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Abstract

Residential care has evolved overtime from a system of supporting indigent children to care for those youth with mental health, behavioral, or medical disability diagnoses. Currently, in the United States there are 57k children involved in the child welfare system with approximately 14% residing in residential care. These systems have a long history of utilizing punishment-based, coercive techniques for managing problem behavior. Although these methods are thought to be further traumatizing for youth who have already been traumatized throughout their lives, the punishment-based techniques are ubiquitous throughout residential care. This study sought to evaluate the feasibility of adopting the School-Wide Positive Behavior Interventions and Supports (PBIS) model to residential care for youth involved with the Florida child welfare system. During this study, two cottages at the facility met high PBIS fidelity and experienced a decrease in reported inappropriate behavior across daily behavior scores and incident reports. The results are promising and suggest PBIS can be adopted and implemented within residential facilities. Limitations and future research is discussed.
Introduction

History of Residential Care

Early in America the primary support for indigent children was through the private sector. Often these institutions were designed to provide religious indoctrination (Courtney & Hughes-Heuring, 2009). From the beginning to mid-1800’s children were starting to be viewed as valuable and placed in orphanages. Toward the end of the 19th century, children in orphanages or parented by individuals too poor to feed or cloth them were sent to farming communities in the Midwest of the United States (Malia, Quiglet, Dowty, & Danjzcek, 2008). At the turn of the century residential care was in full operation with an on-going dispute about whether out-of-home care was best for children (Courtney & Hughes-Heuring, 2009). It is estimated that at the end of 19th century 84,000 children were sent to Christian homes in the Midwest with the number increasing to 150,000 by the late 1920’s (Malia et al., 2008). Throughout the 19th and 20th century there have been fluctuating levels of admissions to residential care mostly due to political (government funding) and cultural influences (community-based care).

To date, the dialog of whether residential care is most appropriate for targeted populations continues although there is a steady increase of admission to these settings (McCurdy & McIntyre, 2004). In the United States each day, there are approximately 57k children in the child welfare system with 1 in 7 residing in a group home/residential placement, or 14% of all cases (U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Administration for Children and Families, Children’s Bureau, 2015). This number increases to 1 in 3 for teens in care. Across the country, 1 in 5 or 14% of children in out-of-home care will experience group
home placement at some point and nearly a third are younger than 13. Specific to the state of Florida, 13% of children in the custody of the Department of Child and Families are residing within a group home (The Annie E. Casey Foundation, 2015). Although there are guidelines for admission to residential care, more than 4 out of 10 children admitted lack a mental health, behavioral, or medical disability diagnosis to support their admission. Even more alarming, although the recommendation for treatment is typically 3-6 months the average stay in the United States is 8 to 9 months with a third of children remaining for longer stays (The Annie E. Casey Foundation, 2015). The U.S. Department of Health and Human Services (2015) reports 24% of children under 12 and 23% of children older than 13 are admitted into residential care for stays greater than one year. This continued use of residential care is partially due to limited community based resources available to states when seeking to place a child who has been removed from their family (Malia et al., 2008).

The teens and children in residential facilities often are victims of child abuse and neglect or other traumatic events before entering the facilities (Zelechoski et al., 2013). These same individuals are then re-exposed to traumatic events due to the heavy reliance on punitive and coercive means for managing behavior within the settings. For example, numerous group homes in the state of Illinois have made headlines in the Chicago Tribune for abusive acts toward consumers (Jackson, Marx, Watchdog, 2014). A notorious home in Florida, Dozer School for Boys, has been in the news numerous times for its long history of abuse dating back to the early 1900’s. More recently, the Huffington Post published an article describing the systemic abuse taking place in a residential care facility in Utah (Murdock, 2016). In addition to these published news articles, researchers have evaluated the effectiveness of military style group homes with results suggesting there are only short-term improvements (Weis & Toolis, 2009) and the
treatments are largely ineffective for female youth with a history of maltreatment (Weis, Whitemarsh, & Wilson, 2005). Although these are only a few examples of the widespread punishment-based world-views found within group homes and residential facilities across the states the problem with residential care has resulted in congress considering measures to scale down funding for the programs (Sapien, 2015). Because residential care continues to be utilized at a high rate, it is important to consider the various models that are available to residential facilities.

**Residential Care**

Although there is a lack of evidenced-based models for residential care and a debate about whether they are efficacious, there is universal agreement that residential care is needed as an intervention for youth who are labeled as high risk (Studt-Boel & Tobia, 2016). In addition, it is believed that residential treatment facilities will be utilized well into the future further suggesting there is a need for more effective, evidence-based models (Barth, 2005; Studt-Boel & Tobia, 2016). These two variables are compounded by the cultural shift toward residential care as a placement of last resort plus expectation for the programs to implore more effective treatment packages with fewer resources and serving an increasing number of high-risk youth (Leichtman, 2006; Studt-Boel & Tobia, 2016).

**Definition.** The focus in this paper will be residential facilities within the United States. Because ‘group home’ and ‘residential treatment’ are often used synonymously, this paper will use the term ‘residential treatment’. Residential treatment is thus defined as:

Therapeutic residential care…[is a treatment]…the planful use of purposefully constructed, multi-dimensional living environment designed to enhance or provide treatment, education, socialization, support and protection to children and youth with identified mental health or behavioral needs in partnership with their families and in collaboration with a full spectrum of community-based formal and informal helping resources (Whittak, F. del Valle, & Holmes, 2015, p. 24).
These residential treatment facilities include group homes, children’s homes, and residential treatment which typically requires multiple overnight stays (typically months) with shift staff or cottage parents.

**Evidence-Based Practices (EBPs) and Models.** Although evidenced-based practices are the gold standard for health care in the United States, the research for residential treatment is still in developmental and preliminary stages (McCurdy & McIntyre, 2004) due to a move away from residential treatment as a high research priority in the 1990’s (Bullard, Gaughan, & Owens, 2014). An early literature review on consumer outcomes from residential treatment found only a portion of consumers benefited from residential care although a more recent review suggests “overall evidence supports that youth experience improvements following placement” (Studt-Boel & Tobia, 2016, p. 17). Both reviews noted numerous methodological limitations to the studies included which complicates researchers’ ability to evaluate the effectiveness of the programs. Researchers suggest there are three main issues with the literature on residential treatment a) lack of randomized controlled trials, b) lack of operationally defined outcome measures, and c) vague descriptions of programs evaluated leading to broad generalizations regarding the effectiveness across varying conditions (Lee & Barth, 2011; Studt-Boel & Tobia, 2016). Though there is limited research on evidenced-based models for residential treatment, 10 different treatments have been identified as evidenced-based treatments that are used in residential settings a) adolescent community reinforcement approach, b) aggression replacement training, c) dialectical behavioral therapy, d) ecologically-based family therapy, e) eye movement and desensitization therapy, f) functional family therapy, g) multi-modal substance abuse prevention, h) residential student assistance program, i) solution-focused brief therapy, and j) trauma intervention program for adjudicated and at-risk youth (see James, Alemi, & Zepeda,
2013 for full review). This finding suggests clinicians are able to adapt and incorporate evidenced-based practices (EBP) into residential treatment with encouraging outcomes (James et al., 2013). Although EBP’s have shown promising results in residential treatment, there is data to suggest that clinicians, although reporting the use of EBP, are unknowingly not utilizing EBP’s (James et al., 2015). For example, James et al. (2015) surveyed 75 agencies across the United States to inquire about their attitudes, perceptions, and utilization of EBP. An overwhelming majority of agencies reported they were using EBP’s within their organization. Upon further evaluation, the authors discovered only 52.8% of the reported practices actually met the criteria for EBP. This data suggest there is a disconnect between researchers and practitioners regarding what constitutes an EBP (James et al., 2015).

Specific to evidence-based models, one notable review evaluated 19 studies comparing group care versus family foster care, group care versus treatment foster care, group care versus non-placement services, and newer versus traditional group care models. Results from group studies suggested both family foster care and multidimensional treatment foster care (MTFC) were more efficacious and a quality alternative to group care (Lee, Bright, Svoboda, Fakunmoju, & Barth, 2010). Conversely, James (2011) reported two studies that found no difference between residential and community-based care (Barth, Greeson, Guo & Green, 2007; James, Roesch, & Zhang, 2012), two studies finding community-based care more effective than group-care (Breland-Noble et al., 2004; 2005), and one study suggesting consumers in residential care were more likely to be successfully discharged (Lee & Thompson, 2008). In general, these studies lacked generalizability due to the threats to internal validity as a result of lacking a non-comparison group (James, 2011). Though the research supporting residential treatment is limited by weak methodological group designs and mixed results, there are promising models used
within the United States. One important component for clinicians to consider when evaluating all models is after-care planning. This is because the lack of after-care planning contributes to the diminished effectiveness of programs (Frensch & Cameron, 2002). James (2011) identified five treatment models most commonly used within the U.S. and reviewed the research supporting each model.

*Positive Peer Culture.* The positive peer culture (PPC) model was first described by Vorrath & Brendtro (1985). A major goal of PPC is for the consumers to take responsibility for helping each other. Because PPC is grounded in the social psychology paradigm, it is believed this goal is achieved because consumers are motivated by acceptance from their peers (Vorrath & Brendtro, 1985). As children develop into teens, the influence of adults is less valued and peer acceptance is of higher priority. Thus, the PPC model de-emphasizes adult authority and attempts to change negative peer environments into positive environments through peer mediation (James, 2011). As group norms change and become more positive, mutual respect is earned leading to the fostering of prosocial attitudes and social concern coupled with an increase in self-worth. The model has four treatment components a) building group responsibility, b) the importance of the group meeting, c) service learning, and d) teamwork primacy. PPC is designed to be delivered in a group format occurring in 90 minute sessions five times per week over a six to nine month period (James, 2011). Although the model is manualized and there are evaluation studies, the model is weakly ranked at level 2, supported by research evidence (James, 2011).

*Teaching Family Model.* The Teaching Family Model (TFM) is most notably used at Boys Town after its successful implementation at the Achievement Place Research Project at Kansas University (Phillips, Phillips, Fixsen, & Wolf, 1974). Daly & Dowd (1992) outlined a few main characteristics of the program that made it successful, these include a harm-free
environment comprised of caregiver support and a model of care. The model of care must include a focus on positive behavior, consumer orientation, staff training, program evaluation, and internal program audits (Daly & Dowd, 1992). TFM relies on a married couple to be teaching parents at assigned cottages. This allows for the environment to resemble a family with the consumers learning living skills and positive interpersonal skills (James, 2011). The core elements of TFM include: a) careful selection of teaching parents, b) comprehensive skill-based training for the providers, c) parents in the role of professional practitioners, d) 24-hour professional support, e) focus on prevention of problem behavior and prosocial skill acquisition, f) self-government system, g) on-going evaluation of the teaching parents, h) annual reaccreditation, and i) heavy emphasis on family-style living and normalization. The TFM model was ranked by James (2011) as being promising (level 3) and having a plethora of studies supporting the model though the literature is void of randomized control trials. A more recent quasi-experimental study found the TFM resulted in a continuation of improvement at discharged and at an 8-month follow-up when compared to non-TFM facilities (Farmer, Seifer, Wagner, Burns, & Murray, 2016).

**Sanctuary Model.** The Sanctuary Model ® is an ecological approach incorporating a trauma-informed model. A main goal of the model is to make changes as an organization toward a focus on psychological healing and an environment for the previous experienced trauma to be addressed (Bloom, 1997; Jones, 2011). Core components of the model include an emphasis on nonviolence, emotional intelligence, inquiry and social learning, shared governance, open communication, social responsibility, growth, and change. Cognitive behavioral therapy coupled with a trauma informed framework is used to teach consumers skills for learning to adapt and cope with traumatic events and stress. This model is not manualized but typically is delivered in
12 sessions by a trained professional. Before the model is implemented at any facility they first must undergo stringent assessment and then a five day training. Although this model is ranked as promising (level 2) there is limited research supporting its efficacy.

**Stop-Gap Model.** The Stop-Gap Model was first introduced by McCurdy & McIntyre in 2004. This model is designed to use residential care as a short-term treatment with a heavy emphasis on discharging the consumer to community-based services. The model incorporates three levels or tiers of care a) environment based intervention, b) intensive intervention, and c) discharge-related intervention (for full review see McCurdy & McIntyre, 2004). Environment based interventions include but are not limited to token economy, academic intervention, social skill intervention, anger management skills training, and problem solving skills training. An intensive intervention would include a functional behavioral assessment and behavior support plan. In conjunction with these treatments discharge planning would be occurring to prepare parents through parent education and parent management training with community integration – this is achieved through intensive case management. Similar to other models, this model is ranked as promising due to the early stages of research supporting the framework (James, 2011).

**Re-Ed.** The Re-Ed model was originally designed for short-term residential treatment but has been adapted for long-term treatment. Consumers receive this treatment in a group format multiple times a day with meetings ranging from 15 minutes to over an hour. The counselors emphasize strength-based approaches, relationship building, and data-driven decision making. Additionally, consumers are provided homework to help meet behavioral goals. Due to the lack of comparison studies for this design, it was not able to be rated (James, 2011).

**Comparison of Models.** Of the five models evaluated, only the PPC model was ranked as being supported by research evidence while the TFM, Sanctuary Model, and Stop-Gap model
were ranked as promising. It is important to note the PPC received its rating based on one experimental study whereas the TFM has a plethora of research supporting it but lacks randomized controlled trials. As a whole, James (2011) shines a light on the lack of evidence-based treatment models for residential care. These mixed findings make it difficult for administrators to select a model to adapt for their facility. Additionally, only two of the models include environmental strategies to directly address maladaptive behavior at the facilities. Thus, research is not limited to the treatment models listed above but also the behavior management systems used at residential treatment facilities.

**Token Economy and Level Systems.**

Residential treatment facilities cross the world have the onus of managing maladaptive behavior while trying to increase prosocial behavior. One solution to this challenge was the incorporation of the token economy (Ayllon & Azrin, 1968) in residential treatment. Within a token economy an individual earns a token for appropriate behavior that can be exchanged for backup reinforcers. Each backup reinforcer has a cost that is equivalent to a certain quantity of tokens. In one study by Field, Nash, Handwerk, and Friman (2004) the utility of using a token economy with youth in a residential facility was found to be successful with much of the population but required adaptions for a select few youth. The authors demonstrated more frequent delivery of backup reinforcers allowed for the youth to be successful in the token economy as evidenced by a reduction of maladaptive behavior and increase in prosocial behavior. In general, the system has been shown to be effective with teaching new skills (Sarmento, Almeida, Rauktis, & Bernardo, 2008; Spiegler and Guevremont, 2003; Stocks, Thyer, & Kearsley, 1987; Rauktis, 2016) and has been incorporated in a variety of residential
care models such as the TFM (Daly & Dowd, 1992; Wolf, Kirigin, Fixsen, & Blasè, 1995), Project-ReEd (Hobbs, 1982), and Stop-Gap (McCurdy & McEntyre, 2004).

A second solution was to incorporate a variation of the token economy known as a point/level system (Mohr, Martin, Olson, Pumariega, & Branca, 2009). Although there is a plethora of research supporting the use of token economies with various populations (e.g., school settings, individuals with disabilities), there is a lack of evidence supporting the efficacy of level systems in residential treatment (Mohr et al., 2009; VanderVen, 1995). A level system is a model in which youth start with zero points or privileges and earn more points by completing daily tasks. These points earn the youth certain levels and within the level they are granted specific privileges. Level systems are thought to be an easy to use reinforcement approach to managing behavior while teaching responsibility and self-esteem but often lead to withholding points and removal of privileges to try to manage behavior (Mohr & Pumariega, 2004). Unfortunately the model of level systems continue to be widely used although they lack empirical support and are riddled with other problems such as staff using the system as a punitive function (e.g., threatening loss of points), conflict between staff and youth over the inconsistent use of the system, and lack of individualized treatment or developmentally appropriate treatment (for full review see Mohr et al., 2009). Another major criticism of a level system is staff’s reliance on control (Anglin, 2004; VanderVen, 2009; Rauktis, 2016) resulting in youth who have already experienced trauma being re-exposed to traumatic events leading to longer-lasting impacts on their mental health (VanderVen, 1995). Ultimately, it is the youth’s experience and evidenced-based outcomes that should lead to the decision to implement any program, including a behavior management system.
When youth have been interviewed about their experiences with level systems, the feedback suggests the systems are deficient and substandard. For example, Rauktis (2016) conducted six focus groups with youth who were exposed to level systems during their time in residential care. A total of 40 youth participated with the majority of the sample representing females. Youth reported they felt the system limited their personal autonomy and staff relied heavily on punishment (e.g., response costs or negative consequences). Some youth reported entire groups would lose privileges although only one person within the group was responsible for a rule infraction. Most youth reported they perceived their experience within the system as feeling powerless and lacking individualization. When asked about how the system was implemented, the youth reported rules differed depending on the staff working and there was an unwritten rule that youth should “listen to me [staff] or else” (p. 98). Ultimately, many of the youth felt the level system was not effective at managing their behaviors. The importance of youth’s perspective (Johnson, 1999) in tandem with an evidence-based intervention is paramount to the success of managing behavior in residential treatment.

The youth’s perception of the ineffective level system is supported by the lack of evidence suggesting the systems are effective (Mohr et al., 2009; Mohr & Pumariega, 2004; VanderVen, 1995; VanderVen, 2009). Research further supports the systems heavy reliance on a culture of power and control while depriving youth of normal activities afforded to youth not in residential care (VanderVen, 2000). Considering there is a high prevalence of youth in residential care who have been traumatized (Zelechoski et al., 2013) and level systems might be theorized as another means of exposing youth to trauma and/or re-exposing them to trauma.

Although the level system model is viewed as ineffective, there is evidence to suggest “behavioral management techniques based on solid learning theory…[are]…effective therapeutic
tools” (Mohr & Pumariaga, 2004, p. 117). Positive Behavior Support is one evidence-based behavior management system that is person-centered, data-driven, and culturally sensitive.

**Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports (PBIS)**

School-wide Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports (hereinafter PBIS) is an evidence-based ecological system that has been successfully implemented by thousands of schools across the United States (Sugai & Horner, 2006). This system’s model focuses on the implementation of supports and treatment in natural contexts by the individuals comprised of the ecological system. A central component of PBIS is not to just reduce problem behavior but to also foster development of life-long, sustainable positive behavior (Dunlap, Sailor, Horner, & Sugai, 2009). PBIS has four defining features “a) application of research-validated behavioral science; b) integration of multiple intervention components to provide ecologically valid, practical support; c) commitment to substantive, durable lifestyle outcomes; and d) implementation of support within organizational systems that facilitate sustained effects” (Dunlap et al., 2009, p. 4). As a whole, the system is focused on empirically valid treatments that are developed based on the values, perspectives, and preference of the individuals within the ecological system so the model is maintained overtime and is effective. By incorporating PBIS into a system, the ultimate goal is to reduce the number of individuals that require intense, individualized behavior support plans that ultimately will reduce the resources required to serve all individuals within the system.

Though PBIS is rooted in the science of Applied Behavior Analysis (ABA), the model started to break away from ABA in the early 90’s as a result of moral concerns, including use of aversive treatments to manage behavior. Specifically, because PBIS is focused on improving quality of life, there is an emphasis of developing behavior change programs that are viewed as
worthy or important to the individual receiving the intervention. This important feature is in conflict with the traditional view of developing plans based on the perspective of the service provider (Singer & Wang, 2009). The PBIS system also places a heavy emphasis on self-determination. Often individuals involved with varying systems (e.g., schools, human services) are limited in their choices regarding classroom placement or activities they wish to engage in. Thus, recognizing, preventing, and avoiding the typical subordinate relationship paradigm will allow for individuals served within the PBIS systems to achieve the goal of self-determination goal (Singer & Wang, 2009).

With the goal to improve quality of life while focusing on self-determination, contextual fit, and avoiding power struggles, PBIS provides a framework different than the level system commonly used within residential treatment. Specifically, the person-centered focus and self-determination is different than the typical control paradigm used in residential care. In addition, when contrasted with the level system, PBIS emphasizes on teaching pro-social behavior while maintaining self-determination, which allows practitioners to focus on relationship building versus attempts at controlling individuals’ behavior. The emphasis on contextual fit within a systems change allows for cultural competence (VanderVen, 2000) to be incorporated into the systems design. In addition, the person-centered, value based, data-driven PBIS system sets a framework for avoiding re-traumatizing youth served within residential care.

**PBIS and Alternative Settings**

PBIS has been successfully adapted to juvenile detention centers (Jolivette & Nelson, 2010) resulting in a shift away from the historically punitive culture in such facilities. This evidence-based model’s goal of reducing maladaptive behavior while teaching and fostering maintenance of pro-social behavior provides a promising foundation for adopting the system to residential
facilities. The implementation of PBIS in alternative settings only recently became more prevalent, with no known published implementation research articles between the years of 2002-2007 (Nelson, Sprague, Jolivette, Smith, & Tobin, 2008). In 2002, Scott et al. laid the foundation for adapting PBIS to alternative settings for high-risk youth. The authors provided a conceptual framework for adapting the three tiers (primary, secondary, and tertiary) to systems that serve high-risk youth. Tier 1, universal-primary supports, were theorized to be beneficial in juvenile justice systems because they could be applied across multiple contexts at risk youth were actively involved in on a day-to-day basis. In addition, the supports were theorized to benefit the youth with social skill deficits because the youth could learn skills in a natural context by focusing on providing reinforcers for the prosocial behavior. For the primary-tier interventions to be successful, the system requires changes and adoption across 12 main areas (see table 1; George, Kincaid, & Pollard-Sage, 2009).

Table 1. Primary Tier Changes (George, Kincaid, and Pollard-Sage, 2008)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Leadership Team</th>
<th>Coaching Capacity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Established Collaboration, Operations, and Faculty (e.g., staff) Buy-In</td>
<td>Demonstrations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coordination (e.g., data-based, operationalizing problem behavior)</td>
<td>Evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funding</td>
<td>Visibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political Support</td>
<td>Training Capacity</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Tier 2, secondary prevention, supports were conceptualized as providing two domains for preventing problem behavior from maintaining. The domains included the required Tier 1 system-wide data collection and early identification of youth who were not successful under Tier 1 supports. These data allow for interventions to be quickly applied to groups of youth who might be engaging in similar behavior problems. The Tier 3, targeted or tertiary, supports are intended to be used with youth who are not successful with the Tier 1 and 2 supports. The
authors discussed the application of the functional behavior assessment technology to evaluating the problem behavior observed within the facility as opposed to using it to evaluate the behaviors that led to the incarceration (Scott et al., 2002). The important conclusion to the conceptualization of the PBIS model to an alternative setting is the goal of creating an environment that fosters success rather than focusing on rejecting those who the environment struggles to support.

An updated conceptualization by Jolivette and Nelson (2010) focused on PBIS in alternative settings (i.e., juvenile justice). The authors argued because juvenile justice settings include multiple systems (e.g., service providers), buildings, shifts, and a variety of staff, it is important to include a representative from all of the various system groups involved with the youths’ care. By including all groups, the facility can increase the probability of buy-in which is recommended to be between 90 – 95% across time and include public and private endorsements (Jolivette and Nelson, 2010). The authors also recommend an action plan for implementation across the various contexts (e.g., house, cafeteria) and on-going data based decision-making. Regarding fidelity, it is recommended for the PBIS design team to consider balancing the PBIS intervention with other services while also including lesson plans with examples and non-examples for each context in the system will be adopted. In addition, recommendations are provided for professional development including an initial PBIS kick-off orientation and on going mentoring to support staff across the various contexts. Interestingly, as early as 2007 during the period of time these frameworks were published, researchers were already implementing PBIS in juvenile justice systems (Nelson et al., 2009).

Sidana (2006) reported the implementation of PBIS within the educational program and some houses at the Iowa Juvenile Home that served at risk female youth. Post implementation
data showed a significant reduction in restraints (73%) and 50% reduction in behavioral referrals (Nelson et al., 2009). In addition to this early work, Clarida (2005) reported on the adoption of PBIS in a facility located in Illinois. Post-implementation results at this facility resulted in a reported decrease in both fights and the number of minor and major rule violations. Although these early reports are promising, there was still a void in peer-reviewed published work for multiple years after this report. Johnson et al. (2013) published the first peer-reviewed study to demonstrate the efficacy of adapting PBIS to educational settings in juvenile facilities. The authors examined the impact of the PBIS system after two years of implementation. Improvements were measured by comparing the 1-year post data to data collected for the year prior to PBIS being initiated. The data suggested a promising impact on at risk youth behavior. Specifically, there was a 41% decrease in without security referrals, 56% decrease in with security referrals, and 35% decrease in security referrals plus admission. Even more promising was the increase in attendance from 77% to 98.2% and awarded industry certifications (e.g., technical certificates) from 16 to 147 (Johnson et al., 2013). The latter is most important because youth were graduating with certificates that would allow for them to apply for higher paying technical job positions upon release from the juvenile detention system.

In a similar study, Jolivette et al. (2014) evaluated the effectiveness of PBIS in a residential educational setting. The authors reported the system was implemented with high fidelity by the staff and received high social validity from both the teachers and students in the system. In addition, at three different 6-month times post-implementation of PBIS, the authors reported a decrease in discipline referrals. The PBIS model has also been very successful in the state of Texas. After incorporating PBIS into a few juvenile justice facilities, laws were passed allowing for PBIS to be adopted as the behavior management model for the entire state. As of
2015, the PBIS model has been implemented in almost all of the facilities across the state and has hired a PBIS coordinator to assist with the continued development of the system and finalize plans for incorporating Tier 2 supports (Lopez, Williams, & Newsom, 2015). There have been similar state law changes and successful adaption of PBIS in the state of Georgia (Fernandez, McClain, Williams, & Ellison, 2015) and successful implementation in the state of Arizona (Vaugn-Alonzo, Bradley, & Cassavaugh, 2015). In addition to the findings that Tier 1 supports are successful at supporting at risk youth in juvenile justice systems, more recently researchers have evaluated the utility and incorporation of Tier 2 supports.

Clark and Mathur (2015) evaluated the use of Merging Two Worlds as an effective Tier 2 intervention. The curriculum is designed to teach students the knowledge and skills they might need when beginning to transition out of residential care. Youth were reported to engage in less negative self-statements but did not increase in their use of positive self-statements (Clark & Mathur, 2015). In a second study, positive outcomes for three youth who received Tier 2 interventions (e.g., Check-In/Check-Out, preventive staff support) were reported. With the incorporation of the Tier 2 supports the youth were able to successfully transition through their incarceration leading to a scheduled release for one youth and successful release for the two other youth (Vaugn-Alonzo et al., 2015). In a third study, Check-In/Check-out as a stand-alone intervention was found to not only decrease off task behavior but was also found to be socially valid by the residential school teachers (Swoszowki, McDaniel, Jolivette, & Melius, 2013). Although known published research for Tier 2 supports adopted in juvenile justice facilities is limited, like the success of Tier 1 supports, these studies suggest Tier 2 supports can be successfully implemented with high risk youth in more restrictive environments.
Lessons Learned. After multiple years of adopting and adapting PBIS to juvenile justice facilities, researchers (Sprague et al., 2013) have learned that the process of adoption and implementation requires the same components as implementation in education settings (see Table 1). Sprague et al. (2013) also report the utilization of orientation and on-going unit meetings that occur during shift change have been useful for teaching the selected behavioral expectations. In addition, while concurring basic assumptions of the PBIS system, the authors report the need to foster an environment that views anything less than long-term positive life adjustments as simply insufficient. As researchers continue to adapt PBIS to juvenile settings, it is paramount they consider how to build team-based planning and collaboration while developing professional training programs for the wide-variety of staff represented in residential facilities (Mathur & Nelson, 2013). Last, probably one of the most notable lessons learned is the need to adapt the types of data and analyses used to measure success of PBIS in juvenile justice facilities when compared to evaluating the intervention in educational settings (Scheuermann, Nelson, Wang, & Bruntmyer, 2015).

A brief review of Scheuermann et al. (2015)’s recommendations will be provided here (for full review see reference). The authors recommend adaptations in the types of data collected and analyses used to evaluate the impact of the intervention. First, the authors recommend collecting data that allows the evaluation team to determine the impact of the PBIS model on positive behaviors versus solely monitoring negative behaviors (e.g., office referrals). Second, it is recommended that a standardized measure be incorporated and used in the evaluation process. Due to the variability in number of days youth are placed in residential care, the authors argue for the use of rate versus frequency. Third, the authors suggest data should be analyzed from a multilevel perspective. By making these three changes to the data-based decision making and
evaluation, the authors researchers can more accurately assess the effectiveness of the PBIS model in residential/justice system settings.

**Social Validity.** Jolivette et al. (2014) found youth reported, it “helped me when I got to the unit to be good” and a theme from teachers was the system, “promotes positive behavior management with positive impact (p. 75)”. Conversely, there is some evidence to suggest staff are less satisfied with the implementation of PBIS (Houchins, Jolivette, Wessendorf, McGlynn, & Nelson, 2005). One of the most sensitive themes to surface in this focus group was the idea of logistics. Participants reported uneasiness about altering their own beliefs about behavior management and participation in training (Houchins et al., 2005). This particular barrier has also been encountered with the adoption of PBIS in school settings while success of implementation has still been achieved. Although the staff perspective of the PBIS model is important as implementation fidelity hinges on their buy-in, the youth’s perspective is important, as the goal is to make long-term positive change in their lives. In the only published study on youth perceptions of PBIS in juvenile justice facilities (Jolivette, Boden, Sprague, Ennis, & Kimball, 2015), there was universal agreement the PBIS model was better than the previous coercive, control based behavior management systems. Youth reported optimism about being about to earn privileges without having to worry about those privileges being removed. Some youth also voiced concerns about staff reverting back to old practices (Jolivette et al., 2015). Although these findings are promising, they should be considered with caution, as more studies are needed to evaluate youth perceptions of the PBIS model in more restrictive environments.

**Purpose Statement**

The purpose of this study was to extend the literature on adopting PBIS to alternative settings that serve high-risk youth. Specifically, this study evaluated the feasibility of adopting
the PBIS model to a residential care facility for youth who were involved with the Department of Children and Families (DCF), the state child welfare authority. As Lampron and Gonsoulin (2013) so eloquently stated, it is time for PBIS to be adopted and applied to more restrictive facilities that serve high-risk youth. Specifically, as clinicians working in more restrictive facilities work in collaboration with school and community systems to prevent youth from entering the more restrictive systems but also reduce the recidivism rate. To this author’s knowledge, there are no published studies evaluating the effectiveness of an agency-wide PBIS model, including living quarters, at an open-campus residential facility serving youth involved with DCF. Therefore this study aimed to address the following research questions:

1. To what extent could the School-Wide PBIS model be adopted to and implemented with fidelity at a residential facility for youth involved in the foster care system?

2. To what extent did frequency of challenging behaviors reported by staff decrease at the youth residential facilities when Agency-Wide PBIS (AWPBIS) was implemented?

3. To what extent did the frequency in observable positive to negative interactions change at the youth residential facilities when AWPBIS was implemented?
Methods

Participants

Administration (4), supervisors (5), direct-line staff (approx. 55), and youth at a therapeutic residential facility participated in this study. The Chief Executive Officer (CEO) had over 30 years of experience in administration at child welfare agencies. She held a Master’s degree in counseling and was a Licensed Mental Health Counselor. The Chief Operating Officer (COO) held a Master’s degree in business administration and had over 10 years of experience in administration at child not-for-profit agencies. The clinical supervisor held a Master’s degree and was a Licensed Clinical Social Worker. The residential program director held a Master’s in Public Health Policy and had 5 years of experience in the child welfare setting. Direct care staff held a minimum of a high school diploma and cottage supervisors held a bachelor’s degree. Staff received training in first aid, child abuse and neglect reporting, and on the job training for managing youth behavior. The youth at the facility were involved with the Florida Department of Child and Families. At full capacity, the facility could support 60 youth.

Consent. This study was approved by the University of South Florida Institutional Review Board and required some participants to be consented. The agency provided de-identified youth data and incident report data so those data did not require a consent process. Members of the PBIS team were asked to voluntarily consent to the study so the research team could include feedback from the team and collect staff-youth interaction data. Additionally, staff members at the agency were asked to voluntarily consent to have data collected on their interactions with the youth. Both of these participations were completely voluntarily and
participation was not known to the agency administration. The Institutional Review Board (IRB) documents can be found in Appendix A.

Setting

The primary research site was a therapeutic residential facility for youth involved with the Department of Children and Families. An organizational flowchart can be found in Appendix B. The CEO oversaw operations at the agency and led the organization. A COO and Residential Director supervised the day-to-day operations. The director was responsible for daily operations with youth, staff, and the clinical team. The clinical director supervised all admissions, therapist activities, and Medicaid billing. Each cottage was supervised by a house manager and a group of team leads. Their responsibilities included supporting new staff, completing youth paperwork, completing youth inventories, and ensuring the schedule of staff was completed.

At the beginning of the study, the facility was divided into five main cottages a) co-ed home for ages 5 – 11, b) all male home for ages 12 – 18, c) all female home for ages 12 – 18, and d) two maternity homes in which mothers under 18 and their children resided. A few months into the study, one maternity cottage was changed to a sibling cottage for two weeks, which ultimately closed, leaving one empty cottage. Youth admitted to the program were required to have a mental health diagnosis and typically engaged in minor to severe inappropriate behavior. These behaviors ranged from cussing, verbal threats without an act, and task refusal, to more severe inappropriate behaviors such as fighting, threats with an act, running away from placement, and sexually acting out. Each cottage could support 12 youth at any given period of time, for a maximum of 60 youth across all five cottages. The homes were staffed 24 hours per day during 8 hr shifts. Staff were supervised across three shifts by an on-sight supervisor. In addition to the cottages, youth had access to an education center, cafeteria, swimming pool, game
room, woodwork shop, and their local school. Youth were permitted off campus privileges if granted by their mental health counselors.

**Target Behaviors and Data Collection**

Four main primary measures were used to evaluate the effectiveness of PBIS at the facility. These included a) An Agency-Wide Evaluation Tool, b) Daily Youth Behavior Scores, c) Frequency of incident reports, and d) Staff-Youth interaction data.

**Fidelity Measure.** An *Agency-Wide Evaluation Tool* (see Appendix C), adapted from the School-Wide Evaluation tool (SET), was used to measure fidelity implementation of the PBIS model. This measure allowed for a composite score between 0 – 100 to be calculated assessing 8 core areas a) expectations defined, b) behavioral expectations taught, c) on-going system for rewarding behavioral expectations, d) system for responding to behavioral violations, e) monitoring and decision-making, f) management, g) agency-level support, and h) teams (see Appendix B). This measure was completed prior to the three day PBIS training with staff and each consecutive week following the training. Because implementation of PBIS was staggered across the cottages, two different scores were calculated from the measure a) total agency fidelity and b) individual cottage fidelity. The agency composite score was computed each week using categories A – H on the form. Each cottage’s fidelity score was computed by averaging the scores across sections A – D. Each one of these domains was defined and measured using a Likert scale ranging from 0 – 2.

As previously stated, the *Agency-Wide Evaluation Tool* was adopted from the SET. The researcher made semantic changes to the document by changing “school” to agency, “student” to youth, and “teacher” to “staff”. Changes were made to section B in regards to the frequency of teaching behavioral expectations (i.e., minimum of monthly) and number of staff who were
required to be interviewed during fidelity checks, because the population was much smaller than a school setting. In addition, the researcher made changes to section E of the document to reflect on-going evaluation and reviews of data on a weekly schedule. Changes were also made to section H to require the team to be comprised of staff representing all levels at the agency and required monthly meetings.

