



LEARNING COMMUNITY SUPPORTS INTERAGENCY PLANNING FOR Youth with Co-occurring Intellectual/ Developmental Disabilities and Mental Health Disorders

Public systems are confronted with obstacles when providing for children with intellectual/developmental disabilities (IDD) who also have mental health or behavioral disorders. Many among this very diverse group of children and youth encounter restricted access to essential supports. Their behavioral difficulties and distress are often misunderstood and sometimes ignored. Since our national and states' public and private systems and categorical funding are not consistently structured to address their needs, these children and youth are at high risk for expensive and preventable out-of-home placements in foster care, juvenile detention, psychiatric institutions and developmental disabilities centers, as well as homelessness or incarceration as adults. Many individuals face a series of disrupted placements and long-term confinement, as well as medically preventable acute psychiatric inpatient and emergency room treatment. Children and youth with IDD experience serious trauma at rates far higher than their peers, including bullying, teasing, and physical, emotional and sexual abuse, which often does not receive needed attention. As a group, they may suffer from significant medical problems as well. Stress for parents can be severe and unrelenting, especially when their children are excluded from community-based public programs or offered services that do not match their needs. In some states families find they are unable to obtain intensive services that their children need unless they relinquish custody to state authorities.

Prevalence

Approximately 13% of children under 18 in the US have a developmental disorder (CDC, 2012). Reliable population-based estimates are not yet available to clarify the proportion who also have mental health disorders. Studies have documented that 30-50% of children and adolescents with Intellectual Disability (ID) have co-occurring mental health disorders or challenging behavior. Very high rates of co-occurring emotional disorders are also found among children with developmental disorders such as Autism Spectrum Disorders (41-70%), Cerebral Palsy, and Epilepsy, including those who have normal intellectual levels (Jacobstein 2014). Since there are many children with IDD and many with emotional disorders in child welfare and juvenile justice settings, it is probable that there are many with co-occurring disorders, as well. The limited data available on prevalence of IDD among children in mental health clinics and psychiatric hospitals suggest that there are many more than generally recognized.

AUTHORED BY

Linda Henderson-Smith, PhD, LPC

Diane Jacobstein, PhD

National Technical Assistance
Center for Children's Mental Health
Georgetown University Center for
Child and Human Development

SEPTEMBER 2015



Rationale for Learning Community

Two important meetings helped to set the stage for Georgetown's Learning Community initiative. In July 2014, thirty-three Children's Mental Health Directors convened for a bi-annual meeting and were polled on their three top concerns or issues. The population of children with co-occurring IDD and mental or behavioral disorders was one of their three highest concerns. The Children's Directors identified the need to develop systems to provide services and supports for this population (funding, services, etc.), as well as the need to develop infrastructure for cross-agency planning, since barriers and service gaps affect all agencies. In October 2014, NADD, the main national association for persons with developmental disabilities and mental health needs, hosted a national forum to address these issues. The forum was organized in response to a position paper entitled *Including Individuals with Intellectual/Developmental Disabilities and Co-Occurring Mental Illness: Challenges that Must Be Addressed in Health Care Reform* (NADD, 2013). The meeting's purpose was to develop a strategic plan to ensure that people with co-occurring IDD and mental illness receive the quality of care necessary for successful community-based living, including long term supports, mental and physical health care. The importance of state infrastructure development and cross-agency collaboration at the state level was emphasized in the forum and in planning for a full year of work on this issue. Georgetown's Learning Community was an outgrowth of the University's SAMHSA-funded work over many years to support services and supports for this population and an ongoing partnership with NASMHPD and NADD.

METHODOLOGY

Learning Community Application Process

An email invitation to apply to join the Learning Community was sent in May 2015 to the identified Children's Mental Health Director for each state and US territory. As part of the application, each Children's

Director was required to identify a cross-agency team that would participate in the meetings. The Children's Directors also provided information about the status of their current planning for the identified population and their goals for participating in the initiative. Required members of this team included representatives from state level Medicaid, Education, and IDD agencies. Inclusion of others such as parents, youth, community stakeholders, and other state initiative representatives was also encouraged.

