

Mandatory Outpatient Treatment (MOT) for Juveniles

November 13, 2015

Rita Romano

Emergency Services Division Manager

Prince William County

Community Services Board

Questions

- Is Prince William County CSB using MOT for juveniles and if so, is it effective?
- If not using MOT for juveniles, why not?

MOT for Juveniles

- Yes, Prince William County CSB is using MOT for adults and for juveniles
- Prince William County was one of the first CSBs to significantly use the new MOT laws
- In FY15 a total of 70 MOTs were ordered, none of which were for a juvenile
 - 55 were ordered into direct MOT
 - 12 were ordered involuntary & MOT
 - 3 were ordered by petitioning after commitment hearing
- Starting in 2012 a total of 3 juvenile MOTs
 - Outcomes-All participated in continued treatment after their MOT
 - One continued with OP therapy; one completed Snowden's Partial Hospitalization Program and then continued in OP therapy; one was seen by CSB therapist until accepted in the Keller Center after school program (3 hours, 3 times a week)

Why is PWC not using MOT for Juveniles more frequently?

- Juvenile civil commitment hearings are held in the jurisdiction where the juvenile is detained
- PWC does not have any TDO facilities for juveniles, therefore, our jurisdiction does not hold civil commitment hearings for juveniles
 - The MOTs that we have been ordered have been transferred to our jurisdiction by Fairfax County for 2 juveniles detained at Dominion Hospital and by Richmond for 1 juvenile detained at Virginia Treatment Center for Children
- Therefore, our Emergency Services staff who generally participate in locally held hearings do not have the ability to evaluate the juveniles prior to their hearing and do not have input

Adult MOT Laws-Difficult to Follow

- According to Brian Stetting, Policy Director, Treatment Advocacy Center, MOT laws in Virginia are one of the most complex laws in the country

3 Ways to MOT

- Two different groups
 - “Straight” MOT - Majority of cases
 - “Step-Down” MOT
 - CMI followed by possibility of MOT which is one of the outcomes of commitment hearing
 - MOT after person has been ordered into CMA or CMI admission and someone files a motion for MOT hearing


“Straight” MOT

- “Straight” MOT- criteria in the law
 - Person needs to meet commitment criteria
 - Less restrictive alternatives to involuntary inpatient treatment are determined to be appropriate
 - Person is willing and agrees to abide by the treatment plan and has the ability to do so

“Step-Down” MOT Criteria

- “Step-down MOT” Criteria
 - Two ways to get “step-down” MOT ordered
 - As an outcome of a commitment hearing- if the disposition is CMI and
 - Person has been committed on involuntary basis at least twice in past 3 years and has been non-compliant
 - Given treatment history, person appears in need of MOT to prevent relapse or deterioration
 - Person is unlikely to voluntarily participate in OP treatment unless ordered
 - Person is likely to benefit from mandatory outpatient treatment
 - Person has to agree to abide by the discharge plan and has the ability to do so
 - Person no longer needs inpatient hospitalization and requires MOT at time of discharge to prevent relapse or deterioration of his condition
 - After the commitment hearing, before discharge from inpatient treatment –
File a Motion for MOT hearing
 - If individual was ordered into further inpatient treatment and has been through the involuntary commitment process at least twice in past 3 years and has at least 2 CMI or CMA admissions
 - Other criteria the same as “straight” MOT

MOT Statistics for HPRII



Number of MOTs Ordered at Commitment Hearing

	4th Quarter FY15				Fiscal Year to Date FY15			
	MOT only (37.2-817D)	Involuntary and MOT (37.2-817C1)	Cross-Jurisdictional*	Total	MOT only (37.2-817D)	Involuntary and MOT (37.2-817C1)	Cross-Jurisdictional*	Total
Alexandria	5	1	0	6	7	4	0	11
Arlington	1	0	1	1	5	0	3	5
Fairfax	13	0	2	13	68	0	7	68
Loudoun	3	3	2	6	9	13	2	22
Prince William	13	3	1	16	55	12	3	67
Total	35	7	6	42	144	29	15	173

*Of the first and second columns, how many were cross-jurisdictional. These should not be double counted in the total.

Number of Post-Commitment Hearing Predischarge MOT Hearings

	4th Quarter FY15				Fiscal Year to Date FY15			
	CMA (37.2-805)	Involuntary (37.2-817C)	Cross-Jurisdictional*	Total	CMA	Involuntary	Cross-Jurisdictional*	Total
Alexandria	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1
Arlington	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Fairfax	0	0	0	0	2	2	0	4
Loudoun	0	1	1	1	0	1	1	1
Prince William	1	0	0	1	3	0	1	3
Total	1	1	1	2	5	4	2	9

*Of the first and second columns, how many were cross-jurisdictional. These should not be double counted in the total.

Post-Commitment Hearing Predischarge MOT Hearing Dispositions

	4th Quarter FY15				Fiscal Year to Date FY15			
	CMA - MOT Ordered	CMA - MOT Not ordered	Involuntary -MOT ordered	Involuntary - MOT Not Ordered	CMA - MOT Ordered	CMA - MOT Not ordered	Involuntary -MOT ordered	Involuntary - MOT Not Ordered
Alexandria	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1
Arlington	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Fairfax	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0
Loudoun	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0
Prince William	1	0	0	0	3	0	1	0
Total	1	0	1	0	3	0	5	1

Mandatory Outpatient Treatment Follow-Up Hearings and Outcomes

		# of hearings held for services that cannot be provided (37.2-817H)	# of dispositions where court supported MOT not being provided	# of MOT Review (37.2-817.1B) Hearings held	# of Material non-compliance findings at Review Hearing			# of petitions filed by CSB to rescind MOT (37.2-817.3)	# of MOTs rescinded	# of hearings held for Continuation of MOT (37.2-817.4)	# of MOTs continued at Hearing	
					Inpatient Admission	Continue/Extend MOT	Rescind MOT					
Alexandria (4th Qtr FY15)	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Arlington (4th Qtr FY15)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Fairfax (4th Qtr FY15)	11	0	0	2	0	0	2	2	2	0	0	2
Loudoun (4th Qtr FY15)	3	0	0	5	0	0	4	0	0	0	0	0
Prince William (4th Qtr FY15)	15	1	1	2	0	1	1	2	2	0	0	1
Total (4th Qtr FY15)	30	1	1	9	0	0	7	4	4	0	0	3

** - PWC - 1 client appealed to Circuit Court nad his MOT order was overturned, 1 was dismissed locally due to client not being properly served and 1 petition was not accepted by OOA Court (Petersburg). Both were CMI under the TDO petition; Ffx - 7 were transferred to another CSB

*or less if period of MOT order <90 days