**Youth Behavior.** Staff in each home recorded data on youth behavior once per day. At the end of the second shift when staff were completing their notes in the electronic medical records, staff recorded a number 0 – 6 based on a Likert Scale to denote how appropriate the youth’s behavior was during their shift (See Appendix D). Based on the scoring form, a 0 denoted no inappropriate behavior was observed, a 1 denoted infrequent minor inappropriate behavior was observed, 2 denoted frequent minor inappropriate behavior was observed, a 3 denoted infrequent severe inappropriate behavior was observed, 4 denoted frequent severe inappropriate behavior was observed, and a 5 denoted an incident report was completed. A six was scored if the staff made contact with the youth (e.g., by phone) but did not see them during their shift. Scores of six were not included in the analysis. In addition to using a Likert scale, staff would denote which problem behaviors were observed during the shift, though these data were not provided to the research team. Data from each day were aggregated to compute a weekly Behavior Score for each cottage. The equation to compute the average group home Behavior Scores was: sum of 7 days of daily Likert scores for all youth divided by the sum of total number of records for all youth. For example, if there were ten youth in the home and each received a score of 3 for every second shift for seven days, the total for the home would be 210. This was divided by the total number of shifts for all youth. Specifically, 1 shift per day for 7 days multiplied by the number of youth in the home. For the previous example, this equates to 7
shifts multiplied by 10 youth. Thus, 210 was divided by 70 to obtain a composite score of 3. All weekly behavior scores were graphed weekly for visual analysis of trends across time.

An additional analysis was conducted to evaluate the percentage of youth each day that received specific scores (e.g., percent who received a 1). Specifically, we analyzed the percent of youth each day that received a zero, 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, summed 1 and 2, and summed 3 and 4. This was calculated by summing the total number of scores in a category and dividing by the number of youth scored that day. For example, if 5 youth received a 1 and one youth received a 2, this would be a total of 6. This total was then divided by the total number of youth (e.g., 12). Thus, 6 divided by 12 would equate to 50% of youth for this category. This same equation was used for each respective category analyzed.

These data were further analyzed by calculating the mean percent of youth that received specific behavior scores each day across the baseline and intervention phase. This was achieved by summing the total number of youth that received a specific score in the phase and dividing by the total number of youth present during the phase. Last, we analyzed data for the six weeks preceding implementation of PBIS and the last six weeks of the intervention for cottages that received 80% or higher on the AET. Two types of averages were obtained from this analysis a) average weekly behavior score and b) average percent of youth to receive specific scores. The average weekly behavior score was calculated by summing the total number of scores across the six weeks and dividing by the total number of youth scored during the week. Average percent of youth to receive specific scores was calculated by summing the number of youth in each category (1, 2, 3, etc.) and dividing by the total number of youth scored during the time frame. Both of these equations resulted in a pre/post type of analysis.
**External Incident Reports.** The staff completed incident reports for various reasons to maintain compliance with the Department of Children and Families. For purposes of this study, we evaluated incident report frequency across time for the following categories: a) involuntary admission to a psychiatric hospital, involuntary psychiatric admission; b) theft, vandalism, and/or destruction of property, c) child arrest; d) eloping; e) significant injury to staff; f) missing child; and g) altercations. These data were entered into a database, provided to the research team de-identified, and were summarized weekly. An analysis was conducted by graphing total frequency per week in each cottage. Each youth was assigned a numerical identification that was only known by agency staff. In addition to the weekly analysis, the average number of incident reports in the six weeks preceding intervention of PBIS and last six weeks of the intervention were analyzed. This was achieved by summing the total number of incident reports during the six week period and dividing by the total number of weeks. These scores were used to conduct a pre/post type of analysis.

**Internal Incident Reports.** Staff were required to complete internal incident reports for behaviors that could have led to injury but did not require an external report. These data were entered into a database, provided to the research team de-identified, and were summarized weekly. An analysis was conducted by graphing total frequency per week in each cottage. Each youth was assigned a numerical identification that was only known by agency staff. In addition to the weekly analysis, we evaluated the average number of incident reports in the six weeks preceding intervention of PBIS and last six weeks of the intervention. This was achieved by summing the total number of incident reports during the six week period and dividing by the total number of weeks. These scores were used to conduct a pre/post type of analysis.
**Staff-Youth Interaction.** Staff-Youth interaction was measured during 10 min observations using a 30 sec partial-interval data collection system (see Appendix E). Staff were informed that data collectors were observing and collecting data to gain information about the cottages. A minimum of 4 ten min observations were conducted each week at each cottage throughout various activities. This resulted in total observation of staff-youth interactions in each home totaling 40 min per week. These data were analyzed in 40 min aggregations per week. Two main behaviors were recorded and measured using this system a) positive interactions and b) negative interactions. A check was denoted for any targeted interaction to occur at any point during the 30 sec interval. The total number of intervals a behavior was observed was divided by the total number of intervals observed and multiplied by 100. Data from each home were aggregated and graphed weekly.

Positive interactions were defined as any statements, comments, questions, answers to questions, stories, requests, or vocal noises (i.e., laughter) directed towards youth that did not qualify as negative interactions. Negative interactions were defined as statements, comments, questions, or answers to questions that included negative affect or negative comments (i.e., arguing, complaining, swearing, cussing, threatening, or making a derogatory comment to the youth). No interaction was defined as the absence of engaging in positive or negative interactions. In addition, any reference to a youth’s inappropriate behavior in front of other youth was scored as a negative interaction.

**Data Analysis.** The data were analyzed but conducting visual analyses of the single subject design graphs. In addition, visual inspection of mean change across phases was also employed.

**Inter-observer agreement (IOA)**
Total count agreement and interval agreement were used to measure the agreement between two independent observers for the Agency-Wide Evaluation Tool (AET), PBIS Training Fidelity, and Direct Observations of Staff-Youth Interactions, respectively. IOA was calculated for youth daily behavior scores comparing the data entered in the database to the hard data provided by the agency. IOA was not calculated for the incident reports as these data were obtained from the central database used by the agency to store incident report data.

**AET Fidelity Data.** Total agreement was calculated for 18% of baseline weeks and 33.3% of intervention weeks to measure the agreement of fidelity check scores (AET) between two independent observers. This was calculated by dividing the smaller sum by the larger sum and multiplying by 100. For example, if the observers computed fidelity scores of 88% and 90%, the agreement was calculated by dividing 88 by 90 and multiplying by 100%, resulting in an agreement of 97%. Mean baseline fidelity agreement was 85.3% (range 78 – 94%) and mean intervention agreement was 100% with no range.

**Direct Observation Data.** Total agreement was used to calculate the agreement between two observers recording direct observation data. This was achieved by denoting a ‘0’ for non-agreement and ‘1’ for agreement per interval. Scores were summed, divided by the number of intervals, and multiplied by 100. For example, if there were 30 intervals of staff-youth interaction and the observers agreed on 28, the agreement was calculated by dividing 28 by 30 and multiplying by 100. This would result in a score of 93% agreement. Across baseline IOA was collected for each cottage as follows Cottage A (17.5%), Cottage B (20.5%), Cottage C (16%), and Cottage D (17%). IOA was not collected during intervention for any of the cottages. Mean IOA for baseline was as follows Cottage A (84.5%), Cottage B (80%), Cottage C (89%), and Cottage D (92.7%).
Youth Behavior Scores. IOA comparing the data entered into the database to the data provided by the agency was calculated by summing the total number of data points for baseline and intervention. There was a total of 6062 data points across baseline, intervention, and all cottages. The number of errors were subtracted from the total number of data points resulting in the number of data that were accurate. This number was divided by the total number of data points to calculate an agreement. Table 2 includes the agreement between the two data sets. Baseline and intervention IOA were as follows, Cottage A 99.7% and 99.7%, Cottage B was 99.6% and 100%, Cottage C was 99.4% and 98.3%, and Cottage D was 99.9% and 100%, respectively.

Table 2. Baseline IOA Daily Behavior Scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cottage</th>
<th># Correct</th>
<th>Total #</th>
<th>IOA %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cottage A</td>
<td>977</td>
<td>982</td>
<td>99.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cottage B</td>
<td>767</td>
<td>769</td>
<td>99.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cottage C</td>
<td>977</td>
<td>982</td>
<td>99.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cottage D</td>
<td>1074</td>
<td>1075</td>
<td>99.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PBIS Training Fidelity. Like the AET fidelity total, IOA was used to calculate the degree of agreement between two independent observers at the three-day PBIS training. IOA was calculated for 2 of the 3 day trainings (66%). The IOA was 100%. There was no IOA of fidelity calculated for the eight trainings performed across the cottages.

Social Validity

Social validity measures were administered to assess the degree to which the PBIS model was a tight contextual fit for the residential facility. This was achieved by having members of the administration and staff complete a social validity measure (See Appendices F and G). Three
行政和九名员工的社会效度测量在实施Agency-Wide PBIS后被实施。一份行政措施被退还，三名员工的措施被退还。该行政人员报告与PBIS的积极影响一致，PBIS帮助机构开发一种行为管理系统，该系统适应其环境，PBIS是机构会保持的模式，以及PBIS导致儿童行为的改变。该行政人员表示既不同意也不反对PBIS导致的分析趋势在不恰当行为方法。该行政人员在形式上写到基于数据库的决策应进一步开发和嵌入到他们的计划中。

在三名员工中，两名员工表示同意PBIS对机构有积极影响，PBIS帮助机构开发一个有效的行为管理，PBIS应继续使用，以及PBIS导致他们感到他们的意见在机构中是重要的。一名员工同意PBIS导致行为的改变，一名员工既不同意也不反对，一名员工不同意。后者还报告表示PBIS没有帮助机构开发一个鼓励有效积极行为的管理系统，PBIS不应继续使用，并且感到他们的意见在实施PBIS之后没有得到重视。

**Training Fidelity.**

培训的准确度计算了63.6的培训。一个任务分析检查表（见附录H）被用于测量所有培训的培训的准确度。由于与管理层的日程冲突以及失去了一个在Cottage D培训的PI，PI进行了为期三天的培训和每个单元的培训。培训的准确度是100%。

**Experimental Design.**
A concurrent multiple baseline across cottages design was used to evaluate the effectiveness of PBIS at the facility. The multiple baseline design demonstrates the effects of an intervention by intervening on several baselines at different points in time (Kazdin, 2011). Experimental control is established when, and only when, a change in behavior is observed after the intervention is applied (Kazdin, 2011). This design strengthened the external validity of the intervention and established experimental control (Harvey, May, & Kennedy, 2004).

Procedure.

**Baseline.** During baseline, the treatment as-is behavior management system continued to be utilized by staff. This included reported practices of reviewing only incident report data monthly but rarely using the data for decision-making. Staff reported the use of a level system to address rules for youth, documentation of youth behavior, methods for rewarding youth, methods for disciplining youth, and methods for protecting youth who are a danger to their self or others. Youth were reported to earn points daily for healthy and responsible behavior, appropriate interactions with others, education, and safety. Throughout the day youth had the ability to earn 100 points with the possibility of earning extra points by completing extra chores. At the end of each day the youth’s points were summed to determine their level for the next day. There were three levels within the system, Level 1 (0-79 points), Level 2 (80-89 points), and Level 3 (90-100+points). If youth earned enough points for Level 1, they gained access to off-campus privileges or video games per the supervisor’s discretion. Level 2 privileges built on Level 1 with the addition of access to their cell phones. The highest Level included the privileges of Levels 1 and 2 in addition to special privileges determined by the supervisor, team lead or therapist, and hourly passes off campus. Finally, at the end of the week all points were summed and the youth were allowed to ‘cash-in’ their points to purchase items from the agency store. Staff were not
permitted to deduct points from youth once earned but could make decisions about youth’s participation in extracurricular activities. Although there was supposed to be a level system in use, administration and staff reported the system was not used regularly, youth were not earning privileges but rather lost privileges for inappropriate behavior, and staff relied heavily on coercion and threats to dispatch the police to attempt to manage youth behavior. In addition to the verbal reports, the research team observed staff using lecturing, threats, despair (e.g., saying, “I try so hard with you and I just never get anything”), and public shaming in an attempt to manage problem behavior.

**PBIS Team.** During baseline, the agency was asked to develop their PBIS team. The PBIS team was comprised of a minimum of 1 administrator, 1 supervisor, 1 cottage manager, and 1 staff from each cottage. The CEO and COO of the facility selected the team members. As the study progressed and team members left the agency, the CEO and Director of Residential Services would select new team members. Each team member was required to complete the Tier 1 training and be in attendance at each planning meeting. One member was selected to be the liaison between the researcher and the agency. This person coordinated communication with the researcher and the team, scheduled meetings, and assisted with monitoring of the PBIS implementation. Throughout the study, the main principle investigator (PI) was often left to complete the coordinator’s roles due to the coordinator’s other job responsibilities hindering her ability to complete the task. The PBIS team met a minimum of once per week. These meetings were used to develop the behavioral expectations, evaluate data, problem solve obstacles, and make goals for continued implementation of the system.

**Tier 1 Training.** The Tier 1 supports were developed in collaboration with the facility PBIS team. Each facility team member was required to attend a three-day Tier 1 training. During
the Tier 1 training, staff learned about the effectiveness of PBIS, adaptations of PBIS that were successful, common myths about PBIS, basic behavior processes, the importance of prevention and how to problem-solve when making data based decisions. On day one the PI introduced the team to the PBIS system and reviewed the teaming exercises. This included having the team develop a team roster to identify the different roles of each team member, establish meeting dates, and develop a mission statement along with goals. After completing the previous tasks, the team was guided through developing behavior expectations for the agency and rules for different settings. These expectations and rules were outlined for each setting the youth were permitted to spend their time. A matrix was developed to summarize the rules for each setting and how those rules matched the general behavioral expectations. The last task of the first day of training was to develop lesson plans for teaching the behavior expectations and rules to youth residing in the homes. Although the lesson plans were tailored to fit each home’s context after implementation, the team was directed to develop template lesson plans for teaching the new behavioral expectations to all youth at the facility.

On the second day of training, the team was guided through the process of making changes to their rewards system. The rewards system was designed to provide positive reinforcers to youth when they were demonstrating their use of the behavioral expectations. With assistance from the PI, the team developed instructions for staff to follow when providing artificial money to youth. The system was built on the previous system with changes to what privileges or rewards were earned by allowing the youth to decide how to spend their money. Youth were able to exchange their money in a PBIS store or by purchasing activities that were not part of the general daily schedule. In addition to re-designing the reward system that was already in place, the team was required to develop a behavior management manual. Within this
manual the team operationally defined the most frequent inappropriate behaviors observed on
campus and determined appropriate disciplinary actions for each. The team also operationally
defined which behaviors required the staff to notify the supervisor, make a referral to the
counselors, contact the police, or could be managed within the home by the shift staff. This
manual also included the policies for the new behavioral expectations and rewards system
(Appendix I).

On the last day of training, the team developed procedures for analyzing and evaluating
the effectiveness of the PBIS model. The PI outlined for the team how the data would be
evaluated for the purposes of this study. In addition, the PI assisted the team with developing a
system for analyzing the data on a weekly schedule so the team could sustain PBIS over time
while making data based decisions. This included developing a system for tracking new data,
procedures for sharing the data with staff, and procedures for making decisions regarding
changes to the PBIS system based on the data. Last, the team was trained to use the fidelity
checklist for monitoring of fidelity data across time. Before the end, of the training the team was
directed to only engage in planning of the model and to wait to implement the model within any
home until the PI had directed the team to begin implementation.

**Behavioral Expectations.** The PI guided the PBIS team through developing facility-
wide behavioral expectations to be applied across the living facilities (homes), tutoring room,
cafeteria, courtyard, and all group meetings. Five behavioral expectations (i.e., be a responsible
leader, mutual respect, effective communication, be safe, and be trustworthy) were developed
and operationally defined for each contextually relevant setting (e.g., cafeteria, cottage). For
example, in one cottage, “Be Safe” was defined as being in the cottage by curfew, keeping all
windows and doors locked, and asking permission to enter another youth’s room. Each setting
was included in the behavior matrix to denote the contextual fit of the expectation in the specific setting. All behavior expectations were posted visually in all environments of the facility the youth entered. The team members developed a plan for teaching the appropriate behavior (prosocial) required to meet the behavioral expectations. Lesson plans were developed and suggested for each home to use. For example, staff might lead a group on being a responsible leader and have the youth develop collages of leaders from magazine pictures. The staff member would then discuss the qualities of being a responsible leader and how that applies to the specific cottage.

**Problem Behavior.** Three types of behavior were identified for the agency: cottage-managed, therapist managed, and police managed. Flow charts were developed to guide the team through a problem solving process intended to help them identify which category a problem behavior might be classified (Appendix J). Next, the team developed consequences for each inappropriate behavior category that occurred during the course of the daily activities. These consequences were developed to match the severity of the infraction though staff were trained to ignore minor, annoying behavior. Historically, the team utilized what they called “restriction” which was broadly defined at best and lacked clear implementation. In lieu of this system, the team developed a grounding system that outlined which behaviors could lead to grounding. Criteria was set for how many days a youth could be grounded. Grounding was defined as not being able to earn access to a) the PBIS store, b) supervised off-campus privileges, or c) unsupervised off-campus privileges. Consequences were included in the Youth Welcoming Handbook along with the behavioral expectations and rewards.

In addition to these guidelines, the team developed a system for staff to make referrals to the therapist team to prevent long durations of time passing before a therapist was informed
about a youth’s need. For example, instead of waiting two weeks to inform a therapist about a youth engaging in sleep enuresis, this would be discussed at the weekly clinical staffing for each cottage. The guidelines for police-managed behavior included the process for reaching that level of response to prevent law enforcement from being dispatched to lecture youth about their inappropriate behavior. Included in this process was the information staff were required to obtain when police arrived and steps for completing required agency paperwork.

