Organisation’s International Classification of Function, Disability and Health	26
Chapter 2: Literature Review	30
2.1 Parameters of the review.....	30
2.2 Evaluations of home-based rehabilitation.....	31
2.3 Models of home-based rehabilitation	38
2.4 Summary and critique.....	43
Chapter 3: Methodology	47
3.1 Study Design	47
3.2 Sampling and recruitment	49
3.3 Ethical Issues.....	50
3.4 Training	51
3.5 Description of measures	51
3.6 Criteria for selection of outcome measures	51
3.7 Other data collection strategies	57
3.8 Data Analysis.....	60
3.9 Inclusion of people from culturally and linguistically diverse (CALD) backgrounds ..	62
Chapter 4: Who was Involved?.....	63
4.1 Staff Participants	63
4.2 Participating Clients and Carers.....	64
4.3 Clients not asked	66
4.4 Profile of Participants	68
4.5 Data Sets	73
4.6 Three month follow-up assessments	74
4.7 Summary	74
Chapter 5: Description of RITH.....	76
5.1 Introduction.....	76
5.2 Objective One: Profile of client groups involved in home-based (and inpatient) rehabilitation	76
5.3 Objective Two: Current practice	85
5.4 Referral to CRC	107
5.5 Summary and Conclusions.....	108
Chapter 6: Client Outcomes	111
6.1 Objective 2d: Client Goals	112
6.2 Objective 2d: Functional Outcomes.....	117
6.3 Objective 2d: Carer Demand.....	126

6.4 Objective 2d: Client and Carer Satisfaction	128
6.5 Summary of findings for Objective 2d	133
6.6 Objective 3a: The relationship between service provision and participant outcomes	134
6.7 Summary of findings for Objective 3a	138
6.8 Discussion of Chapter 6 findings.....	139
Chapter 7: Client, carer and staff perspectives on best practice.....	140
7.1 Introduction.....	140
7.2 Location of therapy - Benefits of RITH	140
7.3 Location of therapy – limitations of RITH	144
7.4 Therapy – adequacy and quality.....	146
7.5 Involvement in care planning and goal setting	148
7.6 Information	149
7.7 Transition between services and issues since service ceased	150
7.8 Suggestions for improvement	152
7.9 Other issues	154
7.10 Access to community support services	154
7.11 Staffing issues	155
7.12 Need for longer term “slow stream” rehabilitation.....	156
7.13 Complexity of Service System	156
7.14 Access to medical care	156
7.15 Access for CALD clients in rural areas.....	156
7.16 Summary and conclusions – client and carer interviews.....	156
7.17 Summary and Discussion – staff focus groups.....	157
Chapter 8: Best Practice Framework	159
8.1 Referral and admission.....	159
8.2 Equity of access	160
8.3 Person-centred care planning and care co-ordination	160
8.4 Service provision	162
8.5 Individualised and flexible service delivery.....	162
8.6 Staff support and safety	163
8.7 Evaluation and quality improvement	163
8.8 Continuity of care	164
Chapter 9: Discussion and Recommendations	165
9.1 Introduction.....	165
9.2 Description of RITH services	165
9.3 Client and carer outcomes	166
9.4 Client and carer experiences of home-based rehabilitation.....	170
9.5 Staff perceptions of home-based rehabilitation.....	171
9.6 Study critique	171
9.7 Conclusions	174
9.8 Recommendations	175
References	176
Appendices	183
Appendix A – List of randomised controlled trials.....	183
Appendix B – Studies of cost effectiveness	188
Appendix C – Objectives, data collection strategies, and data analysis techniques	190
Appendix D – Participant Information and Consent Form	192
Appendix E - Outcome measures used by each home-based rehabilitation service.....	199
Appendix F - Description of measures used in this study	201
Appendix G - The Barthel Index/ Functional Independence Measure conversion scale .	205
Appendix H – Client and Carer Satisfaction surveys	206
Appendix I – AQoL with client goals.....	212
Appendix J – Program Admission Profile.....	216
Appendix K - Participant Admission Information	217
Appendix L – Discharge Record	219
Appendix M – 3-Month Follow - up Record	222

Appendix N – Client and carer interview schedules	226
Appendix O – Survey for referring agencies	228
Appendix P – Outcome Measures Survey	231
Appendix Q - Analysis of participant goals	235
Appendix R - % HART items “Not OK” (% OK with help)	237

