Psychiatric Residential Treatment Facilities for Child Behavioral Health Services in North Carolina Medicaid

Paul Lanier, PhD[1,2]; Roderick Rose, PhD[3]; Daniel Gibbs, MSW, JD[1]; Jacob Hyman, M.S.[2]; Neil Kamdar, M.A.[2,5]; Joseph Konstanzer, MPH[4] Kristen Hassmiller Lich, PhD[4]

[1]School of Social Work, UNC Chapel Hill, Chapel Hill, NC
[2]Cecil G. Sheps Center for Health Services Research, UNC Chapel Hill, Chapel Hill, NC
[3]School of Social Work, University of Maryland, Baltimore, Maryland
[4]Gillings School of Global Public Health, UNC Chapel Hill, Chapel Hill, NC
[5]Institute for Healthcare Policy and Innovation, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, MI

- Paul Lanier: https://orcid.org/0000-0003-4360-3269
- Roderick Rose: https://orcid.org/0000-0001-5309-4547
- Daniel Gibbs: https://orcid.org/0000-0002-1551-1554
- Kristen Hassmiller Lich: https://orcid.org/0000-0002-3311-42022

Corresponding Author: Paul Lanier, 325 Pittsboro Street, Chapel Hill, NC 27599-3550, planier@unc.edu

Abstract

Background: Psychiatric residential treatment facilities (PRTFs) are a type of non-hospital inpatient treatment setting for children with severe behavioral health disorders. PRTFs are a restrictive and costly form of care that can potentially be avoided with community-based behavioral health services. **Methods**: Statewide Medicaid enrollment and claims data for 2015 to 2021 were used to describe PRTF utilization in North Carolina. We examined annual episodes of care in PRTFs and compared trends before and after the COVID-19 public health emergency. **Results**: In the study period, 7,774 children insured by North Carolina Medicaid entered a PRTF across 11,566 episodes of care at a net cost of over $230 million. In 2021, 34% of children who entered PRTFs were in foster care and 37% of children were placed in PRTFs outside of North Carolina. **Limitations**: Analysis limited to data collected for administrative purposes. **Conclusions**: Current trends indicate ongoing overrepresentation of children in foster care placed in PRTFs and increased out-of-state PRTF placements. Coordinated efforts in future research, policy, and practice are needed to determine the cause of these trends and identify solutions.

Introduction

Over 1 in 5 children in North Carolina (NC) – about 450,000 children statewide – have a mental, emotional, developmental, or behavioral health problem.[1] Federal policy requires that children receive behavioral health services and education in the least restrictive setting possible within their own community.[2] Although many behavioral health challenges can be adequately treated with community-based outpatient services, some children with severe symptoms may require supervised restrictive care.

Psychiatric residential treatment facilities (PRTFs) are defined by the Centers for Medicaid and Medicare Services as a "non-hospital facility with a provider agreement with a State Medicaid Agency to provide the inpatient services benefit to Medicaid-eligible individuals under the age of 21."[3] In NC, children referred to PRTFs must meet the criteria outlined in the Division of Health Benefits' certificate of need[4]: (a) the community's ambulatory care resources do not meet the treatment needs of the recipient; (b) proper treatment of the recipient's condition requires services on an inpatient basis overseen by a physician; (c) inpatient services can reasonably be expected to improve the recipient's condition or prevent further regression so that services will no longer be needed. These criteria ensure that children are only placed in PRTFs because their needs cannot be met in another treatment setting.

Children with mental health challenges are also more likely to come in contact with the child welfare system and to enter foster care.[5,6] Because maltreated children are more likely to need mental health services[7,8], it is understandable that children involved with child welfare are overrepresented in PRTFs. However, when less restrictive child welfare placements (e.g., foster care, kinship care) are unavailable, restrictive settings such as PRTFs are often used as a stable placement, regardless of whether the child's care medically requires this setting. Because Black

and Native American children are overrepresented in the child welfare system[9], understanding the connection between the child welfare system and PRTFs is crucial to promoting racial equity – a stated commitment of the NC Department of Health and Human Services.[10]

Although federal and state policies state that PRTFs should only be used when medically necessary, advocacy groups have raised concerns about the financial and ethical costs of overutilizing PRTFs.[11] Concerningly, children already in foster care placement are at highest risk of unnecessary placement in restrictive care. Thus, while overuse of PRTFs indicates a clear clinical need in a population, it also reflects that population's poor access to quality community-based services. Monitoring PRTF utilization rates and trends is crucial to ensuring appropriate treatment is available to children, particularly those already in contact with the child welfare system.