**Cottage Implementation.** The team decided which cottage would be the first to receive PBIS. The first cottage began implementation of PBIS while the other cottages continued in baseline. Implementation was then staggered for each successive cottage. When PBIS was first implemented in a cottage, staff within the cottage were involved with the development of how to define the behavioral expectations, teach youth the behavioral expectations, and establish appropriate consequences for rule violations. The staff were then trained by the representative PBIS team member and PI on PBIS as a system and the process for using the system within their cottage. Staff then had a kickoff party with the youth to discuss behaviors that met the behavioral expectations and behaviors that violated the expectations. Ongoing review of the behavioral expectations occurred during a daily family meeting. During this meeting, staff reviewed the behavioral expectations, reviewed the daily schedule, and taught a new prosocial behavior that fit under the auspice of one behavioral expectation. The topics were part of a monthly list of topics that each cottage was required to complete and provide a permanent product to demonstrate the prosocial behavior had been taught. Youth were invited to participate in leading these activities. Within each home, there was a reward system in place allowing youth to earn money for following the behavioral expectations. Staff were instructed to provide the youth money when they “caught the youth” following rules. Additionally, staff provided money for behavior and
topic days. On topic days, the staff were given a topic such as mutual respect and were directed to deliver money to the youth who were observed to engage in that specific behavior on that day. Each week the youth were allowed to cash in their money at a reinforcement store. In addition, youth were encouraged to make recommendations about rewards they might earn by meeting the behavioral expectations. Within the store youth could purchase snack foods, toys, electronics, and vouchers that allowed them to buy access to extra privileges. For example, youth could purchase vouchers to escape doing chores, to have extra-unsupervised time off-campus, to stay up late past their bedtimes, etc. Each youth had a checking account that was used to monitor their money balance, how much they were spending in the store, and on which items. Outside of the store, the youth could also use their money to attend big events. Specifically, if 15 tickets were donated to Busch Gardens, youth could use their money to purchase those tickets. Youth were given one to two weeks notice of the sell of activities. They also had a calendar in their home of weekly activities that would cost them agency money. This system was developed to allow the youth to engage in self-determination about what activities they preferred to engage in as historically staff would just select youth – tending to pick those youth they had the best relationships with. In addition, this system allowed the youth to plan and have goals to work toward if there was a specific activity they wanted to participate in, they had to engage in appropriate behavior to earn the money and then save to buy into the activity.
Results

Each dependent variable was analyzed separately and is presented throughout the following paragraphs.

Agency-Wide Evaluation Tool (AET)

Baseline. Baseline data is depicted in Figure 1 for the agency and Figure 2 for each cottage. Before the first three day PBIS training, the agency’s AET score was 32%. Each cottage was also scored resulting in the following score: Cottage A (12.5%), Cottage B (21.8%), Cottage C (12.5%), and Cottage D (15.6%). Across baseline the agency’s mean was 42.4% (range 32-44.1%), Cottage A mean was 12.8% (range 12.5-15.6%), Cottage B mean was 18.2% (range 12.5-21.8%), Cottage C mean was 12.6% (range 12.5-15.6%), and Cottage D mean was 13.08% (range 12.5 – 15.6%).

Figure 1. This graph depicts the agency AET score for each week of the evaluation.
**Intervention.** Intervention AET data is depicted in Figure 1 and 2. Across all four cottages an immediate level change was observed upon implementation of PBIS. Specific to cottage A the mean AET score was 84.8% (range 71.8-90.6%). The score was on an increasing trend for three weeks before we started to observe a slight decreasing trend. This was most likely due to staff turnover and new youth entering the home. Cottage B was second to receive the PBIS implementation. The mean AET score for cottage B was 74.7% (range 56.2 – 84.3%). Fidelity of implementation in cottage B remained on an increasing trend at the end of this study. This cottage also experienced staff turnover requiring the manager to be trained in the PBIS system, join the PBIS team, and begin the process of organizing PBIS within this cottage.

Cottages C and D began PBIS implementation during the same week. The staff that started with the original PBIS team were not employed at the agency at the time of the PBIS implementation. This required the coordinator and PI to have extensive involvement in the development and training of staff. Additionally, the members selected to replace the original team members left the organization within two weeks of implementation. The cottage also received a new manager. Two weeks later the new team members left the cottage and the new manager was demoted to a position in another cottage. As a result, the mean fidelity in cottage C was 58.3% (range 50 – 68.7%). Cottage D had a mean AET score of 59.7% (range 56.2 – 62.5%). Second to cottage A, this cottage experienced the least amount of PBIS team member turnover. Although this cottage was observed to implement components of the PBIS system, components such as behavioral expectation lessons and knowledge of the PBIS system were not observed.
Figure 2. This graph depicts each cottage's AET score across each week of the evaluation.
Figure 3. This graph depicts the average weekly behavior score for each cottage.
Weekly Youth Behavior Score.

**Baseline.** The average weekly behavior score for each cottage is depicted in Figure 3 and table 2. The mean for each respective cottage is as follows Cottage A (1.0), Cottage B (1.08), Cottage C (1.24), and Cottage D (1.13).

Table 3. Average Weekly Behavior Score by Cottage

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cottage</th>
<th>Baseline</th>
<th>Intervention</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cottage A</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cottage B</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>1.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cottage C</td>
<td>1.24</td>
<td>.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cottage D</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>.98</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Intervention.** The mean results for can be found in Table 3. Across the intervention phase the mean for Cottage A was .75. There was an observable negative level change for this cottage after implementation of PBIS. Cottage B mean was 1.18. There was a positive level change after intervention suggesting regression for this cottage. There was a negative level change for both Cottage C (mean .99) and Cottage D (mean .98) but this was most likely due to a substantial reduction in youth residing in the cottages. We conducted a secondary analysis of behavior change for both cottages that obtained an AET score of 80% or higher (i.e., Cottages A and B). Specifically, based on an evaluation of the average weekly score 6 weeks prior to intervention and the last 6 weeks of intervention, there is a notable change in scores (see table 4). Six weeks prior to intervention Cottage A had a mean weekly behavior score of .91 with a reduction to .54 during the last six weeks of intervention. Similarly, Cottage B had a mean score of 1.16 during the six weeks proceeding intervention and 1.01 during the final six weeks of intervention. Because of these promising data, we conducted a third analysis of daily behavior scores described below.
Table 4. Six Week Analysis of Average Weekly Behavior Score Pre/Post

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>6 weeks pre-Intervention</th>
<th>Last 6 weeks of intervention</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cottage A</td>
<td>.91</td>
<td>.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cottage B</td>
<td>1.16</td>
<td>1.01</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Percentage of Youth with Specific Daily Behavior Scores.

**Baseline.** During baseline in Cottage A, on average, 47.2% of youth each day scored a behavior score of zero (figure 4), 31.3% scored a 1 (figure 5), 5% score a 2 (figure 6), 8.8% scored a 3 (figure 7), 3.5% scored a 4 (figure 8), and 3.6 % scored a 5 (figure 9). When aggregating scores 1 and 2 and 3 and 4 we noted 36.3% scored a 1 or 2 (figure 10) and 12.6% scored a 3 or 4 (figure 11). During baseline in Cottage B, on average, 44.6% of youth each day scored a zero (figure 12), 27.4% scored a 1 (figure 13), 14.8% scored a 2 (figure 14), 8.2% scored a 3 (figure 15), 4.4% scored a 4 (figure 16), and 2.4% scored a 5 (figure 17). Again we aggregated scores 1 and 2 and 3 and 4, to analyze the percentage of youth in each category to receive those scores. On average each day, 42.3% of youth score 1 and 2 (figure 18) and 10.6% scored 3 and 4 (figure 19).

**Intervention.** After implementation of PBIS in Cottage A, there was an increase in the number of youth on average receiving a score of zero (61.3%; figure 4). Fewer youth received a score of 1 (20.2%), score of 3 (6.3%), score of 4 (3.1%), score of 5 (2.4%), 1 and 2 aggregated (25.5%), and 3 and 4 aggregated (9.5%). Conversely, there was a slight increase in the average number of youth receiving a score of 2 each day (5.28%). Specific to Cottage B, there was a decrease in the percent of youth each day to receive a score of zero (28.9%), score of 2 (7.9%), score of 3 (7.9%), score of 4 (2.7%), aggregation of 1 and 2 (36.9%), and aggregation of 3 and 4.
(10.6%). Conversely, there was a slight increase of youth receiving a score of 1 (29%) and 5 (2.7%).

Table 5. Cottage A Six Week Analysis of Daily Percentage of Youth With Specific Scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scores</th>
<th>6 weeks Pre (%)</th>
<th>Last 6 weeks of Intervention (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Zero</td>
<td>55.7</td>
<td>23.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One</td>
<td>23.2</td>
<td>23.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Four</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Five</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One &amp; Two Combined</td>
<td>28.1</td>
<td>26.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three and Four Combined</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Six Week Analysis of Daily Percentage. An analysis of 6 weeks of data preceding intervention compared to the last six weeks of intervention suggested promising results for Cottage A (see Table 5) and Cottage B (see Table 6). Specifically, across all daily scores excluding the score of 1 for both cottages and aggregated 1 & 2 for Cottage B, the percent of youth to receive each respective score decreased from pre-intervention to the final six weeks.

Table 6. Cottage B Six-Week Analysis of Daily Percentage of Youth With Specific Scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scores</th>
<th>6 weeks Pre (%)</th>
<th>Last 6 weeks of Intervention (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Zero</td>
<td>44.2</td>
<td>28.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One</td>
<td>20.2</td>
<td>32.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two</td>
<td>17.3</td>
<td>7.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>5.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Four</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Five</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One &amp; Two Combined</td>
<td>37.5</td>
<td>40.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three and Four Combined</td>
<td>14.6</td>
<td>8.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 4. This graph depicts the percentage of youth each day who received a score of zero in Cottage A.

Figure 5. This graph depicts the percentage of youth each day who received a score of 1 in Cottage A.
**Figure 6.** This graph depicts the percentage of youth each day who received a score of 2 in Cottage A.

**Figure 7.** This graph depicts the percentage of youth each day who received a score of 3 in Cottage A.
**Figure 8.** This graph depicts the percentage of youth each day who received a score of 4 in Cottage A.

**Figure 9.** This graph depicts the percentage of youth each day who received a score of 5 in Cottage A.
Figure 10. This graph depicts the percentage of youth each day who received a score of 1 and 2 in Cottage A.

Figure 11. This graph depicts the percentage of youth each day who received a score of 3 and 4 in Cottage A.
Figure 12. This graph depicts the percentage of youth each day who received a score of zero in Cottage B

Figure 13. This graph depicts the percentage of youth each day who received a score of 1 in Cottage B
Figure 14. This graph depicts the percentage of youth each day who received a score of 2 in Cottage B.

Figure 15. This graph depicts the percentage of youth each day who received a score of 3 in Cottage B.
Figure 16. This graph depicts the percentage of youth each day who received a score of 4 in Cottage B.

Figure 17. This graph depicts the percentage of youth each day who received a score of 5 in Cottage B.
Figure 18. This graph depicts the percentage of youth each day who received a score of 1 and 2 in Cottage B.

Figure 19. This graph depicts the percentage of youth each day who received a score of 3 and 4 in Cottage B.
Figure 20. This graph depicts the frequency of external incident reports for each cottage by week.
**External Incident Reports.**

**Baseline.** During baseline the mean number of external incident reports each week for each cottage can be found in Figure 20. The means specific to each cottage were as follows: Cottage A (3.9), Cottage B (1.3), Cottage C (3.1), and Cottage D (1.7).

**Intervention.** After implementation of PBIS the mean number of external incident reports decreased for each cottage (also see figure 20). Specifically, Cottage A (2.3), Cottage B (.66), Cottage C (.77), and Cottage D (.55). It should be noted the change for cottages C and D should be interpreted with caution, as there was a significant reduction in the number of youth served in these cottages.

**Six-Week Analysis.** Table 7 depicts the pre- and post- six-week analysis of the average number of external incident reports for Cottages A and B. Most notably, there was a reduction in the weekly average of incident reports for both Cottage A (2.8 to 1.1) and Cottage B (2.6 to .33).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cottage</th>
<th>Pre</th>
<th>Post</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>.333</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Internal Incident Reports.**

**Baseline.** During baseline the mean number of internal incident reports each week for each cottage can be found in Figure 21. The means specific to each cottage were as follows: Cottage A (3.3), Cottage B (3.8), Cottage C (7.6), and Cottage D (2).
Figure 21. This graph depicts the frequency of internal incident reports for each cottage by week.
**Intervention.** After implementation of PBIS the mean number of internal incident reports decreased for cottages C (5.6) and D (.25), see figure 21. Cottage A increased to a weekly average of 3.4 and Cottage B increased to a weekly average of 4.7. It should be noted the change for cottages C and D should be interrupted with caution, as there was a significant reduction in the number of youth served in these cottages.

**Six-Week Analysis.** Table 8 depicts the average number of internal incident reports for Cottages A and B during the six weeks proceeding PBIS implementation and the last six weeks of intervention. Most notably, there was a reduction in the weekly average of incident reports for both Cottage A (5.3 to 1.1) and Cottage B (6.8 to 2.8).

Table 8. Internal Incident Reports Six Week Pre/Post Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cottage</th>
<th>Pre</th>
<th>Post</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Staff-Youth Interaction Data.**

Twenty-two staff consented to have their interaction data utilized in this study. As the study progressed, multiple staff departed from the agency leaving a total of 14 staff consented to have their interaction data included in the study. The consent allocation for each cottage was as follows: Cottage A (4), Cottage B (5), Cottage C (2), and Cottage D (3). Overall the data do not suggest there was a change in the positive, negative, and no interaction categories (see figure 22).

**Baseline.** During baseline the mean percentage of intervals for each type of scored interaction within Cottage A was as follows positive (36%), negative (13%), and no-interaction (57%). In Cottage B the mean percentage of intervals was positive (53%), negative (16%), and no-interaction (38%). For Cottage C we were only able to collect baseline data and the interactions were represented by the following means positive (25.9%), negative (8%), and no-
interaction (68.8%). Last, Cottage D means were as follows positive (18.5%), negative (5.6%), and no-interaction (78.4%).

**Intervention.** For all cottages were was no change in the level of each respective interaction. Specifically, for Cottage A the mean percent of intervals observed as positive was 36.6%, negative (15.5%), and no-interaction (53.3%). Cottage B was as follows positive (41.8%), negative (12%), and no-interaction (51.8%). Finally, Cottage D means were as follows positive (21.4), negative (17.1), and no-interaction (67.1). Data was not collected in Cottage C post intervention due to staff being absent on observation days.
Figure 22. This graph depicts the average percent of intervals positive (X), negative (open circle), and no-interaction (closed circle) were observed in each cottage by week.
Discussion

Due to the historical punitive culture of residential facilities and need for evidence-based practices within these facilities, this study sought to evaluate an evidence-based organization change model focused on increasing pro-social behavior while reducing inappropriate behavior. Specifically, the aim of this study was to evaluate the feasibility of adopting PBIS to a residential facility supporting high-risk youth in the custody of the Florida Department of Children and Families. To date, this is the only known study to evaluate the adoption and implementation of PBIS within a residential facility. The first research question was tested by developing a PBIS team at the agency comprised of all levels of staff and training them to systematically build and implement a systems-level approach to managing behavior. PBIS fidelity data suggest the system was adopted and implemented with high fidelity in two of the four cottages with barriers to implementation across all four. One major barrier to the implementation of the PBIS system at the facility was staff turnover and the absence of a systematic staff training protocol.

During the evaluation, multiple cottages experienced high rates of turnover and the originally trained PBIS team experienced an attrition rate of 62%, including the loss of the administrator, resulting in new staff being identified to serve on the team. The revised team also experienced attrition difficulties leading to a third team being developed to support the agency. Turnover at the agency as a whole resulted in staff lacking training on the PBIS system and other job task as a whole. Staff turnover and attrition is not a novel concern but is a major problem facing residential facilities (Connor et al., 2003). In fact staff turnover has been found to range between 30 – 70% raising concern about the continuity of care at these facilities (Connor et al.,
Unfortunately there are numerous equations for calculating turnover, which leads to difficulty identifying the exact level of turnover across agencies. Although there are mixed results on the level of turnover rate, there is solid research on variables that lead to high levels of staff turnover. Interestingly, some of these specific variables were noted at the agency involved in this research study (Connor et al., 2003; Seti, 2008).

The lack of staff training and monetary compensation have been identified as major contributing factors to staff turnover in addition to decision making authority and lack of recognition (Connor et al., 2003; Seti, 2008). To date the agency in this study lacks a systematic approach to training and supporting staff across time. Additionally, numerous team members reported feeling as if their input and opinions were not valued at the agency that may have led staff to feel like they were working in an authoritative state. At the research site, staff reported feeling they were rarely recognized for the hard work they were engaged in on a day-to-day basis. Last, there is research to suggest the implementation of a new evidence-based model can be a contributing factor to higher rates of staff turnover (Woltmann et al., 2008). This research finding is partially supported by anecdotal reports by staff that they disagreed with the agency’s focus on rewarding youth for good behavior and intended to leave the agency before full implementation. Though turnover was a significant barrier to the implementation of PBIS, the fidelity data from this study do present a promising future for the implementation of PBIS in residential settings. Interestingly, two specific staff informed the PI they decided to maintain their full-time employment instead of transitioning to as-needed due to the implementation of PBIS.