Table of Tables

Table 1: A comparison of the ICIDH and ICF classifications.....	28
Table 2: Outcome measures used in RCT's according to ICF.....	33
Table 3: Summary of findings of Level 1 &2 studies on client outcomes.....	34
Table 4: Summary of findings of RCTs on carer outcomes.....	36
Table 5: Composition of Home rehabilitation teams	40
Table 6: Service recruitment matrix.....	49
Table 7: Clinical sub-program values included in recruitment	50
Table 8: Framework for selecting outcome measures	54
Table 9: Data collection schedule	55
Table 10: Predictor variables.....	61
Table 11: Outcome variables	61
Table 12: Participants, recruitment periods, eligible clients and response rates	65
Table 13: Eligible clients (Ortho or Neuro admitted during recruitment period).....	66
Table 14: Reasons given for not asking eligible clients to participate.....	67
Table 15: Number of participants by service type and location	68
Table 16: Participant Demographics.....	69
Table 17: Referral source of orthopaedic participants.....	70
Table 18: Referral source of neurological participants.....	70
Table 19: Participants' Living Arrangements on Admission	71
Table 20: Availability of an informal carer on Admission	71
Table 21: Number of data sets completed by time and by rehabilitation type	74
Table 22: Mean age and gender of clients admitted during recruitment period	77
Table 23: Diagnosis of the total population of clients admitted during recruitment period by health service and program type	78
Table 24: Referral source of all clients admitted during recruitment period by health service and program type	82
Table 25: Ambulatory Admissions and EFT.....	91
Table 26: Bed substitution Admissions and EFT	93
Table 27: Inpatient team bed numbers and EFT	94
Table 28: Mean length of stay from referral source by rehabilitation type and diagnosis	96
Table 29: Mean hours of direct and indirect therapy, length of stay and mean hours of therapy per day.	98
Table 30: Services brokered during home rehabilitation	104
Table 31: Other Community services supplied or referred to during home rehabilitation	105
Table 32: Achievement of admission aim and referral to CRC (n=155)	108
Table 33: Summary of descriptive data for the three service types	110
Table 34: Number of goals set by participants by rehabilitation type.....	112
Table 35: Number of participant goals by ICF factor by rehabilitation type.....	113
Table 36: Percentage of goals achieved, partially achieved or not achieved by rehabilitation type.....	114
Table 37: Reason for discharge from rehabilitation	115
Table 38: Aim of rehabilitation achieved (therapist's perspective).....	115

Table 39: Overall outcomes at 3-month follow-up.....	117
Table 40: Percentage of all participants independent on items on the DFADL	122
Table 41: Mean number of items "Not OK" on HART by rehab type and time (SD)	123
Table 42: Changes in scores on items in the Caregiving Demand Scale	127
Table 43: Participant responses to Carer Satisfaction Survey question 12	132
Table 44: Correlations between service measures and improvements on outcome measures from admission to discharge by diagnosis.....	136
Table 45: Correlations between service measures and improvements on outcome measures from discharge to 3-months post discharge by diagnosis	137
Table 46: Mean improvement (SD) from discharge to 3-months post discharge by referral to CRC and diagnosis	138

Table of Figures

Figure 1: WHO ICIDH Classification example.....	27
Figure 2: Study Design.....	48
Figure 3: Waiting time for rehabilitation services	83
Figure 4: Mean hours of direct and indirect therapy by week of therapy by diagnosis and rehabilitation type.....	97
Figure 5: Mean hours of therapy per day by therapy by rehabilitation type for orthopaedic participants	99
Figure 6: Mean hours of therapy per day by therapy by rehabilitation type for neurological participants	100
Figure 7: Mean number of therapies by rehabilitation type and diagnosis	101
Figure 8: Percentage of clients receiving each therapy type by rehabilitation type	101
Figure 9: Mean Barthel Index (BI) scores by rehabilitation type for orthopaedic participants over time.....	118
Figure 10: Mean HART (number of OK by Self items) by rehabilitation type for orthopaedic participants over time	119
Figure 11: Mean DFADL score by rehabilitation type for orthopaedic participants over time.....	119
Figure 12: Mean Barthel Index Scores by rehabilitation type for neurological participants over time.....	120
Figure 13: Mean HART (number of 'OK by Self' items) by rehabilitation type for neurological participants over time.....	121
Figure 14: Mean DFADL score by rehabilitation type for neurological participants over time.....	122
Figure 15: Mean AQoL score by rehabilitation type for orthopaedic participants over time	125
Figure 16: Mean AQoL score by rehabilitation type for neurological participants over time	125
Figure 17: Mean Caregiving Demand Scores for ambulatory and bed substitution services at admission, discharge and 3-month follow-up	128
Figure 18: Percentage of participants who agreed with items on the client satisfaction survey.....	129
Figure 19: Responses to the Question "I now get all the support I need from services such as MOW's; Home care; District Nursing Service etc"	130
Figure 20: Percentage of participant carers who agreed with questions on the satisfaction survey.....	131

Acknowledgements

The project team gratefully acknowledges the generous contributions of the following people, without whom this project would not have been possible.