National Studies

PRTFs' national usage rates are neither regularly monitored nor comprehensively understood. A 2015 CMS report identified 384 PRTFs in the U.S., with nine operating in NC and 20 states with zero PRTFs.[12] From 2008 to 2011, the federally-funded Community-Based Alternatives to PRTFs Demonstration project provided a Medicaid reimbursement waiver in nine states to provide services via a systems of care approach that enabled children eligible for PRTFs to receive care in their home and communities instead.[13] The evaluation found the Demonstration "easily met cost-effectiveness tests and on average has consistently maintained or improved functional status for all children and youth."[13,14] Yet aside from this Demonstration evaluation, there are no known national studies of PRTFs. Even less is known about PRTFs' effectiveness. The one recent systematic review of relevant peer-reviewed literature found mixed evidence of efficacy in improving child outcomes from generally low-quality studies.[15]

Studies of PRTFs in NC

Two studies and one recent report examined PRTF use in NC. A 2012 study used Medicaid data to identify 2,157 youth admitted to PRTFs between 2008 and 2011.[16] The number of youth served by PRTFs almost doubled in the study period from 752 in 2009 to 1,410 in 2011. The study also sought to determine whether the profile of the youth population in PRTFs met the criteria established by the 2007 clinical coverage policy. Like NC's current policy, the 2007 policy required children to demonstrate clinical need and that other less restrictive options were first tried and found unsuccessful. By analyzing Medicaid claims data, the authors concluded NC's youth in PRTFs generally met these criteria: all had a psychiatric diagnosis, about half had a prior inpatient psychiatric hospitalization, and most had received other less restrictive forms of community-based treatment prior to entering a PRTF. However, the study did not explore factors associated with PRTF use or whether specific groups were more likely to enter PRTFs.

A 2015 study linked Medicaid claims data to other services databases to examine connections between youth's use of PRTF, the income maintenance system, and child welfare services between 2007 and 2012.[17–19] The study identified 2,730 youth from child welfare or income maintenance systems also admitted to PRTFs and, like the 2012 study, found that PRTF use rose during the study period. This study also yielded new findings about children's experiences before, during, and after stays in PRTFs for the first time. First, recidivism was high: about one-third of children discharged later returned to a PRTF, on average 18 months after discharge. Second, medication use was very high among this group: about 85% of the youth in the sample were prescribed a psychotropic medication, 75% were prescribed an antipsychotic, and 66% were prescribed three or more psychotropic medications. Third, use of community-based services before and after care was surprisingly low given the youth's high level of need. Only

50% had a prior claim for family therapy, 69% for individual therapy, and 42% had prior residential treatment. In multivariable models predicting whether PRTFs were used, clinical need (particularly a trauma-related diagnosis) strongly predicted PRTF entry. Notably, contact with other public systems (specifically foster care) also emerged as a consistently strong predictor of PRTF use. That is, while children entering PRTFs have high levels of mental health concerns, the association between system contact and PRTF entry suggests factors beyond clinical need may be driving PRTF utilization.

In 2020, the NC Department of Public Instruction, in conjunction with the NC Department of Health and Human Services' Division of Mental Health, Developmental Disabilities, and Substance Abuse Services and Division of Health Service Regulation, provided a descriptive report to the NC General Assembly about the education of children in PRTFs.[20] The report identified 15 contracts for educational services in 30 PRTFs. The contracted PRTFs reported educating 1,051 children, including 429 identified as "exceptional children" with an individualized education plan. The extent of the report's assessment of child outcomes was its finding that 85% of children were discharged (after an average 190-day length of stay) with an education plan in place. The report's two recommendations were to improve collaboration between education and treatment staff and to improve interagency coordination.