The second research question was answered by analyzing daily behavior scores, external incident reports, and internal incident reports. Data from the two cottages that reached fidelity
scores of 80% or higher are most notable. These cottages were also found to be implementing the three active ingredients of PBIS that have been found to lead to the most positive outcomes. Specifically, these components included high quality implementation of a rewards system, high implementation of the violation system, and consistent implementation of teaching behavioral expectations (Molloy, Moore, Trail, Epps, & Hopfer, 2013). Cottage A was most consistent with implementing all three active ingredients with the highest level of consistency across staff. Cottage B consistently implemented rewards and teaching systems but there was variability of implementation in regards to the system for rule violations (i.e., grounding). Specifically, some staff were relying on threats of grounding and/or variability in the application of the grounding criteria. Interestingly, Cottage A was also found to have a higher level of positive outcomes across all three-outcome measures. Cottage A experienced a decrease in the average weekly behavior score in addition to the six-week pre/post analysis of the average weekly behavior score. Additionally, Cottage A experienced a decrease in the daily percent of youth who were receiving higher scores on the daily behavior score sheet suggesting an overall reduction in problem behavior.

Similar results were noted for Cottage B in regards to reduction in problem behavior but these findings were not as notable. Specifically, the average weekly behavior score did not decrease from baseline to intervention but with further analysis there was a change in the six-week pre/post analysis of the average weekly behavior score. In addition the percentage of youth to receive higher daily behavior scores was observed to decrease for the categories of 2-5. There was an increase in the number of youth receiving the score of 1 and decrease in youth receiving a score of zero. Although these data suggest there may have been more inappropriate behavior, we would argue with a reduction in more serious problematic behavior there could be an increase
and more attention paid to minor problem behaviors. Thus, staff could have been noticing minor behaviors more often due to the absence of higher intensity problem behavior. Overall, the data suggest PBIS resulted in a reduction of major problem behaviors for both Cottages A and B.

The results from the third outcome variable also suggested there was a decrease in problem behavior within the cottages that were implementing all three PBIS active ingredients. This decrease was most notable when analyzing the internal and external incident reports during the pre-sex week intervention and last six weeks of interventions for both cottages. When analyzing the average mean for the baseline and intervention phases, there was a level change for external incident reports. Conversely, the mean number of internal incident reports for both Cottages A and B increased from the baseline to intervention phase. This could partially be due to technological difficulties during the first four weeks of baseline hindering staffs’ ability to enter the internal incident reports into the agency database. Unfortunately there is no remedy to recovering the data at this point. Even with the limitations presented, the outcome data from the two cottages present promising evidence that a PBIS system implemented to high fidelity can result in a reduction of problem behaviors observed within a residential facility.

The third research question was answered by analyzing direct-observation data of staff interacting with youth during day-to-day activities on the campus of the facility. Unfortunately there was not a change in the percentage of intervals staff engaged in the targeted positive, negative, and no-interaction categories. Due to recruitment parameters, we were only able to collect and use data on staff that consented to the study. Thus, we were limited in the amount of data we could collect each week due to consented staff being absent from work or departing from the agency. Although we cannot draw definitive conclusions about the data, it should be noted the staff were not specifically trained on techniques to change their interactions with youth. To
this end, future research should evaluate adding components to the PBIS training intended to specifically target interaction styles and analyze outcome data post-intervention.

**Implications for PBIS Literature**

This study contributes to the PBIS literature by demonstrating the model can be applied to alternative, non-education settings. At the time of this writing, this is the only known study to apply the PBIS model to a residential facility, including living quarters, supporting high-risk youth in the custody of the state. As researchers continue to evaluate how best to adapt and adopt PBIS to alternative education settings (Nelson et al, 2008) and juvenile justice settings (Jolivette & Nelson, 2010) this study presents promising outcomes for also utilizing the model within residential treatment. Of course further research is needed to understand the long-term feasibility, maintenance, and outcomes for PBIS in residential settings but this work is a huge step in the right direction. As noted earlier, Lampron and Gonsoulin (2013) stated, it is time for PBIS to be adopted and applied to more restrictive facilities that serve high-risk youth. This study directly addresses this challenge and provides insight into lessons learned as we aimed to adopt PBIS to a residential facility.

With any new initiative, each study presents a set of lessons that can be learned and addressed in future lines of work. Sprague et al. (2013) described numerous lessons learned by their implementation of PBIS in juvenile justice settings. Findings and experiences while implementing PBIS for this study can be used to draw parallels between the lessons learned in juvenile justice settings and residential care facilities. First, the foundations of PBIS are just as necessary in residential facilities and juvenile justice facilities. Specifically, a) identifying a small scale location for initial implementation, b) need to secure funding, visibility, and consistent political support, c) establishing providing on-going training and coaching to a
leadership team to address evaluation, planning, and coordinating implementation; d) identifying a team of super-users to train and support implementation; and e) designing a system for providing on-going evaluation and performance-based feedback (Sprague et al., 2013, pp 126-129).

Similar to Sprague et al. (2013) we found first testing the model in one of the cottages allowed for trouble-shooting implementation barriers and staff buy-in. This also allowed for an opportunity for both youth and staff across the campus to ask questions and develop curiosity about the new system. We also found it is necessary to ensure funding, visibility, and consistent political support is maintained. For example, there was significant buy-in from administration for utilizing funds to train staff and support implementation but because donations were needed to maintain the items in the PBIS store, there were barriers to also have the most highly preferred items requested by the youth for the store. Additionally, toward the beginning of implementation the CEO assigned other administrators to overseeing and expressing commitment to the implementation of PBIS. Based on this experience we recommend ensuring the CEO is involved in all phases of the planning and implementation. For us, we found success with the CEO attending PBIS team meetings every three weeks and developing an administrative steering committee that oversaw implementation of the PBIS system and monitored the activities of the PBIS team. The steering committee was instrumental in allowing the PI to provide on going coaching to administration on incorporating the PBIS philosophy into all levels of the agency (including managerial style) and broader planning, evaluation, and implementation of the PBIS system. Finally, consistent political support was a major barrier for the team in regards to mid-administration. Once the initial PBIS administrator departed from the agency, a new
administrator was hired who was noted to rely heavily on an edictal managerial style built on coercion and reactive type techniques for managing both staff and youth behavior.

Due to this change in philosophy early in implementation, members of the PBIS team expressed concern about digressing from the core collaborative-based problem solving approach they most enjoyed about the PBIS model. Extensive coaching was required on behalf of the CEO to ensure the new administrator was developing skills that were aligned with a PBIS model. In addition to mid-administration, we found it necessary to have each cottage manager on the PBIS team to help political support at all levels of staff. The managers were instrumental in the high fidelity scores within cottages A and B. In fact, before the manager of Cottage B joined the PBIS team, there were significant barriers to implementation due to information having to be directed to the manager through the PBIS team member selected for the cottage.

Identifying super-users among staff and managers was a crucial component for maintaining PBIS in the two cottages that achieved high fidelity scores. These staff were encouraged to take on specific roles (e.g., lesson plan development, schedule development, supporting new staff) to help maintain the PBIS system across the agency and within the assigned cottages. Unfortunately there was no system for the PBIS team to provide on-going evaluation and performance feedback thus stunting the advancement of the super-users skills. Even with this lack of a formal system, the super-users were essential to the buy-in and implementation of PBIS in their specific cottages. Like lessons learned in juvenile justice settings, we noted the need for on-going evaluation and performance feedback at all levels of implementation. Unfortunately at the conclusion of this study the agency was still in the planning phase of developing a systematic training protocol to support on-going evaluation and performance feedback for all levels of staff across all aspects of job responsibilities. The barriers
to implementation during this study suggest a systematic training protocol should be developed in conjunction with the PBIS model prior to implementation. It may also be paramount to the success of PBIS to add the training protocol to the AET to ensure on-going fidelity to the system.

Similar to juvenile justice settings, level and point systems are ubiquitous in residential facilities (Field et al., 2004). Often these systems lead to coercive interactions between staff and youth as well as they are used to threaten compliance. Interestingly during the planning of the rewards system for PBIS, the staff reported dissatisfaction with the rigidity and parameters of both level and point systems previously used at the agency. Staff reported the flexibility in the design of the rewards system within the PBIS model and ability to adapt the system to youth as they made progress with engaging in prosocial behavior (i.e., fade frequency of reinforcement) contributed to their buy-in. This lesson is important for future adaptations as we found considering staff’s views and factoring in their feedback led to higher rates of buy-in and utilization of the rewards system.

In addition to the lessons learned that overlap with juvenile justice systems, we noted two core lessons that are important for the adaption of PBIS to residential facilities. First, ensuring buy-in at all levels of the agency was important for the implementation. Though this may seem rudimentary, the team was most successful when there was public support from the CEO, COO, Directors, Therapist, Cottage Managers, and Team Leads. Each of these levels brought unique perspectives to the system and allowed for open communication across the entire system.

Second, the direct care staff reported a long history of feeling their perspectives and opinions were not valued by administration. By placing a heavy emphasis on ensuring team-based decision making staff had the opportunity to be more engaged with the development of the system. The PI had a standing meeting rule of “not swiping right”, team members were
instructed to consider all views points. Anecdotally staff reported to the PI they were starting to finally feel their voices were being valued by the agency administration although much of this was viewed as the PI facilitating the communication. Future adaptations should work to build processes for formal open lines of communication between direct care staff and administration.

**Implications for literature on EBPS in residential facilities**

The literature is still void of EBPs to adopt in residential facilities. In an updated analysis, James (2017) highlighted the absence of models that could be titled EBP but noted the increase in research focusing on improving the quality of care within residential facilities. James (2017) had other recommendations for implementing EBPs within residential care a) take a critical look at the program, b) foster the stability and quality of direct care staff, c) assess readiness, and d) build an evaluation and research infrastructure. This study adds to the literature of evaluating models that can improve the quality of care and outcomes of youth served within residential facilities. Additionally, the present study contributes to the impact contextual fit (Albin, Lucyshyn, Horner, & Flannery, 1996) supports the implementation of a model and buy-in. The former and latter are thought to be important variables to implementing new practices with fidelity and fit the second recommendation outlined by James (2017).

A PBIS system also meets the other three recommendations outlined by James (2017). Specifically, the model requires an assessment to be conducted to evaluate the level of readiness an agency is across various domains needed to meet fidelity. The system also requires an evaluation of the current practices in place and how they fit within the philosophy of a PBIS system including the core foundations of PBIS. Because PBIS is a data-based decision making model, the agency is required to develop on-going evaluation systems to contribute to the decision making process. Last, James (2017) recommends agencies develop manuals for the
systems they use to assist with fidelity and evaluation. The current study, along with PBIS as a model, requires master operating procedures to ensure fidelity and track system structure. The operating procedures are crucial to the sustainability of a PBIS system.

**Future Research**

Though this study presents promising data for adopting PBIS to residential facilities fidelity was not replicated across all cottages limiting the experimental control. Future studies should seek to replicate the implementation of PBIS across cottages and agencies to evaluate the feasibility of agency-wide fidelity. In addition, future researchers might seek to compare outcome data to matched sample sizes in addition to evaluating the system using randomized controlled trials. Researchers should also consider incorporating data analysis recommendations by Scheuermann et al. (2015) which include a) evaluating the impact of the system on prosocial behavior versus only analyzing problem behavior, b) utilizing standardized measures, and c) utilizing multilevel data analysis. The present study only analyzed the impact PBIS had on problem behavior failing to analyze how PBIS impacted prosocial behavior. A core goal of PBIS is to not only to reduce problem behavior but to also increase prosocial behaviors that will have life-long positive impacts on the individuals within the system (Dunlap et al., 2009). Thus, future researchers should evaluate the impact of PBIS on changes to prosocial behavior.

Standardized measures were used in this study to evaluate the fidelity of implementation of PBIS and daily behavior scores but failed to used a standardized equate to account for changes in the daily population or frequency of incident reports across days. Future research should consider the impact of varying population on dependent variables in addition to rate versus frequency when analyzing data reported in frequency (Scheuermann et al., 2015). Finally, future research should use multilevel data analysis to analyze the impact of PBIS. Within the present
study dependent variables were analyzed across cottages and the agency as a whole. Future research might consider analyzing dependent variables across work shifts and target behaviors. Additionally researchers should consider evaluating whether participants representing the data set are homogeneous or heterogeneous. The researchers might first consider analyzing the data based on homogeneous data sets and then heterogeneous data sets. This will allow the researchers to first ensure that changes in the dependent variables are not due to varying degrees of mental health needs. Second, this will allow the researchers to evaluate how changes in outcome data are impacted by youth with the varying degrees of mental health needs. Unfortunately in this study an analysis was not conducted on the degree of homogeneity of the individuals representing the data sets.

**Conclusion**

The present study demonstrated the feasibility of adopting PBIS to a residential facility serving high-risk youth in the custody of the Department of Children and Families. To the authors knowledge this is the first study to evaluate PBIS in the respected setting. Outcome data suggest PBIS is a promising approach to managing behavior within a residential setting but the limitations of the study should be considered when evaluating the implications of the findings. Though the findings are promising, future research should seek to replicate the study to evaluate the impact of PBIS in residential settings.
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Appendix C. AET

Agency-wide PBS Evaluation Tool
(AET)

Adapted Version of the AET for Agency-Wide Positive Behavior Support ©
Includes Scoring Measures from the IDD Program-Wide PBIS Tiered Fidelity Inventory (Algozzine et al., 2014)

Overview

Purpose of the AET

The Agency-wide Evaluation Tool (AET) is designed to assess and evaluate the critical features of agency-wide effective behavior support across each fiscal year. The AET results are used to:

1. assess features that are in place,
2. determine annual goals for agency-wide effective behavior support,
3. evaluate on-going efforts toward agency-wide behavior support,
4. design and revise procedures as needed, and
5. compare efforts toward agency-wide effective behavior support from year to year.

Information necessary for this assessment tool is gathered through multiple sources including review of permanent products, observations, and staff (minimum of 3) and student (minimum of 2 per home) interviews or surveys. There are multiple steps for gathering all of the necessary information. The first step is to identify someone at the agency as the contact person. This person will be asked to collect each of the available products listed below and to identify a time for the AET data collector to preview the products and AET up observations and interview/survey opportunities. Once the process for collecting the necessary data is established, reviewing the data and scoring the AET averages takes two to three hours.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Products to Collect</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. _______ Discipline/Behavior handbook/policies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. _______ Agency improvement plan goals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. _______ Annual Action Plan for meeting agency-wide behavior support goals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. _______ Social skills instructional materials/ implementation time line</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. _______ Incident reports and all other behavior data collected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. _______ Referrals to counseling staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. _______ Other related information</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Using AET Results

The results of the AET will provide agencies with a measure of the proportion of features that are 1) not targeted or started, 2) in the planning phase, and 3) in the implementation/maintenance phases of development toward a systems approach to agency-wide effective behavior support. The AET is designed to provide trend lines of improvement and sustainability over time.
Agency-wide Evaluation Tool (AET) Implementation Guide

Agency ____________________________ Date ___________
District ____________________________ State ___________

**Step 1: Make Initial Contact**

A. Identify agency contact person & give overview of AET page with the list of products needed.
B. Ask when they may be able to have the products gathered. Approximate date: __________
C. Get names, phone #s, email address & record below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Phone</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Email

**Products to Collect**

1. _____ Discipline/Behavior handbook/policies
2. _____ Agency improvement plan goals
3. _____ Annual Action Plan for meeting agency-wide behavior support goals
4. _____ Social skills instructional materials/ implementation time line
5. _____ Incident reports and all other behavior data collected
6. _____ Referrals to counseling staff
7. _____ Other related information

**Step 2: Confirm the Date to Conduct the AET**

A. Confirm meeting date with the contact person for conducting an administrator interview, taking a tour of the agency while conducting student & staff interviews, & for reviewing the products.  
   Meeting date & time: __________________________

**Step 3: Conduct the AET**

A. Conduct administrator interview.
B. Tour agency to conduct observations of posted home rules & randomly selected staff (minimum of 3) and student (minimum of 2) interviews.
C. Review products & score AET.

