

# **PBIS Forum 17 Practice Brief: Facility-wide PBIS Implementation as Viewed by Roundtable Participants and From the Field**

---

PBIS Leadership Forum- *Roundtable Dialogue*

December 2017

## **Facility-wide PBIS Definition**

More and more secure and non-secure juvenile facilities are adopting and implementing Facility-wide Positive Behavior Interventions and Supports (FW-PBIS), an evidence-based framework that is preventative and developmentally appropriate, to replace traditional punitive behavior management systems and practices (Jolivette, Scheuermann, & Ennis, 2015). FW-PBIS is an adapted three-tiered framework designed to meet the social, emotional, and behavioral needs of youth in juvenile facilities with researchers indicating that youth in these settings are positively and behaviorally responding across the tiers (e.g., Alonzo-Vaughn, Bradley, & Cassavaugh, 2015; Fernandez, Doyle, Koon, & McClain, 2015; Fernandez, McClain, Brown Williams, & Ellison, 2015; Jolivette, 2016), and the proportions of the three-tiered model still hold true, even in more restrictive, alternative settings (Jolivette, McDaniel, Sprague, Swain-Bradway, & Ennis, 2012). At its core, FW-PBIS is a data-driven framework in which juvenile facilities implement across all waking hours and environments while collecting data across all tiers to both guide facility-wide decisions and to individually monitor the needs of each youth. As described by Jolivette et al. (2012), traditional PBIS practices can be adapted to fit the complex and unique needs of youth in these more restrictive settings. In juvenile facilities, Tier I supports are universally delivered to all youth, in all settings, throughout the day, afternoon, evenings, and weekends by all staff. Facility-wide behavioral expectations are established and practiced in each setting with staff monitoring youth social and emotional behaviors. Tier II supports build upon Tier I and provide additional services to the youth that do not respond to universal supports, by providing more intensive interventions. Secondary tier interventions are typically delivered in small groups or one-on-one with youth displaying similar problem behaviors. Youth requiring additional and more intensive supports receive Tier III supports that are often individualized and based on the function of their behavior. The specific tiered supports a youth needs are dependent upon their data and the evidence-based practices adopted by the agency/facility with each facility's 'menu' of practices being different based on their unique population and mission/vision.

## **Why May Juvenile Agencies and Facilities Consider Adopting the PBIS Framework**

Adoption of the PBIS framework with FW-PBIS implementation as the goal of a juvenile agency/facility is something that must be (a) carefully considered; (b) widely discussed; (c) agreed upon at both the agency and facility levels; (d) with appropriate resources dedicated to systems change, fidelity of implementation, editing of existing behavioral policies and procedures, and staff professional development; and (e) focused on data collection and monitoring in real-time with data access granted at the facility-level. For those agencies/facilities who are looking for a framework to better organize their behavior management system, work smarter not harder, and improve youth outcomes, then conversations on adopting the PBIS framework would be appropriate. In addition, the U. S. Departments of Education and Justice (2014) as well as researchers (e.g., Ennis & Gonsoulin, 2015; Jolivette & Nelson, 2010; Myers & Farrell, 2008; Sprague, Jolivette, & Nelson, 2014) and policy groups (e.g., Lampron & Gonsoulin, 2013) call on juvenile facilities to implement a multi-tiered behavioral framework with PBIS being one of the options (see resource list posted on [www.pbis.org](http://www.pbis.org) for conceptual and research manuscripts, webinars, presentations, and briefs related to FW-PBIS implementation in juvenile corrections).

# **PBIS Forum 17 Practice Brief: Facility-wide PBIS Implementation as Viewed by Roundtable Participants and From the Field**

---

PBIS Leadership Forum- *Roundtable Dialogue*

December 2017

## **Roundtable Dialogue Participants and Topics**

Participants in this year's PBIS Leadership Forum juvenile justice roundtable dialogue came from 12 states representing each region of the country with some fully implementing FW-PBIS for several years, some in the early stages of FW-PBIS implementation, some wanting to grow their school-wide PBIS into FW-PBIS, and some thinking about adopting the PBIS framework. Our attendees constituted a diverse group of juvenile agency administrators, juvenile staff, and state educational agency personnel; yet the conversations, ideas shared, problem-solving, and energy was positive, preventative, proactive, and focused on what was best for the youth served in their secure and non-secure juvenile facilities.