Aims of the Current Study

This study aimed to describe the population of children insured by NC Medicaid who received mental health services through PRTF placements. Two key indicators of concern were assessed over time to examine recent utilization trends: (a) the proportion of children in PRTFs who were also in the public foster care system, and (b) the proportion of children placed in PRTFs out-of-state. We focus on these indicators because they represent aspects of service utilization which

state agencies can potentially influence, as the state, through local social service agencies, assumes responsibility for the care of children in foster care. Thus, where children in foster care receive treatment for mental health concerns is the state and county government's responsibility. Further, the licensing and availability of PRTFs within NC can be directly influenced by funding and regulatory decisions of the NC General Assembly and the NC Department of Health and Human Services. Beyond these two key indicators, we gathered descriptive information about the demographic, clinical, and service characteristics of children who entered PRTFs from 2015 to 2021. This data's recency also enabled us to examine whether the COVID-19 pandemic was associated with any substantial changes in children placed in PRTFs.

Methods

Data and Study Population

This descriptive observational study relied solely on a limited data set of Medicaid eligibility and claims files provided by the NC Division of Health Benefits to the UNC Cecil G. Sheps Center for Health Services Research through the Carolina Cost and Quality Initiative. The secondary data files contain a census of Medicaid members and services in NC between calendar years 2015 and 2021. The sampling frame for this study was children and youth (ages six to 21 years) at the time of PRTF admission enrolled in NC Medicaid. Based on annual enrollment reports, the overall size of child NC Medicaid population was relatively stable during this time period.[21] The study protocol was reviewed and determined to be exempt by the UNC Office of Human Research Ethics.

Measures and Analysis

PRTF usage was identified leveraging institutional and professional claims. For institutional claims, we used revenue center code 0911 and either a billing or rendering provider taxonomy code of 323P00000X. Since professional claims did not include a revenue center code, PRTF usage was identified solely based on billing or rendering provider taxonomy code of 323P00000X. Since youth can be re-admitted to PRTFs and have varying lengths of stay, PRTF utilization was defined and calculated as an episode of care (EOC). A PRTF EOC was defined as 3 or more continuous days of care. PRTF stays separated by 30 or more days were counted as a new EOC. We calculated the annual number of unique children as well as a count of total EOCs. Before and after COVID-19 (defined as March 1, 2020) counts of children who received PRTF services were based on admission dates and children were described using demographic characteristics defined in Medicaid data: race (White, Black, American Indian, Asian/Pacific Islander, other); ethnicity (Hispanic, non-Hispanic); and gender (male, female). Diagnoses during the EOC were identified using *International Classification of Diseases, 9th and 10th Revisions,* ICD-9 (up to September 2015) and ICD-10 codes. Medications during the EOC for attention deficit hyperactivity disorder (ADHD) as well as anxiolytics, antidepressants, antipsychotics, and mood stabilizers were identified by *American Hospital Formulary Service* therapeutic classification code.

PRTF location (i.e., in or out-of-state) was identified using billing provider state code to classify the provider location. Foster care service recipients were identified using enrollment data within 30 days of the beginning or end of the EOC indicating the specific Medicaid foster care program type. The aggregate net paid amount reimbursed for PRTF services by Medicaid each year was calculated. The net paid amount is much lower than the billed amount but represents the actual amount reimbursed. We inflation adjusted the net paid amount from using the Bureau of Labor

Statistics Consumer Price Index to the most recent year in the study period (2021). All data management and analyses were performed in SAS Version 9.4 (SAS Institute, Cary, NC).

Results

From 2015 to 2021, 11,566 PRTF episodes of cares were reimbursed for 7,774 children insured by NC Medicaid. Annual net paid amounts ranged from $28 million to $54 million for a total seven-year expenditure of $230 million in 2021 dollars. On average annually, 1,110 children were admitted to PRTFs over 1,652 EOCs. After peaking in 2017, the number of children and EOCs decreased each year through 2021. However, in 2021 the proportion of children in foster care peaked at 34% as did the proportion of PRTF placement out-of-state (37%).