Learning Community Participants

Three states were chosen, each of which was in a different stage of planning for the identified population.

State A—State A's team consisted of representatives from Behavioral Health, Child Welfare, Education, IDD and Financing agencies, the SAMHSA System of Care Expansion Grant, a large Community Mental Health Center, the Developmental Disabilities Council, the Federation of Families Statewide Chapter, and a University Partner. State A had no System of Care (SOC) infrastructure established in the state for any population, however, they were poised to roll out a state-wide initiative. They realized that this population was frequently coming to the state level with crises, with little capacity for the state to find appropriate services and supports, especially in rural areas. State A had one major goal with several objectives. The goal was "functional, short-term implementable approaches to help better serve children, youth and their families." The objectives were to:

- "Increase co-occurring treatment competencies within both the IDD and mental health (MH) treatment systems and strengthen system partnerships for enabling youth to receive services with increased collaboration within both systems when clinically indicated."
- "Strengthen our system to more effectively meet the needs of children and youth in the child welfare system who have co-occurring IDD and MH treatment needs."



- Receive “technical assistance regarding the limited use (4-8 youth a year) of residential placement for children and youth with symptoms and behaviors that are so severe that our existing systems are not equipped to meet their needs.”

State B—State B’s team consisted of representatives from Behavioral Health, IDD, Education, System of Care Expansion Grant, Developmental Disabilities Council, Medicaid, Local Community Mental Health Center, Early Childhood and the Federation of Families Statewide Chapter. State B had a SOC infrastructure at both the local and state levels; however, there was limited connection between the two levels. Some local communities had long-standing and well-developed SOC implementation and the state is working to expand services and supports state-wide over the next several years. State B indicated in their application that they realized this population was currently excluded from their existing SOC and had several goals for their request for technical assistance:

- “Identifying evidence-based treatment and therapeutic services is the uppermost concern for addressing this population.”
- Determining “qualifications of all staff and the appropriate composition of a treatment team, as well as what should residential services look like and what meaningful activities should be provided when individuals are not in school.”

State C—State C’s team consisted of staff representing Behavioral Health, Child Welfare, Juvenile Justice, and Financing agencies, local stakeholders, a university partner and a University Center of Excellence in Developmental Disabilities (UCEDD). State C had a fully implemented SOC infrastructure for children, which included the identified population, however, they indicated that they wanted information on how to cross-train and ensure appropriate services were being provided. Their identified goals were to:

- Develop a training plan.
- Identify evidence-based treatment and therapeutic services.

Learning Community Process

The Learning Community was established with a clear process spread over a four month period (June through September 2015). There were three webinars, one provided each month, three one-hour coaching calls, an on-site technical assistance and planning visit for all three states and resource sharing throughout. To begin the process, each of the three teams was polled for topic areas that would be most helpful. Three topics were agreed upon by all: (1) an overview of the population, (2) best practices in services, supports and workforce development, and (3) financing. These themes were carried throughout the webinars, coaching calls and on-site visits.

RESULTS

Webinars

Three webinars were created for the Learning Community on the identified themes.

Webinar #1–Defining Needs provided an overview of the population, including prevalence, common challenges, public health implications, and impact of system barriers on families and children. *Webinar #2–Best Practices and Workforce Strategies* specified recommendations for comprehensive assessment, supports, service array, and outlined service delivery models, including Systems of Care as understood in the MH field and a national initiative developed for this population by the Center for START Services at the University of New Hampshire. *Webinar #3–Financing* provided information on cross-agency funding opportunities and provided resources, i.e. joint bulletins from the federal government. All three webinars contained additional resources that the state teams could share with others in their state to assist with their planning.

