May 13, 2014

Ms. Elizabeth Timm
Office of Child Care Licensing
1825 Faulkland Rd.
Wilmington, DE 19805


Dear Ms. Timm,

The Developmental Disabilities Council (DDC) has reviewed the Division of Family Services Office of Child Care Licensing’s Proposed Residential Child Facility & Day Treatment Program Regulation. We offer the following comments regarding this Regulation.

1. In §1.3, definition of “residential child care facility”, psychiatric hospitals and foster homes are excluded from coverage. However, the status of a pediatric skilled nursing facility is unclear. Exceptional Care for Children in Newark is an example. DHSS ostensibly licenses such facilities pursuant to Title 16 Del.C. §§1119B and 119C. However, such facilities may also meet the DFS definition of “residential child care facility”. DFS may wish to clarify coverage or non-coverage of pediatric nursing facilities.

2. In §1.4, definition of “Administrative Hearing”, the reference to “...place the facility on the enforcement actions of Warning...” is awkward language. DFS may wish to revise the reference.

3. Section 17.3 contemplates HRC review of “restrictive procedures” and “proper treatment”. It is unclear if DFS envisions HRCs reviewing psychotropic medications. Section 1.4, definition of “restrictive procedure”, only covers drugs which qualify as a “chemical restraint”. The definition of “chemical restraint” excludes “the planned and routine application of a prescribed psychotropic drug”. Therefore, if a child were prescribed heavy daily doses of multiple psychotropic drugs, the HRC may arguably lack jurisdiction to review. By analogy the DDDS HRCs review regularly prescribed psychotropic drugs administered in covered facilities, including co-DHSS/DFS regulated AdvoServ. DFS may wish to consider whether HRC review of psychotropic drugs excluded from the definition of “chemical restraint” merit HRC review.

4. In §1.4, definition of “Consultant”, there is a plural pronoun (their) with a singular antecedent (practitioner). Consider substituting “the practitioner’s” for “their”.

5. In §1.4, definitions of “Exclusion” and “Locked Isolation”, it is somewhat anomalous to categorically bar use of unlocked exclusion for kids under age 6 but have no equivalent limit for locked isolation. DFS may wish to consider adding a similar age standard in the definition of “locked isolation”.
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6. In §1.4, the definitions of “exclusion” and “time-out technique” are not well differentiated. Placing a child in an unlocked classroom or office would fit both definitions. Section 3.12.9.3.2 reinforces the overlap by stating that “time-out” may not occur in closet, bathroom, unfinished basement or attic. The implication is that placement in other rooms is an acceptable use of “time-out”. If a provider were considering placement of a child under age 6 in an unlocked room, that would be barred under the “exclusion” definition (and §17.1.2) but allowed per §3.12.9.3.3 if characterized as “time-out”. In addition, we recommend that it be made clear that all children placed in “exclusion” and “time-out” must be observed by an appropriate adult at all times.

7. A related anomaly to that described in the preceding paragraph is that an exclusion requires “continuous” monitoring (§1.4, definition of “exclusion”; §17.5.1.1) while time-out only requires a visual check every 30 minutes (§3.12.9.3.2). If a provider wishes to avoid the continuous monitoring requirement, the provider would simply characterize placing a child in an unlocked room as “time-out”. Moreover, the implication of 30-minute checks is that “time-out” periods are extended. Clinically, a time-out should permit some time to reflect and regain self-control. A time-out should not last for hours. Cf. §3.12.9.3.3, time-out for children under 6 should not exceed 1 minute for each year of age.