Table 1 compares the demographic characteristics, diagnoses, and select medications prescribed in PRTFs before and after March 2020. We observed slight increases in the proportions of PRTF admittees identified as female (41% to 44%), White (58% to 60%), and American Indian (1.4% to 2.0%). Most diagnoses (ADHD, DBD, psychotic disorder, substance use disorder, learning and intellectual disorders) remained stable pre- and post-COVID periods. However, diagnoses for anxiety disorders (18% to 26% post-COVID) and PTSD (17% to 24% post-COVID) increased. From 2015 to 2021, we also observed an increase in the proportion of children who received ADHD medication, antipsychotics, and antidepressants. Notably, about 90% of PRTF EOCs included a prescription for an antipsychotic medication, although less than 3% had an associated psychotic disorder diagnosis.

Discussion

NC, like the rest of the U.S., is experiencing a children's mental health crisis. The American Academy of Pediatrics and other national groups recently declared a national emergency soon

followed by an advisory from the U.S. Surgeon General. Facing a marked increase in service needs, states must decide *where* and *what type* of care children will receive. This analysis shows that prior to COVID and through the end of 2021, NC used PRTFs to provide care to about 1,000 children each year. Our analyses highlight four concerning trends that must inform NC's ongoing response to the current crisis.

First, the increase in the proportion of children placed in out-of-state facilities (from 15% in 2016 to 37% in 2021) foregrounds potentially troubling systemic factors. This increase could reflect a decrease in in-state bed capacity or increases in lengths of stay, given the recently decreasing number of children placed in PRTFs annually. Alternatively, this trend could indicate that children placed in PRTFs increasingly have specialized care needs that can only be met by facilities with unique programming or specialties not available in NC's PRTFs. This might also reflect that NC only guarantees in-state treatment up to age 18, whereas Medicaid ensures care up to age 21.[22] Regardless, out-of-state placements' potential distance from children's home communities, combined with PRTFs' restrictiveness, could pose risks to children's development of social connections and supports. Moreover, lack of direct oversight and legal jurisdiction in out-of-state PRTFs could create legal and logistical barriers to ensuring proper care. Further research should investigate the factors contributing to this increase in out-of-state placements and the potential for disparate outcomes between children placed within or outside of their home communities.

Second, the overrepresentation of children in foster care within PRTFs is exceptionally concerning. In NC, about 9,000 children (ages 6-17 years) are in foster care annually,[23] a relatively small proportion (< 1%) of that age group statewide.[24] However, children in foster care constituted 29-34% of PRTF placements, depending on the year. This consistent,

disproportionately high rate of PRTF placement for youth in foster care indicates that the capacity and effectiveness of community-based supports for system-involved youth are lacking. Although the prevalence of serious mental health challenges are higher among children in foster care, it is not clear that the overrepresentation can be explained by need alone.[8] In fact, a study examining PRTF entries among children in NC with a maltreatment investigation from 2012 to 2017 found that children who entered foster care were over 10 times more likely to enter a PRTF, after controlling for other factors.[17] The current study's findings reinforce concerns that (a) residential treatment may be overutilized for the foster care population in order to provide structured placement options for children with placement instability and (b) children are possibly being removed to foster care to facilitate mental health treatment when their needs exceed the capabilities of their families of origin. The many potential individual-, contextual-, and system-level drivers and decision-making processes potentially producing this glaring disparity are likely complex and demand further empirical examination and reform efforts.

Third, the uptick in PRTF placement rates for female and American Indian children merits further exploration. These groups' increased rates of placement might illustrate an overall system effort to connect these historically underserved groups with treatment. On the other hand, this trend could point to growing mental health needs among these populations or reflect the further entrenchment of systemic biases. Future studies should examine both the extent to which need accounts for the rise in placement among these groups and whether the strength of the relationship between need and placement rates differs across gender, racial, and other demographic categorizations.