The facilitators identified four topics based on questions most frequently asked by practitioners considering or implementing FW-PBIS prior to and while at the PBIS Leadership Forum. Participants were provided a brief description of each topic which was distributed throughout the juvenile justice strand sessions and reiterated at the roundtable and then were asked to self-select which group they would like to join. The sizes of each group were similar.

### **1. Sources and Uses of Data to make FW-PBIS Decisions**

- This group discussed how their facility currently collects data and how the data are used on an agency and local level to make decisions related to FW-PBIS practices for youth and systems supports for staff.

### **2. Selecting and Implementing Appropriate Reinforcements**

- This group discussed how their facilities select reinforcements, the types of reinforcements that have been most and least effective, the criteria for youth to receive reinforcements, and the frequency of the reinforcements.

### **3. Teaching and Modeling FW-PBIS Behavior Expectations**

- This group discussed how they select appropriate behavior expectations, how the expectations are conveyed to youth, and how they teach their youth to display positive behaviors.

### **4. Using FW-PBIS to Organize Facility Practices, including mental health, into the Tiers**

- This group discussed the practices they have tried within the all, some, and few logic of the PBIS framework along with specific mental health practices that could be incorporated into behavioral interventions at each tier of FW-PBIS.

## **Specific FW-PBIS Implementation Examples from Roundtable Dialogue Participants**

These summarized ideas were generated by roundtable participants.

### **Sources and Uses of Data to make FW-PBIS Decisions**

The participants in this group brainstormed a list of agency-wide/facility-wide data sources that they use in relation to making FW-PBIS decisions. Examples of their youth data sources included: (a) length of time at the facility; (b) number and types of restraint methods used on youth; (c) behavioral incidents – such as youth-on-youth assaults, youth-on-staff assaults, exposures, contraband, PREA, elopement/escape attempts,

# **PBIS Forum 17 Practice Brief:**

## **Facility-wide PBIS Implementation as Viewed by Roundtable Participants and From the Field**

---

PBIS Leadership Forum- *Roundtable Dialogue*

December 2017

threatening/intimidation, tattooing, self-harm, damage to property, weapon seized, etc.; (d) weeks being served on which FW-PBIS tier; (e) education discipline referrals; (f) grades; (g) youth disability; (h) types of mental health services being given; (i) points earned; (j) treatment level progression; (k) frequency and length of seclusion; (l) location of incidents; (m) time of day of incidents; (n) activity; (o) youth/staff involved; and (p) strategies in place when incidents occurred. In addition to youth data sources, many participants stated that they simultaneously collect staff data in relation to their PBIS implementation. Examples of staff-related data sources included: (a) injuries caused by youth; (b) absences/tardies to work; (c) number of ‘call-offs’; (d) fidelity of implementation of FW-PBIS and practices; (e) training modules/workshops attended; and (f) number of FW-PBIS reinforcements given to youth (e.g., gotchas). There was some discussion related to how agencies/facilities who are implementing FW-PBIS made edits to their incident forms to ensure that they were capturing all the behavioral data necessary to make data-based decisions related to youth behavior, discipline, and treatment/programming, and how with FW-PBIS implementation this was the first-time teams had access to facility-level data and were empowered to make changes based on it. The participants discussed how the FW-PBIS Leadership Teams and agency use these data to make decisions. Facility-level teams use the data to determine: (a) staffing patterns; (b) programming options and interface with the master schedule; (c) selection of practices; (d) identification for Tier II and III entrance/exit criteria; (e) specific youth programming and treatment options/plans; (f) effectiveness of FW-PBIS implementation; and (g) effectiveness of consequences applied to behavioral infractions. Agencies use the data to determine staff training needs, supports, evaluation, and goal setting (e.g., strategic planning objective criteria).