**Step 4: Summarize and Report the Results**

A. Summarize surveys & complete AET scoring.
B. Update agency graph.
C. Meet with team to review results.  
   Meeting date & time: __________________________
### Agency-wide Evaluation Tool (AET) Scoring Guide

**Agency: ____________________________**

**District: ____________________________**

**State: ____________**

**Pre ____ Post ____ AET data collector _________________________________**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feature</th>
<th>Evaluation Question</th>
<th>Data Source (circle sources used)</th>
<th>Score: 0-2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Expectations Defined</td>
<td>1. Is there documentation that staff has agreed to 5 or fewer positively stated agency rules/behavioral expectations? 0 = Behavioral Expectations have not been identified, are not all positive, or are more than 5 in number 1 = Behavioral expectations identified but may not include a matrix or be posted 2 = Five or fewer behavioral expectations exist that are positive and identified for specific AETtings and at least 90% of staff can list at least 67% of expectations.</td>
<td>Discipline handbook, Instructional materials Other ________</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Are the agreed upon rules &amp; expectations publicly posted in 1 central location per home/area visited by youth? (See interview &amp; observation form for selection of locations). (0= 1; 1 = 2-3; 2 = 4-5)</td>
<td>Wall posters Other ________</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Behavioral Expectations Taught</td>
<td>1. Is there a documented system for teaching behavioral expectations to youth? (0= no; 1 = states that teaching will occur, taught informally or inconsistently; 2= written schedules are used to teach expected behaviors directly to individuals across program and other AETtings)</td>
<td>Lesson plan books, Instructional materials Other ________</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Do 90% of the staff asked state that teaching of behavioral expectations to youth has occurred this month? (0= 0-50%; 1 = 51-89%; 2=90%-100%)</td>
<td>Interviews Other ________</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Do 90% of team members asked state that the agency-wide program has been taught/reviewed with staff on an annual basis? (0= 0-50%; 1 = 51-89%; 2=90%-100%)</td>
<td>Interviews Other ________</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. Can at least 70% of 10 or more youth state 67% of the house/agency rules? (0= 0-50%; 1 = 51-69%; 2 = 70-100%)</td>
<td>Interviews Other ________</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5. Can 90% or more of the staff asked list 67% of the house/agency rules? (0= 0-50%; 1 = 51-89%; 2=90%-100%)</td>
<td>Interviews Other ________</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6 Professional Development: A written process is used for orienting all staff on the 4 Core Tier 1 AWPBIS practices: (a) teaching agency-wide expectations, (b) acknowledging appropriate behavior, (c) correcting errors, and (d) requesting assistance. 0 = no process 1 = process is informal/unwritten not part of professional development and/or does not include all staff or all 4 core Tier 1 practices 2 = formal process for teaching all staff all aspects of Tier 1 system, including all 4 core practices.</td>
<td>Professional development calendar Staff handbook</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. On-going System for Rewarding Behavioral Expectations</td>
<td>1. Is there a documented system for rewarding youth behavior? (0= no; 1 = states to acknowledge, but not how; 2= yes)</td>
<td>Instructional materials, Lesson Plans, Interviews Other ________</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Do 50% or more youth asked indicate they have received a reward (other than verbal praise) for expected behaviors over the past month? (0= 0-25%; 1 = 26-49%; 2 = 50-100%)</td>
<td>Interviews Other ________</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Do 90% of staff asked indicate they have delivered a reward (other than verbal praise) to youth for expected behavior over the past month? (0= 0-50%; 1 = 51-89%; 2 = 90-100%)</td>
<td>Interviews Other ________</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### D. System for Responding to Behavioral Violations

1. **Problem behavior definitions**: program has clear definitions for behaviors that interfere with functional skill and social success.
   - 0 = no clear definitions exist and procedures to manage problems are not clearly documented
   - 1 = definitions and procedures exist but are not clear
   - 2 = definitions and procedures for managing problems are clearly defined, and documented
   - Staff handbook
   - Individual handbook
   - Program policy
   - Discipline flowchart

2. Is there a documented system for dealing with and reporting specific behavioral violations?
   - (0= no; 1= states to document; but not how; 2 = yes)
   - Discipline handbook,
   - Instructional materials
   - Other

3. Do 90% of staff asked agree with administration on what problems are house-staff/clinical staff managed and what problems are crisis/incident report level? (0= 0-50%; 1= 51-89%; 2= 90-100%)
   - Interviews
   - Other

4. Is the documented crisis plan for responding to extreme dangerous situations readily available in each home/location were youth visit?
   - (0= 0; 1= most; 2= all)
   - Walls
   - Other

5. Do 90% of staff asked agree with administration on the procedure for handling extreme emergencies (e.g., fight)?
   - (0= 0-50%; 1= 51-89%; 2= 90-100%)
   - Interviews
   - Other

### E. Monitoring & Decision-Making

1. Does the incident reporting form list (a) youth, (b) date, (c) time, (d) referring staff, (e) problem behavior, (f) location, (g) persons involved, (h) probable motivation, & (i) administrative decision?
   - (0=0-3 items; 1= 4-6 items; 2= 7-9 items)
   - Referral form
   - (circle items present on the referral form)

2. Can the administrator clearly define a weekly system for collecting & summarizing incident reports (computer software, data entry time)?
   - (0=no or no data is collect; 1= data is collected but not summarized; 2= yes, data is collected and summarized)
   - Interview
   - Other

3. Can the administrator clearly define a system for collecting and summarizing the group home/house data collected on individual youth?
   - (0=no or no data is collect; 1= data is collected but not summarized; 2= yes, data is collected and summarized)
   - Interview
   - Other

4. Does the administrator report that the team provides data summary reports to the staff at least weekly? (0= no; 1= 1-2 times/yr.; 2= 3 or more times/yr)
   - Interview
   - Other

5. Do 90% of team members asked report that data is used at least weekly for making decisions in designing, implementing, and revising agency-wide effective behavior support efforts?
   - (0= 0-50%; 1= 51-89%; 2= 90-100%)
   - Interviews
   - Other
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Does the agency improvement plan list improving behavior support systems as one of the top 3 agency improvement plan goals? (0=no; 1=1st-3rd priority; 2=4th or lower priority)</td>
<td>Agency Improvement Plan, Interview, Other</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Can 90% of staff asked report that there is an agency-wide team established to address behavior support systems in the agency? (0=0-50%; 1=51-89%; 2=90-100%)</td>
<td>Interviews, Other</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Does the administrator report that team membership includes representation of all staff? (0=no; 2=yes)</td>
<td>Interview, Other</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Can 90% of team members asked identify the team leader? (0=0-50%; 1=51-89%; 2=90-100%)</td>
<td>Interviews, Other</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Is the administrator an active member of the agency-wide behavior support team? (0=no; 1=yes, but not consistently; 2=yes)</td>
<td>Interview, Other</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Does the administrator report that team meetings occur at least monthly? (0=no team meeting; 1=less often than monthly; 2=at least monthly)</td>
<td>Interview, Other</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Does the administrator report that the team reports progress to the staff at least four times per year? (0=no; 1=&lt;4 times per year; 2=Yes)</td>
<td>Interview, Other</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Does the team have an action plan with specific goals that is less than one year old? (0=no; 2=yes)</td>
<td>Annual Plan, calendar, Other</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Annual Evaluation: Tier 1 Team documents fidelity and effectiveness (including on functional skill outcomes of all youth) of Tier 1 practices at least annually (including year-by-year comparisons) that are share with stakeholders (staff, community, agency) in a usable format.</td>
<td>Annual Plan, calendar, Other</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>Does the agency budget contain an allocated amount of money for building and maintaining agency-wide behavioral support? (0=no; 2=yes)</td>
<td>Interview, Other</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>Can the administrator identify an out-of-agency liaison in the partner agency? (0=no; 2=yes)</td>
<td>Interview, Other</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
H. Teams

1. Team composition: Tier 1 Team includes a Tier 1 systems coordinator, a program administrator, shift staff, and individuals able to provide (a) applied behavioral expertise, (b) coaching expertise, (c) knowledge of individual functional skill and behavior patterns, (d) knowledge about the operations of the program, and (e) means for receiving feedback from youth.

0 = team does not include coordinator, administrator or individuals with behavioral expertise

1 = Team exists but does not include all identified roles or attendance is below 80%

2 = Team exists with coordinator, administrator, and all identified roles represented, with attendance at or above 80% of meetings

Summary Scores:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>G</th>
<th>H</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>/4</td>
<td>/12</td>
<td>/6</td>
<td>/10</td>
<td>/10</td>
<td>/4</td>
<td>/4</td>
<td>/4</td>
<td>/8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Program organizational chart
Tier I team meeting minutes

1. Team Operating Procedures: Tier 1 team meets at least monthly and has (a) regular meeting format/agenda, (b) minutes, (c) defined meeting roles, and (d) a current action plan

0 = Team does not use regular meeting format/agenda, minutes, defined roles, or a current action plan

1 = Team has at least 2 but not all 4 features

2 = Team meets at least monthly and has all 4 features

Let’s talk about your discipline system

1) Do you collect and summarize incident report and group home data on problem behavior? Yes  No
   If no, skip to #4.

2) What system do you use for collecting and summarizing problem behavior data? (E2)
   a) What data do you collect? __________________
   b) Who collects and enters the data? __________________

3) What do you do with the office problem behavior data information? (E3)
   a) Who looks at the data? __________________
   b) How often do you share it with other staff? __________________

4) What type of problems do you expect staff to refer to the supervisors/counselors/police rather than handling in the home AETting (at shift staff level)? (D2)

5) What is the procedure for handling extreme emergencies in the building (i.e. fight)? (D4)

Let’s talk about your agency rules or motto

6) Do you have agency rules or a motto? Yes  No  If no, skip to #10.

7) How many are there? __________________

8) What are the rules/motto? (B4, B5)

9) What are they called? (B4, B5)

10) Do you acknowledge youth for doing well socially? Yes  No  If no, skip to #12.

11) What are the social acknowledgements/activities/routines called (youth of month, positive referral, letter court, stickers, high 5’s)? (C2, C3)
Do you have a team that addresses agency-wide discipline? If no, skip to # 19

12) Has the team taught/reviewed the agency-wide program with staff this year? (B3) Yes  No
13) Is your agency-wide team representative of your agency staff? (F3) Yes  No
14) Are you on the team? (F5) Yes  No
15) How often does the team meet? (F6) __________
16) Do you attend team meetings consistently? (F5) Yes  No
17) Who is your team leader/facilitator? (F4) ___________________
18) Does the team provide updates to staff on activities & data summaries? (E3, F7) Yes  No
   If yes, how often? ______________________
19) Do you have an out-of-agency liaison in the district agency to support you on positive behavior
   support systems development? (G2) Yes  No
   If yes, who? ______________________
20) What are your top 3 agency improvement goals? (F1)

21) Does the agency budget contain an allocated amount of money for building and maintaining agency-
   wide behavioral support? (G1) Yes  No
22) Does your agency have a system in place for analyzing your behavior management system annually
   and presenting that data to all stakeholders? If yes, what does it look like? (F9)
Additional Interviews

In addition to the administrator interview questions there are questions for Behavior Support Team members, staff and youth. **Interviews can be completed during the agency tour.** Randomly select youth and staff as you walk through the agency. Use this page as a reference for all other interview questions. Use the interview and observation form to record youth, staff, and team member responses.

**Staff Interview Questions**
*Interview a minimum of 3 staff*

1) What are the __________________ (agency rules, high 5's, 3 bee's)? (B5)
   (Define what the acronym means)

2) Have you taught the agency rules/behavioral expectations this year? (B2)

3) Have you given out any __________________ since ______________? (C3)
   (rewards for appropriate behavior) (last month)

4) What types of youth problems do you or would you refer to the your supervisor/the counselor/the police? (D2)

5) What is the procedure for dealing with a stranger with a gun? (D4)

6) Is there an agency-wide team that addresses behavioral support in campus?

7) Are you on the team?

**Team Member Interview Questions**

1) Does your team use discipline data to make decisions? (E4)

2) Has your team taught/reviewed the agency-wide program with staff this year? (B3)

3) Who is the team leader/facilitator? (F4)

**Youth interview Questions**
*Interview a minimum of 5 students*

1) What are the __________________ (agency rules, high 5's, 3 bee's)? (B4)
   (Define what the acronym means.)

2) Have you received a __________________ since ______________? (C2)
   (reward for appropriate behavior) (1 month ago)
### Interview and Observation Form

**Staff questions (Interview a minimum of 3 staff members)**

| What are the agency rules? Record the # of rules known. | Have you taught the agency rules/behavior exp. to youth in the last month? | Have you given out anyeral? since? (1 month.) | What types of youth problems do you or would you refer to supervisor/counselor/police? | What is the procedure for dealing with a stranger with a gun? | Is there a team in your agency to address agency-wide behavioral support systems? | Are you on the team? If yes, ask team questions | Does your team use discipline data to make decisions? | Has your team taught/implemented SW program this year? | Who is the team leader/facilitator? | What are the agency rules? Record the # of rules known? | Have you received a since? |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1 | Y | N | Y | N | Y | N | Y | N | Y | N | 1 | Y | N |
| 2 | Y | N | Y | N | Y | N | Y | N | Y | N | 2 | Y | N |
| 3 | Y | N | Y | N | Y | N | Y | N | Y | N | 3 | Y | N |
| 4 | Y | N | Y | N | Y | N | Y | N | Y | N | 4 | Y | N |
| 5 | Y | N | Y | N | Y | N | Y | N | Y | N | 5 | Y | N |
| 6 | Y | N | Y | N | Y | N | Y | N | Y | N | 6 | Y | N |
| 7 | Y | N | Y | N | Y | N | Y | N | Y | N | 7 | Y | N |
| 8 | Y | N | Y | N | Y | N | Y | N | Y | N | 8 | Y | N |
| 9 | Y | N | Y | N | Y | N | Y | N | Y | N | 9 | Y | N |
| 10 | Y | N | Y | N | Y | N | Y | N | Y | N | 10 | Y | N |
| 11 | Y | N | Y | N | Y | N | Y | N | Y | N | 11 | Y | N |
| 12 | Y | N | Y | N | Y | N | Y | N | Y | N | 12 | Y | N |
| 13 | Y | N | Y | N | Y | N | Y | N | Y | N | 13 | Y | N |
| 14 | Y | N | Y | N | Y | N | Y | N | Y | N | 14 | Y | N |
| 15 | Y | N | Y | N | Y | N | Y | N | Y | N | 15 | Y | N |
| **Total** | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

**Team member questions**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Does your team use discipline data to make decisions?</th>
<th>Has your team taught/implemented SW program this year?</th>
<th>Who is the team leader/facilitator?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Youth questions**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What are the agency rules? Record the # of rules known?</th>
<th>Have you received a since?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Location**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Living Rooms</th>
<th>Dining Hall</th>
<th>Education Center</th>
<th>Wood Shop</th>
<th>Kitchens in homes</th>
<th>Game Room</th>
<th>Other (gym, lab)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Are rules & expectations posted?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Are rules &amp; expectations posted?</th>
<th>Is the documented crisis plan readily available?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix D. Daily Behavior Rating Scale

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Daily Behavior Rating Scale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Zero</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Four</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Five</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Six</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix E. Staff-Youth Interaction Data Collection Measure

Home: | Staff: | Data: | Primary/IOA |
---|---|---|---|
Start Time: | End Time: | Routine: |
Observer: | IOA: | Yes/No | Number of Youth: |

Directions: Record data for one staff per data sheet. Circle the check mark that corresponds with behaviors observed during each interval. If no interactions are observed, draw a line through the entire interval. If an observation did not last for 10 minutes, use a yellow highlighter to color in the intervals when observations were not conducted. Please see the bottom of this page for behavior definitions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Positive Interaction</th>
<th>Negative Interaction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 – 0:29</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0:30 – 0:59</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:00 – 1:29</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:30 – 1:59</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:00 – 2:29</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:30 – 2:59</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:00 – 3:29</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:30 – 3:59</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:00 – 4:29</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:30 – 4:59</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5:00 – 5:29</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5:30 – 5:59</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6:00 – 6:29</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6:30 – 6:59</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7:00 – 7:29</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7:30 – 7:59</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:00 – 8:29</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:30 – 8:59</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:00 – 9:29</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:30 – 9:59</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Positive interactions:** any statements, comments, questions, answers to questions, stories, requests, or vocal noises (i.e., laughter) directed towards youth and that do not qualify as negative interactions.

**Negative interactions:** defined as statements, comments, questions, or answers to questions that include negative affect or negative comment (i.e., arguing, complaining, swearing, cussing, threatening, or making a derogatory comment to the child). In addition, any reference to a youth’s inappropriate behavior will be scored as a negative interaction.

**Do not score interactions between staff unless they are talking about youth behavior in front of youth (e.g., “She needs to get it together” – negative interaction)
Appendix F. Admin Social Validity Measure

Board and Administration Questionnaire

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neither Agree nor Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please circle the number that most reflects your view of PBS.

1. PBS has had a positive impact on our agency
   1  2  3
2. PBS has had no impact on our agency
   1  2  3
3. The PBS model has helped our agency develop a behavior management system that fits our context and needs
   1  2  3
4. The PBS model is something I believe our agency will sustain over time
   1  2  3
5. We have seen a change in youth behavior after the implementation of PBS
   1  2  3
6. PBS has provided our agency with a method for analyzing data trends for inappropriate behavior
   1  2  3
Appendix G. Staff Social Validity Measure

Staff Questionnaire

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neither Agree nor Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please circle the number that most reflects your view of PBS.

1. PBS has had a positive impact on our agency
   
2. PBS has had a no impact on our agency
   
3. The PBS model has helped our agency develop a behavior management system has been effective at encouraging positive behavior from the youth we serve.