Fourth, our analysis shows an increase in psychotropic medication prescriptions and in internalizing disorders often associated with trauma (i.e., anxiety and PTSD). However, the fact

that nine out of 10 PRTF placements included a prescription for antipsychotic drugs, the overwhelming majority did *not* include diagnosis for a psychotic disorder, corroborates prior suggestions that these medications are being overutilized potentially for general behavioral management. Some antipsychotic medications have been approved for use by youth diagnosed with certain conditions (Tourette's syndrome, certain forms of bipolar disorder, and for irritability associated with autism spectrum disorder), at select ages.[25] However, in many cases (e.g., for DBD), antipsychotic medications are prescribed off-label.[26] Child psychiatry experts have long warned that improperly prescribed antipsychotic medications might yield adverse side effects and negative outcomes.[27]

Limitations

First, this study is descriptive, and we do not suggest PRTF stays are caused by any youth characteristics, or vice versa. Second, "out-of-state" as an indicator of a youth's distance from their home community is somewhat crude. For example, some youth whose communities are near the borders of other states may be closer to home at an out-of-state facility than at another facility located in a distant part of NC. Third, diagnosis codes in claims data are entered for reimbursement purposes and it is possible a youth was misdiagnosed, meaning that the diagnoses codes appearing in these claims might not reflect the underlying disorder. Similarly, claims for prescribed drugs do not reflect that the drugs were taken. Further, prescription claims do not have an associated diagnosis field, and it is therefore not possible to know why any medication was prescribed.

Conclusion

Ideally, youth with behavioral health needs will be treated in their communities, receiving individual and family services from nearby outpatient clinics, and in many cases supplemented by appropriate medications with proven safety and efficacy. As a last resort, some youth with more substantial mental and behavioral health needs may need a more intensive level of care, potentially supervised in a PRTF. PRTFs have the potential to offer appropriate, high-quality care, but serious concerns remain about the effectiveness of care delivered in PRTF settings and about the safety and well-being of children in low-quality PRTFs.[11,15]

Three themes emerged from our descriptive study of youth placed in PRTFs from 2015 to 2021. First, the rate of out-of-state placement has grown, potentially putting greater distance between youth and their families, and leaving children exposed to other jurisdictional standards and laws. Second, children in foster care are over-represented in these facilities by a factor of 35 or greater, suggesting that other factors besides behavioral health need—such as placement needs—are at work. Improved coordination between behavioral health and social service systems at local, county, and state levels is desperately needed. Third, youth in PRTFs are prescribed antipsychotic medications at an alarming rate. Further research is needed to determine the appropriateness of prescribing behaviors and support dissemination of best practices that minimize potential overprescribing. PRTFs will likely continue to be a critical provider in the children's mental health service system, particularly given the alarming trends in children's mental health needs in the post-COVID era. Yet given these trends, policymakers and stakeholders should ask more questions about the quality of care provided in PRTFs and demand accountability where care is inadequate.

Acknowledgements: We would like to acknowledge partners at the North Carolina Division of Child and Family Well-Being and the North Carolina Division of Health Benefits who provided input and expertise on this study. The database infrastructure used for this project was funded by the Cecil G. Sheps Center for Health Services Research; the Department of Health Policy and Management; UNC Gillings School of Global Public Health; the CER Strategic Initiative of UNC's Clinical and Translational Science Award (UL1TR001111); and the UNC School of Medicine.

Tables and Figures

Table 1. Demographic characteristics, diagnoses, and prescription drugs for episodes of care in PRTFs in North Carolina before and after March 2020

		Pre-COVID-19 (n = 9057) Jan. 2015 to Feb. 2020		Post-COVID (n = 2509) Mar. 2020 to Dec. 2021	
		n	%	n	%
Demographic Characteristics					
Race	American Indian	126	1.4%	49	2.0%
	Asian/Pacific Islander	62	0.7%	<10	-
	Black or African American	3501	38.7%	938	37.4%
	White	5210	57.5%	1499	59.7%
Gender (Female)		3720	41.1%	1101	43.9%
Ethnicity (Hispanic)		513	5.7%	136	5.4%
Foster Care (Yes)		2757	30.4%	823	32.8%
Diagnoses					
ADHD		1311	14.5%	402	16.0%
Anxiety		1664	18.4%	658	26.2%
PTSD		1504	16.6%	593	23.6%
Disruptive Behavior Disorder		3235	35.7%	880	35.1%
Depression		1302	14.4%	320	12.8%
Psychotic Disorder		214	2.4%	37	1.5%
Substance Use Disorder		204	2.3%	49	2.0%
Learning or Intellectual Disability Disorder		89	1.0%	51	2.0%
Prescription Drugs					
ADHD Medication		4120	45.5%	1359	54.2%
Antipsychotic Medication		7989	88.2%	2255	89.9%
Anxiolytics		411	4.5%	116	4.6%
Antidepressants		5023	55.5%	1482	59.1%
Mood Stabilizer		4389	48.5%	1151	45.9%