Victorian Rehabilitation Service Providers:

We would like to acknowledge the staff of the seven rehabilitation services who participated in the data collection phase of this project. Thank you to the Rehabilitation In The Home teams from Angliss Hospital; Queen Elizabeth Centre - Ballarat; Caulfield General Medical Centre; Peter James Centre; St. Vincents Hospital and Sunshine Hospital. Thank you also to the in-patient rehabilitation facility at LaTrobe Regional Hospital.

In addition, we would like to thank all Victorian Rehabilitation In The Home service providers who completed the survey on outcome measurement and the Grace McKellar RITH service who contributed to the focus group component of the data collection.

Thank you also to the RITH referral agencies who completed a survey regarding referral processes and practices – to the Orthopaedic and Neurological rehabilitation consultants at Caulfield General Medical Centre; the Occupational Therapy and Physiotherapy departments at Box Hill Hospital and to the rehabilitation inpatient teams at Queen Elizabeth Centre; Western Hospital Sunshine, St. Georges Hospital and St. Vincent’s Hospital - your contribution was greatly valued.

Clients and Carers:

We would like to gratefully acknowledge the 164 clients and 75 carers who consented to participate in this research project. We would like to extend our thanks to 136 of these clients and carers who kindly welcomed NARI staff in to their home to participate in the 3-month follow up assessments and interviews.

Members of the Project Advisory Group:

Dr Geoff Abbott, Consultant in Rehabilitation Medicine, Melbourne Health, representing the Australasian Faculty of Rehabilitation Medicine.

Ms. Anne Bergin, Director Operations Aged Care and Rehabilitation, Eastern Health, representing the Victorian Hospitals Association.

Mr. Simon Moy, Manager Sub-acute Unit, Continuing Care Section, Metropolitan Health and Aged Care Unit – DHS.

Ms. Sue Race, Manager, Sub-acute Ambulatory Care Services, Continuing Care Section, Metropolitan Health and Aged Care Unit – DHS.

Ms. Nonie Rickard, representing the Australian Rehabilitation Nurses Association.

Ms. Basia Sudbury, Project Officer, Continuing Care Section, Metropolitan Health & Aged Care Services - DHS.

Dr. James Tullock, Acting Director of Medical Services, Aged Care and Rehabilitation, Eastern Health, representing the Australian Society for Geriatric Medicine.

Ms. Janne Williams, Director Rehabilitation and Aged Services Program, Southern Health, representing the Allied Health in Rehabilitation Consultative Committee.

NARI Staff:

Thank you to the staff and students at the National Ageing Research Institute for their continual support and encouragement. In particular, we gratefully acknowledge Dr. Keith Hill for his project advisor role, Ms Natalie El Haber for data entry, and Ms Betty Haramlambous for assisting with final editing.

List of Abbreviations

ADL	Activities of Daily Living
AHA	Allied Health Assistant
AQoL	Assessment of Quality of Life Scale
AMTS	Abbreviated Mental Test Score
BI	Modified Barthel Index
Carer	Family members, spouses, partners or friends who provide regular assistance to the rehabilitation client. May be co-resident or living elsewhere; may be in receipt of a government benefit or not; but may not be employed through any formal organisation
CACP	Community Aged Care Package
CDS	Caregiving Demand Scale
CHC	Community Health Centre
CRAFT	Clinical Rehabilitation and Funding Tree
CRC	Community Rehabilitation Centre
CSS	Client/ Carer Satisfaction Survey
DFADL	Domestic Functioning Assessment in Activities of Daily Living
DHS	Department of Human Services
ED	Emergency Department
EFT	Equivalent Full Time
FIM	Functional Independence Measure
Food Services	For example: meals on wheels or similar
GEM	Geriatric Evaluation and Management
HACC	Home and Community Care
HART	Handicap Assessment Resource Tool
Home Care	Refers to any local government, community or agency service that is arranged to provide assistance with domestic activities of daily living
ICF	International Classification of Function, Disability and Health
MOW	Meals On Wheels
MMSE	Mini Mental State Examination
NARI	National Ageing Research Institute
NOK	Next of Kin
OT	Occupational Therapy/Therapist
PAC	Post Acute Care
PT/ Physio	Physiotherapy/Physiotherapist
QI	Quality Improvement
RDNS	Royal District Nursing Service
RITH	Rehabilitation In The Home
SP	Speech Therapy/Therapist

SW	Social Work/Worker
TCP	Transitional Care Package
TUG	Timed Up and Go