4. I feel we should continue to use the PBS model

5. We have seen a change in youth behavior after the implementation of PBS

6. PBS has made me feel my input matters at the agency
### Appendix H. PBIS Training Fidelity Measure

#### PBIS Training Fidelity Checklist

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Did the trainer discuss behavioral expectations</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>NA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1)</td>
<td>Did the trainer present rules that match the home and behavioral expectations</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2)</td>
<td>Did the trainer discuss the rewards system</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3)</td>
<td>Did the trainer provide examples of rewarding compliance with behavioral expectations</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4)</td>
<td>Did the trainer discuss the procedures for rule violation</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5)</td>
<td>Did the trainer answer questions</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6)</td>
<td>Did the trainer provide time for role-plays</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7)</td>
<td>Did the trainer provide time for role-plays</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subject</td>
<td>Page Number</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PBIS Overview</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PBIS Team</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHN PBIS Organization Flowchart</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative steering committee responsibilities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PBIS team responsibilities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PBIS Coordinator responsibilities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cottage manager responsibilities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Super-user responsibilities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff responsibilities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth responsibilities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff training</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New staff protocol</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New youth protocol</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cottage A PBIS System</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cottage B PBIS System</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cottage C PBIS System</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cottage D PBIS System</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff Recognition System</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fidelity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Background of PBIS

<<Insert Background Information>>

Important Considerations:

1. PBIS is an earn/not earn system meaning we do not take away reinforcers but rather the youth either earns or not earns depending on their behavior
2. PBIS is a collaborative, team-based approach that factors in the values of the system and individuals comprised of the system
3. PBIS places a heavy focus on prevention of problem behavior, teaching appropriate behavior, reinforcing appropriate behavior, and making data-based decisions
4. PBIS is a systems change approach to manage behavior and should be considered applicable to how we support both youth and staff within the system

CHN PBIS Team

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CEO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chief-Operator</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential Director</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clinical Director</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PBIS Coordinator</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PBIS Co-Coordinator</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cottage Representative</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cottage Representative</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cottage Representative</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cottage Representative</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cot Representative</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education Representative</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clinical Co-Representative</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth Liaison</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<<Insert Agency Organizational Flowchart>>
Administrative Steering Committee

1. Administration visibility and support is crucial to the sustainability of a PBIS system
2. The steering committee is comprised of the CEO, COO, Director of Residential, Clinical Director, and PBIS Coordinator
3. The committee’s responsibilities include:
   a. Ensuring funding to support the goals and objectives of the PBIS system
   b. Monitoring fidelity of implementation across the system and making changes to the fidelity form if necessary to reflect the needs of the agency
   c. Approving or disapproving request from the PBIS team
   d. Ensuring on-going PBIS team meetings
   e. Ensuring agency staff are aware of the PBIS system and agency’s commitment

PBIS Team Responsibilities

1. The PBIS Team plays an essential role in the sustainability of the PBIS System
2. The team should have representatives from each of the following categories
   a. Administration
   b. Cottage Managers from each Cottage
   c. Education
   d. Clinical
   e. Youth
3. Team members should be assigned to each of the following categories:
   a. Agency Administrator
   b. Team Leader/Coordinator/Point-of-Contact
   c. Content Expert
      i. Systems Change
      ii. PBIS
      iii. Principles of Behavior
          1. Positive/Negative Reinforcement
          2. Positive/Negative Punishment
          3. Differential Reinforcement
          4. Contingency Management
          5. Evidence-based behavior intervention systems
      iv. Data Specialist
      v. Records/Note-taker
      vi. Timekeeper
      vii. Cottage Liaison
      viii. Youth Liaison – Ad hoc
      ix. Snack Master
4. Team Responsibilities
   a. Meet bi-weekly
   b. Review agency data
c. Identify problems  
d. Engage in the data-based problem solving method  
e. Review and approve (through voting) any changes to the system  
f. Maintain an action list  
g. Review and update progress of action list  

5. Admin Responsibilities  
a. Attends and actively participates in all PBIS Team meetings  
b. Communicates commitment of PBIS to staff, families, and other administrators  
c. Familiar with agency’s current data and reporting systems  
d. Ensures behavior is written into the Agency Improvement Plan  
e. Brings updates from admin steering committee  
f. Communicates policies  
g. Ensures compliance with policies  
h. Allocates resources for PBIS activities and implementation  
i. Ensures PBIS meeting date/times are posted on master schedule  

6. Coordinator  
a. Leads meeting  
b. Ensures agenda is developed for each meeting  
c. Reviews previous meetings action items  
d. Updates action list with progress on items  
e. Maintains Task/Action Log  
f. Presents Data  
g. Keeps records of notes in master binder  
h. Keeps attendance  
i. Coordinates with steering committee  
j. Oversees staff training (see staff training section)  

7. Note taker/recorder  
a. Documents discussion  
b. Records the result of votes  

8. Time Keeper  
a. Monitors the allocated time from the agenda and ends topics when time has elapsed  
b. Leads vote if team request more time for discussion  

9. Cottage Liaison  
a. Bring updates on the progress of initiatives implemented in the cottage  
b. Bring data on grounding  
   i. Number of youth per week  
   ii. Average number of days (include range and mode)  
   iii. Behaviors leading to grounding  
c. Brings data on lessons taught  
d. Communicate progress of youth receiving Tier2/3 supports (including the data to present to the team)  
e. Bring youth and/or staff concerns – must be submitted to coordinator before the meeting to be added to the agenda  

Coordinator Responsibilities  
The agency coordinator is responsible for the following:  

1. Ensuring all meetings are scheduled and team members are notified
2. Ensuring there is an agenda for each meeting
3. Communicating with the cottages about their cottage specific designs
4. Assisting each cottage manager with trouble shooting any system-level barriers that arise (e.g., staff implementation, youth feedback, etc.)
5. Coordinating with the PBIS store managers to ensure cottages are scheduled for specific times
6. Coordinating with the PBIS store managers to collect, summarize, and evaluate the following data:
   a. Percentage of youth in each cottage attending each week
   b. The amount of money each youth spends
   c. Items were are purchased most and least frequently
7. Coordinating with the data specialist to receive weekly data
8. Summarizing agency weekly data and providing data to each respective team
9. Collecting grounding data from each cottage to summarize, graph, and analyze
10. Completing the PBIS Agency-Evaluation Tool (AET)
11. Evaluating necessary changes to the AET to allow for a more sensitive measure
12. Assisting the agency with utilizing the AET to make decisions about changes, additional training, areas of strengths, areas of needed support, areas of requiring data-based problem solving and solutions
13. Assisting with training of new staff
14. Coordinating the staff recognition system
15. Developing and collecting data on the impact of the staff recognition system
16. Coordinating the youth Positive Referral Form system built by the PBIS team
17. Collects data from managers that demonstrates lessons have been completed as scheduled
18. Additional responsibilities as determined by administration and the PBIS team’s needs

Co-Coordinator Responsibilities

1. Support the coordinator in the operation of the PBIS system as delegated by the coordinator and administration.
2. Responsibilities should not remove the manager from their day-to-day responsibilities unless first approved by the Director
3. Conduct PBIS meetings in the absence of the coordinator

Cottage Liaison/Manager Responsibilities

The cottage manager is an essential partner on the PBIS team and has the following responsibilities within the PBIS system

1. Ensures PBIS is discussed in at least one monthly cottage meeting
2. Ensures the delegate in their cottage has prepared a lesson plan schedule based on the master topic schedule outline by the PBIS team
3. Ensures the delegate in their cottage for money is maintaining the accounting and inventory of money
4. Ensures the delegate in their cottage for leading groups is turning in proof the groups are completed with the youth
5. Provides data to the PBIS coordinator demonstrating groups have been completed as scheduled
6. Checks with staff to ensure their viewpoints are being considered in the on-going implementation and changes to the PBIS system
7. Checks with youth to ensure their viewpoints are being considered in the on-going implementation and changes to the PBIS system
8. Utilizes the principles of PBIS to work with both youth and staff

Super-User Responsibilities

Super-users are essential to maintain the fidelity of implementing the interventions utilized within each cottage. Therefore, identified super-users responsibilities will include:

1. Providing in-vivo coaching to peers as assigned by the coordinator and administration
2. Utilizing the steps of Behavioral Skills Training to assist peers in the cottage with implementation of the PBIS system
   a. Instruction
   b. Modeling
   c. Rehearsal
   d. Feedback
3. Incorporating feedback that is based on goal-setting and peer directed specific to strengths and weaknesses
4. Answer day-to-day questions that arise in the cottage
5. Assist with didactic training as the opportunities arises

Staff Responsibilities

1. Provide input into the development and implementation of PBIS in their respective cottage
2. Follow the guidelines set forth in the PBIS manual for their cottage
3. Maintain positive interactions with the use
4. Attend on-going training and actively participate in on-going in-vivo coaching as directed by their manager

Youth Responsibilities

1. Youth should follow the behavioral expectations and behavioral rules outline in the PBIS system
2. Youth will be encouraged to provide suggestions for the PBIS store, activities, and the PBIS system at large
3. Youth can voluntarily provide feedback on the PBIS system

Staff Training
Staff training is essential to the on-going maintenance of PBIS. This component of the system has not been developed but should be built as the agency builds a global staff training systems. Components to consider:

1. Didactic lecture based informational trainings on PBIS at least four times per year as a first step
2. In-vivo observations and feedback (coaching)
3. Fidelity assessments a minimum of twice per year
4. 4 to 1 positive to corrective interactions during feedback
5. Goal-setting
6. Recognition and rewards system

New Staff Training

All new staff should receive training on PBIS. Although this system is not fully developed by the agency, below is a template for developing the system.

1. All staff are informed about the agency’s commitment to PBIS during their interview
2. During orientation staff receive an overview of PBIS utilizing a didactic informational approach
3. All staff must pass an information quiz and role-plays
4. Role-play assessments should include:
   a. How to deliver CHN Money
   b. How to document data (use scenarios)
   c. How to meet with a youth about grounding
5. Observations by the PBIS liaison of the cottage to ensure fidelity
6. On-going training and coaching as outlined in the staff training portion of this manual

New Youth Training

All new youth should be oriented to PBIS and provide information about the system. The following guidelines will be followed:

1. At the time of intake the counselor completing the process will provide an overview of the PBIS system including
   a. Information about the behavioral expectations
   b. Information about the earning money
   c. Information about using the money in the PBIS store and for outings
2. Once the youth is in the cottage, the youth will be provide a welcome packet
3. The PBIS liaison in the cottage will check in with the youth no later than 48 hours after admission to answer any questions
   a. A youth from the cottage can also volunteer to help orient the new youth
4. In conjunction with the process the youth will attend groups within the cottage based on the lessons outlined on the agency master schedule
Cottage A Protocol

The following format is the current guidelines for implementing PBIS in the Cottage:

1. The cottage manager is responsible for communicating all updates about and related to PBIS to his or her team.
2. The cottage manager is responsible for having a minimum of once a month meetings to discuss how PBIS is going in the cottage (e.g., likes and dislikes), review incident report data, review feedback from youth, and make changes to the system to ensure ecological fit.
3. The manager is responsible for communicating all changes to the system with their cottage to the PBIS team to be recorded in the minutes.
   a. The PBIS team should update the manual to reflect major changes.

Reinforcement in Cottage:

4. A staff member should be identified as the Money Ambassador who has the following responsibilities:
   a. Monitor the youth’s account balances
   b. Print new money when inventory is low
   c. Communicate problems with money to the cottage manager
5. All staff are responsible for noticing and providing reinforcement for appropriate behavior.
   a. Examples of reinforcers: Social praise, Thank you Notes, Kuddos sent from administration, CHN Money, Surprise Activities
6. Staff are responsible for providing a minimum of six $1 bills per shift to youth for good behavior.
   a. This technique is referred to as “catch them being good”
7. Staff are responsible for delivering one $5 bill to each youth who meets the criteria for the topic day (e.g., Monday = be a responsible leader day)
8. Staff are responsible for delivery one $10 bill on the day each youth attends school
9. Staff are responsible for delivery one $5 bill on the day each youth attends EPIC

Formal Lessons on Behavioral Expectations

10. Formal lessons are scheduled lessons that last between 15 or more minutes depending on the youth’s age and activity
11. PBIS Lessons are to be listed on a master calendar for the entire campus by topic
12. Staff should consult the master calendar to develop a cottage specific calendar of topics that will be formally discussed with the youth.
13. The lessons mentioned in #11 should take place a minimum of once per week
14. The staff are required to provide evidence the lessons were completed
15. Examples of lessons might included but are NOT limited to:
   a. Having youth make a collage of the people they look up to and talk about how that person models the five behavioral expectations
   b. Having youth break off into teams of two-three, select a leader, and discuss how it means for that person to be a responsible leader
16. Evidence the lessons were completed should be delivered to the PBIS coordinator

Informal Lessons

17. Informal lessons should occur throughout the day with youth
18. Informal lessons are non-schedule lessons but rather in-vivo or incidental moments to teach the behavioral expectations
19. Examples might include but are not limited to:
a. On the drive to Busch Gardens discussing what each behavioral expectation means for the setting  
b. While walking to the cafeteria reminding the youth what ‘Be Safe’ means because of recent rule violations  
c. Having casual conversations about life and imbedding in topics related to the five behavioral expectations

Family meeting

20. Each day staff will have a minimum of 1 family meeting  
21. This meeting will be scheduled around the same time for each respective day  
22. It is the sole responsibility of staff to conduct the family meeting but they may recruit youth to assist with the meeting  
23. Staff should have an agenda set before starting the meeting  
24. Staff should inform the youth what the agenda for the meeting will include  
25. Staff should maintain a 4 to 1 ratio of positive to negative interactions with the youth  
26. The focus of the meeting should include:  
   a. The day’s agenda  
   b. What is going well in the cottage (praise)  
   c. What the youth should focus on improving on for the day  
      i. For example, “We have noticed rooms are remaining dirty. You must have your room cleaned before we start leisure activities today”  
   d. Have youth stating something going well for them  
   e. End the group  
27. The family meeting is not intended to be a lecturing session

Using Agency Money

28. Please see the master overview of the PBIS Money system for specifics on how youth can use their agency money

Corrective Consequences

29. Corrective consequences should be relied on only when preventative strategies have not been effective.  
30. Each cottage should have a list of potential inappropriate behaviors and corrective consequences the staff can use with youth – this should be used to train staff  
31. Corrective consequences can vary from a simple redirection to a more intrusive consequence such as grounding  
32. The cottage manager should have a data collection system in place to track the use of corrective consequence including  
   a. Date of rule infraction  
   b. Rule infraction  
   c. Youth involved  
   d. Type of corrective consequence  
   e. Staff initials  
33. Grounding  
   a. Grounding is defined as the inability to earn access to the PBIS Store and Off-Campus Privileges (supervised or unsupervised)  
   b. The following inappropriate behaviors may lead to grounding:  
      i. Disrespect to staff – insubordination including not following instructions when provided a minimal of three reminders/request. Using inappropriate language such as cuss words  
      ii. Suspension from school – being sent home for inappropriate behavior or inability to attend due to inappropriate behavior
iii. Theft – taking property that does not belong to the youth. This could be theft from staff, peers, the agency, local business, etc.
iv. AWOL – leaving property without permission for any reason or length of time
v. Battery – hitting another individual with force. This can be with an open or closed fist, foot, elbow, head, and/or furniture/foreign object

c. The following guidelines should be used when grounding a youth:
   i. Disrespect to staff – one day maximum
   ii. Suspension from school – grounded per day the youth is suspended
   iii. Theft = Grounded for 1 – 3 days
   iv. AWOL – grounded for 1 day per 30 minutes the youth is off campus
   v. Batter – grounded for 1-5 days depending on injury

d. When informing a youth they are grounded, staff should follow this format
   i. Ensure both parties are in a calm state
   ii. Meet in private
   iii. Explain the rule infraction as it applied to the five behavioral expectations
   iv. Inform the youth how many days she will be grounded
   v. Avoid engaging in lecturing
   vi. Inform the youth if she has questions staff would be happy to schedule a time to meet to discuss the infraction
   vii. When the youth is coming to end their grounding, meet with the youth to explain the expectation and they will be off grounding
| **Be A Responsible Leader** | • Model positive interactions  
• Take initiative to complete responsibilities |
|----------------------------|--------------------------------------------------|
| **Effective Communication** | • Verbalize your needs using positive language  
• Sign-out before leaving cottage |
| **Be Trustworthy**         | • Take responsibility for rule violations  
• Always tell the truth  
• Avoid stealing |
| **Mutual Respect**         | • Model appropriate attire  
• Model cleanliness  
• Appropriately share concerns with peers and staff |
| **Be Safe**                | • Be in by curfew  
• Check-in every 15 minutes  
• Ensure all doors and windows remain locked |
Cottage B

The following format is the current guidelines for implementing PBIS in the Cottage:

1. The cottage manager is responsible for communicating all updates about and related to PBIS to his or her team
2. The cottage manager is responsible for having a minimum of once a month meetings to discuss how PBIS is going in the cottage (e.g., likes and dislikes), review incident report data, review feedback from youth, and make changes to the system to ensure ecological fit.
3. The manager is responsible for communicating all changes to the system with their cottage to the PBIS team to be recorded in the minutes.
   a. The PBIS team should update the manual to reflect major changes.

Reinforcement in Cottage:

4. A staff member should be identified as the Money Ambassador who has the following responsibilities
   a. Monitor the youth’s account balances
   b. Print new money when inventory is low
   c. Communicate problems with money to the cottage manager
5. All staff are responsible for noticing and providing reinforcement for appropriate behavior.
   a. Examples of reinforcers: Social praise, Thank you Notes, Kuddos sent from administration, agency Money, Surprise Activities
6. Staff are responsible for providing a minimum of six $1 bills per shift to youth for good behavior.
   a. This technique is referred to as “catch them being good”
7. Staff are responsible for delivering one $5 bill to each youth who meets the criteria for the topic day (e.g., Monday = be a responsible leader day)
8. Staff are responsible for delivery one $10 bill on the day each youth attends school
9. Staff are responsible for delivery one $5 bill on the day each youth attends EPIC

Formal Lessons on Behavioral Expectations

10. Formal lessons are scheduled lessons that last between 15 -20 minutes depending on the youth’s age and activity
11. PBIS Lessons are to be listed on a master calendar for the entire campus by topic
12. Staff should consult the master calendar to develop a cottage specific calendar of topics that will be formally discussed with the youth.
13. The lessons mentioned in #11 should take place a minimum of once per week
14. The staff are required to provide evidence the lessons were completed
15. Examples of lessons might included but are NOT limited to:
   a. Having youth make a collage of the people they look up to and talk about how that person models the five behavioral expectations
   b. Having youth break off into teams of two-three, select a leader, and discuss how it means for that person to be a responsible leader
16. Evidence the lessons were completed should be delivered to the PBIS coordinator

Informal Lessons

17. Informal lessons should occur throughout the day with youth
18. Informal lessons are non-schedule lessons but rather in-vivo or incidental moments to teach the behavioral expectations
19. Examples might include but are not limited to:
a. On the drive to Busch Gardens discussing what each behavioral expectation means for the setting  
b. While walking to the cafeteria reminding the youth what ‘Be Safe’ means because of recent rule violations  
c. Having casual conversations about life and imbedding in topics related to the five behavioral expectations

Family meeting

20. Each day Mac will have a minimum of 1 family meeting  
21. This meeting will be scheduled around the same time for each respective day  
22. It is the sole responsibility of staff to conduct the family meeting but they may recruit youth to assist with the meeting  
23. Staff should have an agenda set before starting the meeting  
24. Staff should inform the youth what the agenda for the meeting will include  
25. Staff should maintain a 4 to 1 ratio of positive to negative interactions with the youth  
26. The focus of the meeting should include:  
   a. The day’s agenda  
   b. What is going well in the cottage (praise)  
   c. What the youth should focus on improving on for the day  
      i. For example, “We have noticed rooms are remaining dirty. You must have your room cleaned before we start leisure activities today”  
   d. Have youth stating something going well for them  
   e. End the group  
27. The family meeting is not intended to be a lecturing session