### **Selecting and Implementing Appropriate Reinforcements**

The participants in this group discussed how they select and implement appropriate reinforcements for their specific populations. The majority of this group’s time was used (a) discussing ways to provide youth with additional reinforcements to acknowledge positive youth behavior and (b) identifying ways to make the FW-PBIS events/privileges more personalized to improve youth buy-in. Some of their ideas included: (a) more frequent events; (b) providing youth with quality and individualized time with facility adults and family; (c) having staff participate in the events as well; (d) gender-specific reinforcements; and (e) access to off-campus activities. The participants also discussed how their agency and/or facility was moving away from food-centered reinforcements and introducing more privileges, movement-based activities, status activities, and social events. Most participants agreed with this idea as they wanted the FW-PBIS reinforcements to better match what the youth could access once out of the facility.

### **Teaching and Modeling FW-PBIS Behavior Expectations**

The participants in this group discussed the importance of teaching and modeling all aspects of the FW-PBIS plan and then focused on ideas as to how to most effectively accomplish this. They also discussed how teaching and modeling are more important than just reinforcing youth; something that most staff prefer doing. Some of the ideas they generated include: (a) fostering and strengthening positive leadership both at the administrative level of the facility and among the FW-PBIS Leadership Teams; (b) the notion of reinforcing the need for and concept of ‘consistency’ of implementation across all staff, locations, and activities; (c) using both formal and informal ‘teachable moments’ to strengthen the concepts and behavioral expectations within the framework; (d) using the behavioral matrix as an anchor for staff as they teach the expectations by having it posted everywhere within the facility; (e) keeping the lines of communication for feedback on FW-PBIS effectiveness open across staff; (f) supporting staff ownership of the FW-PBIS plan as it was created by their peers; (g) making sure that mechanisms are in place to include youth voice in the teaching and modeling of expectations; and (h) using family engagement activities as a conduit to solidify the behavioral expectations – what works in the facility should work outside the facility. The participants also

# PBIS Forum 17 Practice Brief:

## Facility-wide PBIS Implementation as Viewed by Roundtable Participants and From the Field

---

PBIS Leadership Forum- *Roundtable Dialogue*

December 2017

thought that a FW-PBIS pep rally, periodically conducted, was a way to refocus all staff and youth on the behavioral expectations.

### Using FW-PBIS to Organize Facility Practices, including mental health, into the Tiers

The participants in this group first discussed the definition for the all, some, and few logic inherent within the tiers of the PBIS framework. Initially, they discussed how decisions used to be made on an individual basis for youth and that thinking about everything they (the adults) do in a tiered fashion was a new way of thinking within juvenile facilities. As would be expected, many of the practices they discussed were behavioral in focus, but the group also discussed how mental health interventions could be incorporated. For Tier I, participants identified facility-wide practices that were preventative in nature and delivered to all youth. Their Tier I practice examples included: (a) the use of de-escalation strategies; (b) using ‘thinking reports’ which are post-incident reflections and future goal setting; (c) linking to family engagement activities; and (d) ensuring that all the tenets of FW-PBIS are in place – expectations, matrix, resource guides, acknowledgement system, and data. Their Tier II practice examples included: (a) Check-in/Check-out with additional check-in opportunities; (b) other mentoring programs; (c) re-teaching opportunities; (d) behavioral contracts; and (e) the use of group contingencies. Their Tier III practice examples included: (a) individual or group therapy; (b) specialized treatment groups; and (c) increased staffing for specific youth due to inappropriate behaviors.

### Frequently Asked Questions

Throughout the roundtable groups, a few common questions emerged as they networked with one another and sought ideas and resources for use within their own agencies and facilities. We paraphrase their questions with proposed ideas to consider in addressing their questions.

