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Purpose of the Project
Survey residential treatment providers to answer:
- To what extent do family members and youth participate in making decisions about treatment planning?
- Do residential treatment staff understand and apply the principles of family-driven, youth-guided care?
- What are the family visitation policies and family support practices of residential treatment facilities?
- To what extent are family members and youth involved in the oversight and operations of residential treatment?

Changes in Residential Treatment
- Pressure to offer higher-quality care and to improve outcomes while minimizing length of stay, controlling costs, and collaborating with community-based providers
- Several associations of residential treatment providers have endorsed family-driven, youth-guided principles
- Research has not systematically examined the extent to which residential treatment providers have adopted family-driven, youth-guided practices

What Is Family-Driven Youth-Guided Care?
- Family-driven care: parents or caregivers are respected as the primary decision makers in the care of their children and in the development of policies and procedures governing care for all children in their community
- Youth-driven care: young people take an active role in determining their treatment and are active participants in the design and oversight of services for youth in their community

What Are Family-Driven, Youth-Guided Practices?
Some examples:
- Strength-based individualized treatment planning
- Incorporate family members and “natural helpers”
- Preserve family relationships through regular contact between youth and their families
- Collaborate with community-based providers to connect youth with home and community-based services

More examples:
- Mentoring of youth peers and family-to-family support
- Participation of families and youth in oversight activities – Agency advisory boards, management, staff training, and quality assurance reviews
**Survey of Residential Treatment Facilities**

Developed and conducted Survey of Residential Treatment Facilities (SRTF)

**Challenges and Caveats:**
- Measuring all facets of family-driven, youth-guided care
- Respondent burden
- Avoiding socially desirable responses
- No way to independently verify responses
- Finding facilities/respondents to participate in the survey

**Distribution of SRTF**
- Distributed in spring 2009 to 611 facilities that completed the 2008 SAMHSA Survey of Mental Health Treatment Facilities (SMHTF)
  - Facilities that reported in the SMHTF to provide 24-hour out-of-home residential treatment for children and youth age 17 and under
- Email invitation with 4 reminder emails and 2 phone calls in spring 2009
- Respondents were not compensated
- Received responses from 293 facilities, or 53.8%

**Survey Development**
- Advisory panel of residential treatment providers, family members, youth, researchers, and advocates to select domains of measurement and develop survey questions
- Reviewed the literature
- Key informant interviews
- Developed questions that were practice-oriented
- Pilot tested survey (revise, revise, revise)
- Developed web-version of survey/pilot test (revise again)
- Final survey required 30 minutes to complete online or paper
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Facility Characteristics

To what extent do family members and youth participate in decision-making in treatment planning?

Youth and Family Member Roles in Treatment Planning

Treatment Team Typically Includes...

Treatment Plans

Conclusions: Treatment Planning

- Nearly all facilities reported using strength-based treatment planning and working with other agencies
- Most facilities reported that they incorporate youth and family input
- Parents and/or youth are not primary decision makers in treatment planning
- Half of facilities include family liaisons or natural helpers on the treatment team
Do residential treatment staff understand and apply the principles of family-driven, youth-guided care?

Conclusions: Staff Training

- 12 percent of facilities have staff that regularly apply family-driven principles
- 19 percent of facilities have staff that regularly apply youth-driven principles
- Most report that staff have not heard of or need training to apply these principles

Family Visitation Practices

99.6% of residential treatment providers allow family visitation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percent with Visitation Practice</th>
<th>70</th>
<th>60</th>
<th>50</th>
<th>40</th>
<th>30</th>
<th>20</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Visit anytime</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Set times</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taken away due to behavior</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Only after period of time</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Only after improvement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Family Support Practices

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percent with Family Support Practice</th>
<th>100</th>
<th>80</th>
<th>60</th>
<th>40</th>
<th>20</th>
<th>0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Caregivers calls with families</td>
<td>96%</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social events for families</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pay for transportation to visit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

What are the family visitation policies and family support practices of residential treatment facilities?
Peer Support

- 42% Engage in family to family or youth to youth support
- 30% Offer youth to youth support
- 22% Offer family to family support
- 11% Offer both types of support

To what extent are family members and youth involved in the oversight and operations of residential treatment?

Conclusions: Family Support

- Facilities engage in several family support activities and allow visitation
- Some facilities restrict visitation
- Few facilities offer peer support

Conclusions: Oversight and Operations

- Few facilities include family members or youth in management, training, or quality assurance

Family Involvement in Oversight and Operations*

*Includes serving as a board member, family liaison, staff training or quality assessor

- Few facilities include family members or youth in management, training, or quality assurance

Final Conclusions

- Facilities have adopted some practices that are consistent with family-driven, youth-guided care
- Family members and youth should be placed at the center of decision-making
- There is a need for staff training
- Family members and youth should be included in oversight
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