Coaching Calls

The coaching calls for each state were different, but they yielded some shared results. For two of the states, resources and financing were identified early as needs to be explored, so a resource matrix and financing matrix were

developed for their use. Each team modified their goals and plans for on-site technical assistance as they discussed their needs. States A and B elected to focus on a cross-agency implementation plan for policy, state and local infrastructure, and services and supports within a 12-month timeline. State C decided they wanted to obtain buy-in from local partners within their established SOC and to develop a plan for the state that could assist system partners in serving the identified population.

On-Site Visits—Common Themes

Although the three states originally designated workforce development as the target of their planning for the on-site technical assistance visit, some broader needs emerged during the coaching calls. A structured process was used during the site visits to help each team of 10-50 people develop a shared mission statement or vision. Then a detailed analysis of strengths, barriers and opportunities or recommendations was conducted, tailored a bit differently for each state. States A and B designed strategies to address their teams' mission, which was in both cases related to serving children with co-occurring disorders within a SOC framework. State C, having already included this population within their SOC, used the site visit to elicit detailed feedback from partners and other stakeholders and then planned an itemized response to the barriers, concerns and recommendations enumerated. Examples below illustrate strategies designed by the three states to address (1) Policy, (2) State and Local Infrastructure, and (3) Services and Supports, including workforce preparation. The chosen strategies were followed by detailed action steps.

Examples of Strategies Related to Policy

- Review all funding streams for MH and IDD services and align them as best as possible.
- Review Medicaid policy for potential barriers to serving those with co-occurring disorders.
- Cross-walk clinical eligibility requirements for all funding potentially available for this population.

- Review emergency commitment regulations for needed language change for this population.
- Consider how policy may allow for funding of services and supports for those in this population who are also undocumented.
- Explore possible policy change to include intensive home and community based behavioral health providers as providers in the IDD service system.

Examples of Strategies Related to State/Local Infrastructure

- Build on existing state and local SOC infrastructure to include this population.
- Develop feedback and communication loops between state and local structures to provide gap/needs information and to educate the local levels as to changes being made at the state level.
- Develop a comprehensive needs assessment for this population.
- Develop a multi-disciplinary team of providers and state officials (pediatricians, psychologists, dentists, physical therapists, occupational therapists, educators, etc.) to develop strategies for serving this population and to discuss policy barriers to service.
- Support resource networks for all counties.

Examples of Strategies Related to Services/Supports, Including Workforce

- Complete a survey on what practices are currently used for this population.
- Develop or modify educational materials, including provider manuals, best practice guides, and family handbooks, for use by families, providers, and the community to provide guidance on topics such as how to access resources.
- Develop cross-sector training that also serves as relationship-building opportunities for providers in the mental health and IDD systems. This can include, but is not limited to learning communities, cross-sector training opportunities, webinars, etc.
- Develop a comprehensive training plan for providers, communities, parents and other



stakeholders, including a cross-walk of all training opportunities across agencies. Build on training opportunities that already exist, to include online training platforms, training conferences, provider meetings, etc.

- Develop Continuing Education trainings with credits for professionals to learn the needs of this population and best practices.
- Develop a communication and/or marketing plan to ensure that providers and families are aware of training and technical assistance opportunities.
- Expand use of telehealth consultation to increase access to specialists for rural providers and families.