Note: Exact counts for cells <10 are suppressed per Medicaid policy



Figure 1. Annual Counts of Children, Episodes of Care, and Expenditures for PRTFs in North Carolina.



Figure 2. Proportion of NC Children in PRTFs in Foster Care and Out-of-State Increasing over Time

References

1. Child and Adolescent Health Measurement Initiative. 2019-2020 National Survey of Children's Health (NSCH) data query. Data Resource Center for Child and Adolescent Health. Accessed November 1, 2022. http://www.childhealthdata.org/
2. Stone D. The least restrictive environment for providing education, treatment, and community services for persons with disabilities: Rethinking the concept. Touro Law Review, 2019;35(1):69.
3. Centers for Medicaid and Medicare Services. What is a PRTF? Accessed November 1, 2022. https://www.cms.gov/medicare/provider-enrollment-and-certification/certificationandcomplianc/downloads/whatisaprtf.pdf
4. North Carolina Division of Health Benefits. NC Medicaid Psychiatric Residential Treatment Facilities Clinical Coverage Policy 8D-1. Accessed November 1, 2022. https://files.nc.gov/ncdma/documents/files/8D-1.pdf
5. Leslie LK, Hurlburt MS, James S, Landsverk J, Slymen DJ, Zhang J. Relationship between entry into child welfare and mental health service use. Psychiatr Serv. 2005;56(8):981-987. doi:10.1176/appi.ps.56.8.981
6. Barth RP, Rozeff LJ, Kerns SEU, Baldwin MJ. Partnering for success: Implementing a cross-systems collaborative model between behavioral health and child welfare. Child Youth Serv Rev. 2020;117:104663. doi:10.1016/j.childyouth.2019.104663
7. Stiffman AR, Pescosolido B, Cabassa LJ. Building a model to understand youth service access: The gateway provider model. Ment Health Serv Res. 2004;6(4):189-198. doi:10.1023/B:MHSR.0000044745.09952.33

8. Burns BJ, Phillips SD, Wagner HR, et al. Mental health need and access to mental health services by youths involved with child welfare: A national survey. J Am Acad Child Adolesc Psychiatry. 2004;43(8):960-970. doi:10.1097/01.chi.0000127590.95585.65

9. U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Administration for Children and Families, Children's Bureau. Child welfare practice to address racial disproportionality and disparity. Child Welfare Information Gateway. 2021. Accessed November 1, 2022. https://www.childwelfare.gov/pubs/issue-briefs/racial-disproportionality/

10. North Carolina Department of Health and Human Services. NCDHHS signs health equity pledge to leverage data in addressing disparities, continuing work to embed equity into programs. October 26, 2021. Accessed November 1, 2022. https://www.ncdhhs.gov/news/press-releases/2021/10/26/ncdhhs-signs-health-equity-pledge-leverage-data-addressing-disparities-continuing-work-embed-equity

11. National Disability Rights Network. Desperation without dignity: Conditions of children placed in for profit residential facilities. 2021. Accessed November 1, 2022. https://www.ndrn.org/wp-content/uploads/2021/10/NDRN_Desperation_without_Dignity_Final.pdf

12. Ajuonuma P. Psychiatric residential treatment facilities (PRTF). Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services. Accessed November 1, 2022. https://www.cms.gov/Outreach-and-Education/American-Indian-Alaska-Native/AIAN/PRTFGeneralRequirementsandConditionsofParticipation.pdf

13. Urdapilleta O, Kim G, Howard J, Waterman G. National evaluation of the Medicaid demonstration waiver home- and community-based alternatives to psychiatric residential treatment facilities. National Wraparound Initiative. May 30, 2012. Accessed November 1, 2022. https://nwi.pdx.edu/pdf/nationalevaluationPRTF.pdf

14. U.S. Department of Health & Human Services, Office of the Secretary. Report to the President and Congress, Medicaid Home and Community-Based Alternatives to Psychiatric Residential Treatment Facilities Demonstration; U.S. Department of Health & Human Services, Office of the Secretary: Washington, DC, USA, 2013.

