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Objectives:

• To provide an overview of the project, its scope and methodologies to reduce the utilization of seclusion and restraint practices in an inpatient neurobehavioral unit

• To discuss the significance and role of the treatment culture as a major agent of change

• To discuss the importance of identifying high consumers and promoting the development of alternative treatment strategies
The problem:

Patient population with a high rate of events posing potential harm to self or others
High frequency and intensity
The baseline period:
Prior to initiating the project the average number of restraint and seclusion events per month were 45-50
The project initiative:
To reduce the number and duration of events requiring physical restraint by staff members and placement in a locked seclusion room
Resetting the “Go or No Go Response”
Assisting staff with identifying if physical response is needed
Reframing aggressive behavior

Understanding how our response may sustain or foster aggression
The setting: A 28-bed inpatient neurobehavioral rehabilitation with a secure environment
The persons served:
Adults, male and female with Traumatic or Acquired Brain Injury and a co-occurring psychiatric diagnosis
Demographics:
Male: 63%
Female: 37%
Average Age: 41
Average Age at onset: 27
OVERVIEW

• Our Goal: To Reduce Restraints
• Our Plan: Implement Change Agents
  – Create a program CPI-Response Team
  – Improve/enhance CPI training
  – Utilize post-event reviews
• Results: Decreased R/S & Injuries
Goals for the ORGANIZATION:

- Move to a “Zero Restraint” culture
- Enhance patients rights
- Decrease workplace injuries
- Comply with regulatory standards
Goals for PATIENTS:

- Increase opportunities to alternative programs
- Improve safety and quality of life
- Promote greater independence with positive support
Goals for STAFF:

- **Increase** use of alternative program strategies
- **Decrease** event frequency and duration
- Provide ongoing training
- Decrease workplace injuries
METHODOLOGIES
METHODOLOGIES

• Developing Response Teams comprised of highly trained staff
• Restructuring CPI training
• Initiating Event Reviews for all response calls, including those events which did not require restraint
CREATING A PROGRAM:
CPI-Response Team

Create response teams made up of highly trained responders to attend to all events.
Response Team Strategies

• Response Teams are activated to areas where assistance is needed through an intercom system.
Response Team Strategies

By using response teams, we reduce the number of individuals participating in a behavioral event.
Response Team Strategies

- By reducing the number of responders in a behavioral event, we “remove the audience”

- In turn, we reduce external stimuli.

- Which in turn supports verbal de-escalation by reducing stimuli
Response Team Strategies

- Each restraint or seclusion requires a staff debriefing.
  - JC, CMS standard (meeting the standard)

- We conduct staff debriefings on ALL events.
- Especially those that don’t end in R/S.
- We learn the most from these.
  - Exceeding the standards
The program and its results are also part of a continuous performance improvement project.

Brookhaven is stabilizing and maintaining a new culture.
RESTRUCTURED TRAINING

- Increase the quality of training for:
  - CPI-RT members
  - General staff

- Revise restraint training curriculum to better address brain injury issues

- Increase training opportunities with additional trainers and classes
TRAINING

- Unify training curriculum to teach material similarly

- Evaluate each event through “debriefing” including non-restraint events
Rule of 2’s

Behavior = Verbal or physical

Verbal = No Restraint
Physical = Restraint
TRAINING:
Responding to Verbal Acting Out

- Recognize that verbal behavior may escalate

and

- A restraint is not required, and...
What goes up must come down!
TRAINING:
Responding to Verbal Behavior

• Verbal acting out does not require physical force

• The highest level of energy exerted is not sustainable by patient or staff

• Allow the individual the chance to de-escalate without bringing physical force into the equation
Verbal acting out ≠ Restraint
There are only two ways to act out:

- Verbal
- Physical
Verbal can escalate into physical
TRAINING: Responding to Physical Acting Out

• When does physical acting out by a patient require a restraint (physical response) by staff?
When its a danger to self or others?
Methods of Measurement

- Implemented logging all events that require an intervention by our response team, regardless of outcome.

- Evaluate event log each month for; Restraints, Seclusions, and those events that successfully resolve without R/S.
Measurement

- Identify “high consumers”
- Identify staff members involved with “high consumers”
- Identify other trends: time of day, types of behaviors exhibited, responses to those behaviors.
Average Number of Restraints per month

Baseline | Year 1 | Year 2 | Year 3
---|---|---|---

Diagram showing the average number of restraints per month over three years, with Baseline showing the highest restraints and Year 3 showing the lowest.
Lowering the threshold

- Highly skilled & trained CPI-RT members respond to events

- Resetting the response behaviors of those staff on the CPI-RT’s
Moving towards “Zero”

- Re-establishing specific responses for specific behavior.

- Providing alternatives to staff and thus creating alternatives for patients.
Attaining durable results by conducting event reviews and incorporating examples of success in future training.
Maintaining forward momentum through staff recognition
Summary

Our Goal: To Reduce Restraints

Our Plan: Implement Change Agents:
- Create a program CPI-RT
- Improve CPI training
- Post event reviews

Results: Decreased R/S & decreased injuries
STANDARDS OF CARE

- **CMS issued regulations on restraints in 2006:**
  Face to face evaluations by an LIP during a restraint became a requirement

- **JC issued standards on restraints in 2009:**
  Standards regarding the appropriate use of restraints and seclusions, as well as conducting debriefings

- **ANA issued a position statement in 2012:**
  Reduction of patient restraint and seclusions in healthcare settings
Resources

- www.crisisprevention.com
Questions?

Note: this presentation can be downloaded at www.traumaticbraininjury.net under “Resources”
Thank you!