



RICK SNYDER
GOVERNOR

STATE OF MICHIGAN
DEPARTMENT OF LICENSING AND REGULATORY AFFAIRS
BUREAU OF COMMUNITY & HEALTH SYSTEMS

SHELLY EDGERTON
DIRECTOR

April 28, 2016

Serenity Point Recovery, Inc., SA0700123
Derry Hallmark, Executive Director
15140 16th Avenue
Marne, MI 49435

COMPLAINT INVESTIGATION

Participants

Facility:

Derry Hallmark, Executive Director

State Agency:

James Hoyt, Regulations Officer, Health Facilities Division

GENERAL INFORMATION

The Complaint Investigation was conducted at Serenity Point Recovery, Inc. on February 10, 2016.

On or about February 9, 2016 the department received the initial complaint via a letter.

Complaint Allegations

It was alleged by the complainant/patient that:

1. The complainant alleges that her son was admitted to the Facility on December 4, 2015 through December 9, 2015. The complainant alleges that her son had been given a drug test by the Facility upon entering, which was clean. The complainant alleges that he son was given Meth by another client while in Detox. The complainant alleges that the program failed to protect her son.
2. The complainant indicated that the Facility failed to notify her as the authorized person making medical decisions for her son of the level of care he would be receiving while in the program. Additionally, the complainant advised that the Facility took her son to a hospital in the Grand Rapids area without her giving them permission to do so.

3. The complainant alleges that the Facility intake employee Nick Theil nor any other staff members felt that her son's High degree of sensitivity to sounds would present as a hurdle to his treatment in the Facility.
4. The complainant alleges that the program made the decision to take her son to a hospital in Grand Rapids without first seeking her permission to do so.
5. The complainant alleges that the Facility does not ask for a health or psychiatric examination to determine the medical needs and whether these needs can be met.
6. The complainant alleges that Facility employee Nick Theil used undue pressure on her with numerous daily calls to convince her to send her son to the Facility for treatment.
7. The complainant alleges that the Facility stuck her son on a plane back home with an untrained staff member and this place her son at risk.

Bureau Investigation Findings

During an unannounced inspection of the facility on February 10, 2016 this surveyor met with the Executive Director to review of the complainant's concerns and the following was noted that:

1. The Facility advised that they conducted in-depth investigation into the allegations that the complainant's son was given Meth by another client while in Detox. The Facility advised that all clients and their property are thoroughly searched upon entering the Facility to ensure that no drug contraband enters the building. Additionally, the Facility does a routine sweep on all residents' rooms. Lastly, the Facility took the client in question too Mercy Health Saint Mary's Hospital in Grand Rapids, Michigan on December 7, 2015 and during this time the client was given a drug test that was clean Meth. Therefore; the Facility claims that the complainant's allegation that her son was given Meth while in the Facility is unfounded.
2. The Facility advised that the client in question is a grown adult and entered into a contractual agreement with the Facility as it relates to his treatment. Additionally, the Facility advised that while the complainant asserts that she has decision making authority for her son they were never given any documentation that she had power of attorney to do so.
3. The Facility attests that employee Nick Thiel was very thorough with the complainant about the treatment options that could be offered to her son. The Facility further attests that the complainant failed to provide a clear picture of her son's mental health status and strong auditory sensory issues. The Facility advised that once the client in question entered the Facility it became clear that he was in need of a higher level of care then they were capable of providing. The Facility then made the decision to notify the complainant of this and then made all of the necessary arrangements to get the client home including flying a staff member with him to ensure a safe return.
4. The Facility made the decision to seek psychiatric help for the client in question on December 7, 2016. The client was agreeable to going to Mercy Health Saint Mary's Hospital in Grand Rapids, Michigan. The Facility again stated that while the complainant does not have power of attorney over her son they did notify her

- of the decision to seek out psychiatric care for him.
5. The Facility advised that they do provide a biosocial screening of all clients upon admission to the program. Additionally, all clients are given a medical examination as well to ensure their safety. In relation to the client in question the Facility determined that he was in need of a higher level of care than they could provide and appropriate arrangements were made to get the client home.
 6. The Facility advised that they did not place undue pressure on the complainant to send her son to their program. The Facility further attests that they worked very diligently to make the program as cost effective as they possibly could in an effort to ensure treatment for the client. The Facility advised that they had the client in the program for 6 days and only charged the complainant \$2,600 and they forgave all other expenses that were incurred on his stay. Additionally, the Facility advised that they paid for the costs of flying the client home with a staff member to ensure his safe return.
 7. The Facility advised that they paid for the costs of flying the client home and they sent a staff member whom had been working with the client while in the program and this staff member had a very good understanding of the special needs of the client.

COMPLAINT SUMMARY

The Facility was able to provide this surveyor with a very detailed response to all of the concerns that were raised by the complainant financial billing information surrounding the complainant's concerns. The Facility determined rather quickly that the client in question was in need of a higher level of care and made arrangements with the complainant to get him home and into a hospital in the Portland, Oregon area that could address his psychiatric needs. Additionally, the Facility bore all of the costs associated with getting the client home safely and waived all but \$2,600 of fees associated with being in the Facility. This complaint concern is unfounded.



James Hoyt, Regulations Officer
Licensing and Regulatory Affairs
State Licensing Section
Hoytj3@michigan.gov
(P): 517-243-3092
(F): 517-241-3354