■ LESSONS LEARNED

1. When reflecting on successful planning for this population, the importance of broad cross-agency collaboration cannot be over-emphasized. In each of the three states, thoughtful representatives of many systems participated in all phases of the Learning Community process, gave up time for the two-day planning session and committed to ongoing collaboration on behalf of this population.
2. This is not about integrating two or even three systems. It is rather about creating a comprehensive SOC with multiple agencies working together to serve children with complex needs. It was noteworthy that the teams were eager to embrace SOC values and principles as the foundation for their efforts, as well as to use its well-articulated framework to structure collaboration on behalf of families.
3. Children with complex developmental and behavioral needs should not be considered a separate population. An important theme in each state was inclusion of this population within existing programs and structures, by addressing eligibility issues, providing additional expertise and workforce training and expanding the array of services and supports. There was a fundamental recognition that these are children with many of the same needs as any other children and that working with them is not hard once staff are trained and have appropriate supports.
4. The leadership of the states' Children's Directors was critical, not only because they convened the cross-system alliance, but because they had developed long-standing partnerships and cordial relationships with representatives of other agencies that proved crucial to the outcomes. Support at the Commissioner level was significant and led to cross-agency discussions about this population at the highest state government levels.
5. It was recognized that it is critical to have buy-in from leadership of all child-serving systems at state and local levels. State team members planned after the meetings to reach out to their own leadership and to local interagency teams, providers, and family organizations.
6. Significant cross-agency efforts were devoted to painstaking examination and alignment of policies and financing in order to eliminate barriers to improved outcomes for this population.
7. Though increased funding was a consistent recommendation, states were hopeful that they could address various needs of these children through coordinated use of existing funding.
8. It proved worthwhile to undertake a systematic analysis of service gaps across systems. The states devised creative strategies to address these gaps. One state, for example, received permission from the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services to add a nurse and wellness coach to each Wraparound team to better support children with medical or developmental needs. They also worked out a plan to better support undocumented refugees who were eligible for some services and not others.
9. Each team requested technical assistance around best practices in comprehensive assessment for this population with the intent of augmenting expertise at the local and state levels.

10. Because programs are so complex in each state, it rapidly became clear that people were unaware of many resources provided by other agencies. It proved important for the agencies to discuss their programs to understand where funds and resources reside in each state.
11. Planning for cross-system workforce development addressed multiple levels, in recognition of the need for training for state policy makers, administrators at the local level, providers and families. Creative strategies were proposed, such as working through interagency teams already in place, infusing sessions into numerous annual conferences already in planning, and developing regional or state-wide learning communities.
12. The three states discussed a desire to increase their attention to issues of trauma among children and youth with co-occurring IDD and MH needs.
13. The states developed strategies to share information across their traditionally segregated workforce. As an example, behavioral health providers were not aware of resources in the IDD “world,” such as the University Centers for Excellence in Developmental Disabilities (UCEDDs). Teams developed plans to infuse information through county-based resource networks and develop resource dissemination protocols prepared for all provider and family service agencies.
14. Each state discussed ways to strengthen feedback loops to ensure ongoing information to/from the field and state, for example, by developing or augmenting a communication plan that could be tracked, through a Google Doc form for communication of problems and concerns.
15. Communication with families was addressed. There was discussion of the importance of engaging parents as early as possible, educating parents on navigating the system and developing communication strategies specific to family organizations, including supports for work with families in educational settings.
16. Although long-term goals were sometimes articulated, teams elected to focus only on change that was “doable” within a twelve month period and within each planning team’s sphere of influence. There was a recognition that many well-intentioned planning efforts fail when the goals are too broad. Improved services and supports for children and youth with co-occurring IDD and MH needs requires a culture change that will take time, perseverance and support.

■ FOR FURTHER INFORMATION

- *For further information about the three states*, contact David Miller at NASMHPD at david.miller@nasmhpd.org
- *For general information about individuals with co-occurring I/DD and mental health disorders*, contact Dr. Robert Fletcher of NADD at rfletcher@thenadd.org and visit www.thenadd.org.
- *For information about the Learning Community process, webinars and resources provided to the states*, contact Linda Henderson-Smith, PhD, LPC or Diane Jacobstein, PhD at Georgetown University’s National Technical Assistance Center for Children’s Mental Health, Linda.HendersonSmith@georgetown.edu and jacobstd@georgetown.edu.
- *For general information about the System of Care philosophy and framework*, visit http://gucchdgeorgetown.net/data/documents/SOC_Brief2010.pdf
- *For information about needs of children with co-occurring IDD and mental health disorders and recommended services*, see Jacobstein, D. (2014), *Effective Strategies Checklist: Children and Youth with Developmental Disorders and Challenging Behavior* at <http://gucchdtacenter.georgetown.edu/publications/Effective%20Strategies%20Checklist%20FINAL.pdf>