Using agency Money

28. Please see the master overview of the PBIS Money system for specifics on how youth can use their agency money

Corrective Consequences

29. Corrective consequences should be relied on only when preventative strategies have not been effective.  
30. Each cottage should have a list of potential inappropriate behaviors and corrective consequences the staff can use with youth – this should be used to train staff  
31. Corrective consequences can vary from a simple redirection to a more intrusive consequence such as grounding  
32. The cottage manager should have a data collection system in place to track the use of corrective consequence including  
   a. Date of rule infraction  
   b. Rule infraction  
   c. Youth involved  
   d. Type of corrective consequence  
   e. Staff initials  
33. Grounding  
   a. Grounding is defined as the inability to earn access to the PBIS Store and Off-Campus Privileges (supervised or unsupervised)  
   b. The following inappropriate behaviors may lead to grounding:  
      i. Disrespect to staff – insubordination including not following instructions when provided a minimal of three reminders/request. Using inappropriate language such as cuss words  
      ii. Suspension from school – being sent home for inappropriate behavior or inability to attend due to inappropriate behavior
iii. Theft – taking property that does not belong to the youth. This could be theft from staff, peers, agency, local business, etc.
iv. AWOL – leaving property without permission for any reason or length of time
v. Battery – hitting another individual with force. This can be with an open or closed fist, foot, elbow, head, and/or furniture/foreign object
vi. Destruction of property – breaking or damaging property that does not belong to youth
c. The following guidelines should be used when grounding a youth:
   i. Disrespect to staff – one day maximum
   ii. Suspension from school – grounded per day the youth is suspended
   iii. Theft = Grounded for 1 – 3 days
   iv. AWOL – grounded for 1 day per 30 minutes the youth is off campus
   v. Batter – grounded for 1-5 days depending on injury
   vi. Destruction of property – grounded for days approved by manager not to exceed 3 days
d. When informing a youth they are grounded, staff should follow this format
   i. Ensure both parties are in a calm state
   ii. Meet in private
   iii. Explain the rule infraction as it applied to the five behavioral expectations
   iv. Inform the youth how many days she will be grounded
   v. Avoid engaging in lecturing
   vi. Inform the youth if she has questions staff would be happy to schedule a time to meet to discuss the infraction
   vii. When the youth is coming to end their grounding, meet with the youth to explain the expectation and they will be off grounding
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Be A Responsible Leader</strong></th>
<th><strong>Effective Communication</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Model and follow all rules</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Welcome new youth</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Take initiative to be a positive role-model</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Verbalize your feelings</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Using appropriate words and tone</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Take-turns listening and talking</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Be Trustworthy</strong></th>
<th><strong>Mutual Respect</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Take responsibility for your own positive and negative behaviors</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Always tell the truth</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Aware of other’s personal space</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Sensitive to culture differences</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Being kind to everyone and everything</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Be Safe</strong></th>
<th><strong>Be Safe</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Stay engaged in activities (on-task)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Follow staff directives</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Remain in eyesight of staff unless you obtained permission from staff</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Cottage C

The following format is the current guidelines for implementing PBIS in the Cottage:

1. The cottage manager is responsible for communicating all updates about and related to PBIS to his or her team.
2. The cottage manager is responsible for having a minimum of once a month meetings to discuss how PBIS is going in the cottage (e.g., likes and dislikes), review incident report data, review feedback from youth, and make changes to the system to ensure ecological fit.
3. The manager is responsible for communicating all changes to the system with their cottage to the PBIS team to be recorded in the minutes.
   a. The PBIS team should update the manual to reflect major changes.

Reinforcement in Cottage:

4. A staff member should be identified as the Money Ambassador who has the following responsibilities:
   a. Monitor the youth’s account balances
   b. Print new money when inventory is low
   c. Communicate problems with money to the cottage manager
5. All staff are responsible for noticing and providing reinforcement for appropriate behavior.
   a. Examples of reinforcers: Social praise, Thank you Notes, Kuddos sent from administration, agency Money, Surprise Activities
6. Staff are responsible for providing a minimum of six $1 bills per shift to youth for good behavior.
   a. This technique is referred to as “catch them being good”
7. Staff are responsible for delivering one $5 bill to each youth who meets the criteria for the topic day (e.g., Monday = be a responsible leader day)
8. Staff are responsible for delivery one $10 bill on the day each youth attends school
9. Staff are responsible for delivery one $5 bill on the day each youth attends EPIC

Formal Lessons on Behavioral Expectations

10. Formal lessons are scheduled lessons that last between 15 or more minutes depending on the youth’s age and activity.
11. PBIS Lessons are to be listed on a master calendar for the entire campus by topic.
12. Staff should consult the master calendar to develop a cottage specific calendar of topics that will be formally discussed with the youth.
13. The lessons mentioned in #11 should take place a minimum of once per week.
14. The staff are required to provide evidence the lessons were completed.
15. Examples of lessons might included but are NOT limited to:
   a. Having youth make a collage of the people they look up to and talk about how that person models the five behavioral expectations
   b. Having youth break off into teams of two-three, select a leader, and discuss how it means for that person to be a responsible leader
16. Evidence the lessons were completed should be delivered to the PBIS coordinator

Informal Lessons

17. Informal lessons should occur throughout the day with youth.
18. Informal lessons are non-schedule lessons but rather in-vivo or incidental moments to teach the behavioral expectations.
19. Examples might include but are not limited to:
   a. On the drive to Busch Gardens discussing what each behavioral expectation means for the setting
   b. While walking to the cafeteria reminding the youth what ‘Be Safe’ means because of recent rule violations
   c. Having casual conversations about life and imbedding in topics related to the five behavioral expectations

Family meeting

20. Each day Lowry will have a minimum of 1 family meeting
21. This meeting will be scheduled around the same time for each respective day
22. It is the sole responsibility of staff to conduct the family meeting but they may recruit youth to assist with the meeting
23. Staff should have an agenda set before starting the meeting
24. Staff should inform the youth what the agenda for the meeting will include
25. Staff should maintain a 4 to 1 ratio of positive to negative interactions with the youth
26. The focus of the meeting should include:
   a. The day’s agenda
   b. What is going well in the cottage (praise)
   c. What the youth should focus on improving on for the day
      i. For example, “We have noticed rooms are remaining dirty. You must have your room cleaned before we start leisure activities today”
   d. Have youth stating something going well for them
   e. End the group
27. The family meeting is not intended to be a lecturing session

Using agency Money

28. Please see the master overview of the PBIS Money system for specifics on how youth can use their agency money

Corrective Consequences

29. Corrective consequences should be relied on only when preventative strategies have not been effective.
30. Each cottage should have a list of potential inappropriate behaviors and corrective consequences the staff can use with youth – this should be used to train staff
31. Corrective consequences can vary from a simple redirection to a more intrusive consequence such as grounding
32. The cottage manager should have a data collection system in place to track the use of corrective consequence including
   a. Date of rule infraction
   b. Rule infraction
   c. Youth involved
   d. Type of corrective consequence
   e. Staff initials
33. Grounding
   a. Grounding is defined as the inability to earn access to the PBIS Store and Off-Campus Privileges (supervised or unsupervised)
   b. The following inappropriate behaviors may lead to grounding:
      i. Disrespect to staff – insubordination including not following instructions when provided a minimal of three reminders/request. Using inappropriate language such as cuss words
ii. Suspension from school – being sent home for inappropriate behavior or inability to attend due to inappropriate behavior
iii. Theft – taking property that does not belong to the youth. This could be theft from staff, peers, agency, local business, etc.
iv. AWOL – leaving property without permission for any reason or length of time
v. Battery – hitting another individual with force. This can be with an open or closed fist, foot, elbow, head, and/or furniture/foreign object
vi. Destruction of property – breaking or damaging property that does not belong to youth
c. The following guidelines should be used when grounding a youth:
   i. Disrespect to staff – one day maximum
   ii. Suspension from school – grounded per day the youth is suspended
   iii. Theft = Grounded for 1 – 3 days
   iv. AWOL – grounded for 1 day per 30 minutes the youth is off campus
   v. Battery – grounded for 1-5 days depending on injury
   vi. Destruction of property – approved by manager by cannot exceed 3 days
d. When informing a youth they are grounded, staff should follow this format
   i. Ensure both parties are in a calm state
   ii. Meet in private
   iii. Explain the rule infraction as it applied to the five behavioral expectations
   iv. Inform the youth how many days she will be grounded
   v. Avoid engaging in lecturing
   vi. Inform the youth if she has questions staff would be happy to schedule a time to meet to discuss the infraction
   vii. When the youth is coming to end their grounding, meet with the youth to explain the expectation and they will be off grounding
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Rules</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Be A Responsible Leader</td>
<td>• Model and follow all rules</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Take initiative to be a positive role-model</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Encourage appropriate peer behavior</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effective Communication</td>
<td>• Verbalize your feelings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Using appropriate words and tone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Be Trustworthy</td>
<td>• Take responsibility for your own positive and negative behaviors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Gain permission to use other’s property</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mutual Respect</td>
<td>• Aware of other’s personal space</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Aware of noise level in the home</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Use appropriate language</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Be Safe</td>
<td>• Be in cottage at curfew</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Keep windows and doors locked</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Avoid physical altercations</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Cottage D

The following format is the current guidelines for implementing PBIS in the Cottage:

1. The cottage manager is responsible for communicating all updates about and related to PBIS to his or her team
2. The cottage manager is responsible for having a minimum of once a month meetings to discuss how PBIS is going in the cottage (e.g., likes and dislikes), review incident report data, review feedback from youth, and make changes to the system to ensure ecological fit.
3. The manager is responsible for communicating all changes to the system with their cottage to the PBIS team to be recorded in the minutes.
   a. The PBIS team should update the manual to reflect major changes.

Contract

4. The agency will develop a contract that will be review with youth and include expectations tied to the behavioral expectations
5. These expectations will be mandatory for the continued involved in the program
6. The contract will include measurable and observable goals
   a. For example:
      i. Youth will engage in a minimum of one 30 minute structured play time with youth while staff co-facilitate and observe for 80% of week days
      ii. Youth will complete assigned chores 90% of weeks days

Reinforcement in Cottage:

7. A staff member should be identified as the Money Ambassador who has the following responsibilities
   a. Monitor the youth’s account balances
   b. Print new money when inventory is low
   c. Communicate problems with money to the cottage manager
8. All staff are responsible for noticing and providing reinforcement for appropriate behavior.
   a. Examples of reinforcers: Social praise, Thank you Notes, Kuddos sent from administration, agency Money, Surprise Activities
9. Staff are responsible for providing a minimum of six $1 bills per shift to youth for good behavior.
   a. This technique is referred to as “catch them being good”
10. Staff are responsible for delivering one $5 bill to each youth who meets the criteria for the topic day (e.g., Monday = be a responsible leader day)
11. Staff are responsible for delivery one $10 bill on the day each youth attends school
12. Staff are responsible for delivery one $5 bill on the day each youth attends EPIC

Formal Lessons on Behavioral Expectations

13. Formal lessons are scheduled lessons that last between 15 or more minutes depending on the youth’s age and activity
14. PBIS Lessons are to be listed on a master calendar for the entire campus by topic
15. Staff should consult the master calendar to develop a cottage specific calendar of topics that will be formally discussed with the youth.
16. The lessons mentioned in #11 should take place a minimum of once per week
17. The staff are required to provide evidence the lessons were completed
18. Examples of lessons might included but are NOT limited to:
   a. Having youth make a collage of the people they look up to and talk about how that person models the five behavioral expectations
b. Having youth break off into teams of two-three, select a leader, and discuss how it means for that person to be a responsible leader

19. Evidence the lessons were completed should be delivered to the PBIS coordinator

Informal Lessons

20. Informal lessons should occur throughout the day with youth
21. Informal lessons are non-schedule lessons but rather in-vivo or incidental moments to teach the behavioral expectations
22. Examples might include but are not limited to:
   a. On the drive to Busch Gardens discussing what each behavioral expectation means for the setting
   b. While walking to the cafeteria reminding the youth what ‘Be Safe’ means because of recent rule violations
   c. Having casual conversations about life and imbedding in topics related to the five behavioral expectations

Family meeting

23. Each day Maternity will have a minimum of 1 family meeting
24. This meeting will be scheduled around the same time for each respective day
25. It is the sole responsibility of staff to conduct the family meeting but they may recruit youth to assist with the meeting
26. Staff should have an agenda set before starting the meeting
27. Staff should inform the youth what the agenda for the meeting will include
28. Staff should maintain a 4 to 1 ratio of positive to negative interactions with the youth
29. The focus of the meeting should include:
   a. The day’s agenda
   b. What is going well in the cottage (praise)
   c. What the youth should focus on improving on for the day
      i. For example, “We have noticed rooms are remaining dirty. You must have your room cleaned before we start leisure activities today”
   d. Have youth stating something going well for them
   e. End the group
30. The family meeting is not intended to be a lecturing session

Using agency Money

31. Please see the master overview of the PBIS Money system for specifics on how youth can use their agency money

Corrective Consequences

32. Corrective consequences should be relied on only when preventative strategies have not been effective.
33. Each cottage should have a list of potential inappropriate behaviors and corrective consequences the staff can use with youth – this should be used to train staff
34. Corrective consequences can vary from a simple redirection to a more intrusive consequence such as grounding
35. The cottage manager should have a data collection system in place to track the use of corrective consequence including
   a. Date of rule infraction
   b. Rule infraction
   c. Youth involved
   d. Type of corrective consequence
   e. Staff initials
36. Grounding
   a. Grounding is defined as the inability to earn access to the PBIS Store and Off-Campus Privileges (supervised or unsupervised)
   b. The following inappropriate behaviors may lead to grounding:
      i. Disrespect to staff – insubordination including not following instructions when provided a minimal of three reminders/request. Using inappropriate language such as cuss words
      ii. Suspension from school – being sent home for inappropriate behavior or inability to attend due to inappropriate behavior
      iii. Theft – taking property that does not belong to the youth. This could be theft from staff, peers, CHN, local business, etc.
      iv. AWOL – leaving property without permission for any reason or length of time
      v. Battery – hitting another individual with force. This can be with an open or closed fist, foot, elbow, head, and/or furniture/foreign object
      vi. Dirty rooms – a room that has trash, dirty laundry, and clutter
      vii. Lack of care for child –
      viii. Destruction of property – breaking or damaging property that does not belong to youth
   c. The following guidelines should be used when grounding a youth:
      i. Disrespect to staff – one day maximum
      ii. Suspension from school – grounded per day the youth is suspended
      iii. Theft = Grounded for 1 – 3 days
      iv. AWOL – grounded for 1 day per 30 minutes the youth is off campus
      v. Battery – grounded for 1-5 days depending on injury
      vi. Dirty rooms – 1 day
      vii. Lack of care for child – approved by manager but cannot exceed 2 days and must have written contract to address the specific needs
      viii. Destruction of property – approved by manager but cannot exceed 3 days
   d. When informing a youth they are grounded, staff should follow this format
      i. Ensure both parties are in a calm state
      ii. Meet in private
      iii. Explain the rule infraction as it applied to the five behavioral expectations
      iv. Inform the youth how many days she will be grounded
      v. Avoid engaging in lecturing
      vi. Inform the youth if she has questions staff would be happy to schedule a time to meet to discuss the infraction
      vii. When the youth is coming to end their grounding, meet with the youth to explain the expectation and they will be off grounding
<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Be A Responsible Leader** | • Model and follow all rules  
• Take initiative to be a positive role-model  
• Pick up after yourself |
| **Effective Communication** | • Verbalize your feelings  
• Using appropriate words and tone |
| **Be Trustworthy** | • Take responsibility for your own positive and negative behaviors  
• Comply with curfew |
| **Mutual Respect** | • Aware of other's personal space  
• Are of noise level in the home  
• Mindful of other children and their sleeping schedules |
| **Be Safe** | • Monitor your child  
• Keep windows and doors locked  
• Avoid potential risky situations for you and your child |
Staff Recognition System

As on May 26, 2017 the administrative team is in the process of developing a staff recognition system. This system is crucial to buy-in for staff’s use of the PBIS system.

PBIS Fidelity

Data based decision making is crucial to the sustainability of the PBIS system. The Agency-Wide Evaluation Tool (AET) should be used to measure the on-going fidelity of PBIS.

The AET is divided into 8 categories:

A) Expectations Defined
B) Behavioral Expectations Taught
C) On-going System for Rewarding Behavioral Expectations
D) System for Responding to Behavioral Violations
E) Monitoring & Decision-Making
F) Management
G) Agency-Level Support
H) Teams

Categories A – D should be scored for each cottage. This results in a fidelity score for each individual cottage. The lowest score per question within A-D is assigned to that question when scoring the agency’s fidelity score. All scores are then summed to calculate the agency fidelity score which is based on all scores A- H.

The agency might elect to add another category to include staff training. Recommendations will be provided to the agency for this specific category.

<<Insert AET here>>
Appendix J. Problem Behavior Flowcharts

Do we have behavioral expectations and rules
- Yes: Teach through lesson plans
- No: Develop behavioral expectations and rules

Have we taught them to staff and youth?
- Yes
- No: Problem Solve
- Does this address delivery concern?
- Yes: Provide coaching and problem solve
- No: Acknowledge

Do youth report receiving rewards and staff report delivering rewards?
- Yes: Acknowledge
- No: Prevention Flow chart

Is the behavior Collage/SOD-Managed?
- Yes: Implement appropriate consequence per grid
- No: Call SOD

Did this resolve the problem?
- Yes: Stop
- No: Return to beginning of flow chart

Is the behavior Collage/SOD-Managed?
- Yes: Send information to therapist using format
- No: Call the Police and notify SOD

Obtain the following information:
- Case Number
- Officer Badge Number
- Criminal Charge

Is the behavior Police Managed?
- Yes: See Collage/SOD or Therapist Managed flowchart
- No: See Collage/SOD or Police Managed flowchart

Follow-up with therapist within 2 days

Complete internal or external IR when necessary