8. Section 17.5.1.1 raises a similar concern. Within each two (2) hours of a restrictive procedure, a child is given an opportunity for 10 minutes of release. Based on the definition of “restrictive procedure”, this suggests that extended periods of mechanical restraint, locked isolation, and exclusion are acceptable norms. This section could also be interpreted to authorize a facility to limit access to a toilet to once every two hours. The structure of the DFS regulations appear to allow sequential use of restrictive procedures resulting in extended isolation. For example, §17.5.1.1, in combination with §17.7.1.3, authorize a 2 hour locked isolation followed by a 10 minute break, another 2 hour locked isolation followed by a 10 minute break, and then a third 2 hour locked isolation. Similarly, per §§17.5.1.1 and 17.6.1 and 17.6.2, “exclusions” can be “stacked” resulting in removal of a child to an unlocked room for an hour, followed by a 10 minute break, which can be repeated for an aggregate of six (6) hours. Similarly, per §§17.5.1.1 and 17.9.1.4, “mechanical restraints” can be "stacked" resulting in 2 hours of mechanical restraint, followed by a 10 minute break, followed by another 2 hours of mechanical restraint. Temporal limits on “consecutive minutes” of a restrictive procedure (e.g. §17.7.5 and 17.9.1.4) are easily circumvented by allowing short breaks to toilet or stretch. DFS may wish to consult DPBHS to assess whether the above regulations conform to contemporary clinical standards in the field. The Terry Center has converted its former seclusion room to a children’s store.

9. There is some “tension” between §3.12.10.1.3 and 17.5.1.1. The former section contemplates the release of a child from a restraint after no more than 15 minutes while the latter would authorize restraint for at least 2 hours.

10. In §3.5.5, DFS requires a “direct care worker” (who only needs a high school diploma) to be at least 21 years of age. Some states have promoted college students working as support staff in group homes and similar facilities since they generally represent a demographic group with some intellectual wherewithal. Students seeking degrees in social work, psychology, etc. may be very interested in working in an RTC or specialized child care setting for experience. However, since §3.5.5 requires a direct care worker to be 21, many college students would be categorically barred from such employment. DFS could consider either: a) reducing the age to 18; or 2) adopting a standard of
at least 21 or, if the applicant is a college student, 18. DFS could also consider only allowing employment of 18-20 year old college students with a minimum number of credits in a social services field (e.g. social work; psychology).

11. In §3.12.5.5, DFS may wish to add a reference to referrals to the Pathways to Employment program for qualifying adolescents. See 17 DE Reg. 1070 (May 1, 2014).

12. There are several authorizations to use restraint to prevent destruction of property. See, e.g. §4.4, definition of “non-violent physical intervention strategies”; and §3.12.10.1.2. When the Legislature adopted S.B. No. 100 in 2013, it did not authorize use of restraints in public school educational settings based on property destruction. See 14 Del.C. §4112F(b)(2). If a child is tearing paper, throwing a pencil or eraser, or ripping buttons off his/her clothes, the DFS regulation authorizes use of physical and possibly mechanical restraint. DFS may wish to at least consider a more “restrained” authorization. For example, if the property destruction implicates a threat of bodily harm (e.g. throwing a desk or punching a wall), restraint may be justified. The DFS regulation is simply too “loose” in authorizing restraint based on any, even minor, property destruction.

13. Section 4.7.1 can be interpreted in two ways: a) facilities must be free of lead paint hazards if they accept kids under 6 who either have an intellectual disability or severe emotional disturbance; or b) facilities must be free of lead paint hazards if they accept kids under age 6 OR with intellectual disabilities of any age OR with severe emotional disturbance of any age. We suspect DFS intends the latter. Moreover, the term “severely emotionally disturbed” violates Title 29 Del.C. §608 and should be modified. The regulation should include more strident language that would require the remediation of lead paint.


15. Section 3.12.10.1.4 requires persons implementing physical intervention strategies to be “specifically trained in its use...and have current certification, if applicable.” This is a rather ambiguous standard. When is a certification applicable? Does some in-house training suffice?

The Developmental Disabilities Council appreciates this opportunity to provide comment regarding this Regulation. We thank you in advance for your sincere consideration of our remarks. Should you have questions of us please contact us at 302.739.3333.

Sincerely,

Diann Jones
Chair

cc. State Council for Persons with Disabilities
Governor’s Advisory Council for Exceptional Citizens