15. Lanier P, Jensen T, Bryant K, et al. A systematic review of the effectiveness of children's behavioral health interventions in psychiatric residential treatment facilities. Child Youth Serv Rev. 2020;113:104951. doi:10.1016/j.childyouth.2020.104951

16. Bruton, J.; Blackmon, A.; Wiford, C.; Burns, B.; Maultsby, L. Evaluation of Psychiatric Residential Treatment Facility Use by North Carolina Children for Fiscal Years 2009–2011. Access September 26, 2017. http://serp.duhs.duke.edu/PDF/PRTF_Evaluation_Report.pdf

17. Lanier P. Admission to psychiatric residential treatment facilities among youth from families investigated for maltreatment. J Child Fam Stud. 2017;26(1):306-316. doi:10.1007/s10826-016-0541-3

18. Rose RA, Lanier P. A longitudinal study of child maltreatment and mental health predictors of admission to psychiatric residential treatment facilities. Int J Env Res Public Health. 2017;14(10):1141. doi:10.3390/ijerph14101141

19. Lanier P, Rose R, Nelson G, Marsh S, Owen M, McMahon J. North Carolina children at the intersection of the child welfare and behavioral health systems: Enhancing our understanding of psychiatric residential treatment facility populations. 2015.

20. North Carolina Department of Public Instruction and Department of Health and Human Services. Report to the North Carolina General Assembly on the education of children in private psychiatric residential treatment facilities (SL 2014-100, SB 744). January 15, 2016. Accessed October 4, 2022. https://www.ncdhhs.gov/media/542/download

21. NC Medicaid, Division of Health Benefits. NC Medicaid and NC Health Choice enrollment reports, 2017 and 2021. Accessed October 4, 2022. https://medicaid.ncdhhs.gov/nc-medicaid-and-nc-health-choice-enrollment-reports

22. Herr M. Outsourcing our children: The failure to treat mental illness in-state. North Carolina Central Law Review. 2013;36(1):66-103. https://archives.law.nccu.edu/ncclr/vol36/iss1/5

23. Duncan DF, Stewart CJ, Vaughn JS, et al. (2018). Management assistance for child welfare, Work First, and food & nutrition services in North Carolina (V3.21). 2018. UNC Chapel Hill School of Social Work. Accessed November 1, 2022. http://ssw.unc.edu/ma

24. Annie E. Casey Foundation Kids Count Data Center. Child population by age group in North Carolina. 2022. Accessed November 1, 2022. https://datacenter.kidscount.org/data/tables/6169-child-population-by-age-group#detailed/2/any/false/574,1729,37,871,870,573,869,36,868,867/158,137,138,182,838,392,440/12869

25. CMS Medicaid Program Integrity Education. Atypical antipsychotic medications: Use in pediatric patients. October 2015. Accessed October 4, 2022. https://www.cms.gov/medicare-medicaid-coordination/fraud-prevention/medicaid-integrity-education/pharmacy-education-materials/downloads/atyp-antipsych-pediatric-factsheet11-14.pdf

26. Rose RA, Lanier P, dosReis S, Tamrat WK. Antipsychotic use among youth in foster care with comorbid ADHD and disruptive behavior disorder. J Child Fam Stud. 2022. doi:10.1007/s10826-022-02375-1

27. Minjon L, van den Ban E, de Jong E, Souverein PC, Egberts TCG, Heerdink ER. Reported adverse drug reactions in children and adolescents treated with antipsychotics. J Child Adolesc Psychopharmacol. 2019;29(2):124-132. doi:10.1089/cap.2018.0139