#### **Q: What is the difference between SW-PBIS and FW-PBIS?**

**A:** School-wide PBIS (SW-PBIS) is the implementation of the PBIS framework across the tiers only during educational hours and by education staff as is typical in traditional school settings. SW-PBIS has been implemented by 25,911 elementary, middle, and high schools including early childhood and alternative settings ([www.pbis.org](http://www.pbis.org); December 2017). Facility-wide PBIS (FW-PBIS) is the implementation of the PBIS framework across the tiers during all waking hours, across all facility environments, by all staff, for all youth in non-secure and secure residential facility environments (Jolivette, Kimball, Boden, & Sprague, 2016; Kimball & Jolivette, 2015). Non-secure residential facilities may include juvenile facilities on a non-locked campus, community-based programs such as group homes and shelter care settings, and non-locked residential facilities. Secure residential facility environments may include locked juvenile facilities, both detention and long-term, psychiatric and therapeutic hospitals, and locked residential facilities. Thus, the difference is that with FW-PBIS all staff, including non-education personnel, implement the framework and such implementation includes non-school hours across the entire facility environments and activities. Most juvenile facilities initial implementation of the framework is FW-PBIS while others move from SW-PBIS and grow to FW-PBIS so as to allow for proactive and preventative consistency and continuity across all programming and treatment, staff, and youth.

#### **Q: How do we embed mental health practices into the all, some, or few logic of the PBIS framework?**

**A:** Embedding existing mental health services into an FW-PBIS framework requires consistent communication and an established data collection process between the facility’s mental health staff and all other facility personnel, including the FW-PBIS Leadership Teams (Jolivette et al., 2012). Typically, facilities begin by incorporating universal Tier I interventions and screeners to identify youth requiring additional

# PBIS Forum 17 Practice Brief:

## Facility-wide PBIS Implementation as Viewed by Roundtable Participants and From the Field

---

PBIS Leadership Forum- *Roundtable Dialogue*

December 2017

services and establish a mental health and trauma-informed culture. That is, all current practices – behavioral, mental health, transition, etc. – are discussed, decisions are made as to whether they serve all youth, some youth, or few youth, and gaps in meeting the needs of youth in a proactive manner are identified with additional practices added to address them (see Jolivet et al., 2012 for a process of identifying practices across the tiers). Some juvenile agencies/facilities root all practices within a trauma-informed lens while simultaneously implementing the PBIS framework. By doing so, the language of the facility-wide behavioral expectations, how such expectations are taught and modeled, and for what reinforcements are earned are streamlined and constantly implemented across all programming and treatment with the mental health language used by all staff with all youth as a preventative measure (Marrow, Knudsen, Olafson, & Bucher, 2012). Researchers have identified the need to meet the mental health needs of youth with emotional and behavioral disorders which constitute part of the juvenile correction population.

### **Q: How do we identify evidence-based practices, especially for Tiers II and III, for youth in juvenile facilities?**

**A:** There are many reputable entities whose websites provide a plethora of practices, interventions, and strategies for youth involved in the juvenile system and which can be adapted and tiered to fit within the all, some, and few logic of the PBIS framework. Typically, juvenile agencies and/or facilities have standing committees or ad hoc committees whose charge is to research, identify, and train juvenile staff on evidence-based practices to meet all aspects of the youth served, such as academic, behavioral, emotional, mental health, transition, recreation, etc. The specific practices are translated into sustainable policies and procedures. Such committees would be a system support within the PBIS framework; a support provided to staff to ensure high fidelity of implementation of the practices. We offer some entities whose research indicate appropriate practices for youth in juvenile corrections – including age appropriate, developmentally appropriate, emotional/socially appropriate, trauma-informed, and culturally-relevant (this is not an exhaustive list). As also demonstrated, evidence-based practices from typical settings can be adopted and adapted for use within juvenile facilities as part of the PBIS framework.

- OSEP Technical Assistance Center on Positive Behavior and Interventions Supports
  - [www.pbis.org](http://www.pbis.org)
- The National Assistance Center for the Education of Delinquent Children and Youth
  - [www.neglected-delinquent.org](http://www.neglected-delinquent.org)
- Colorado Blueprints
  - [www.blueprintsprograms.com](http://www.blueprintsprograms.com)
- Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention
  - [www.ojjdp.gov](http://www.ojjdp.gov)
- Center for School Mental Health
  - [www.csmh.umaryland.edu](http://www.csmh.umaryland.edu)
- OSEP Ideas That Works
  - [www.osepideasthatwork.org/jj](http://www.osepideasthatwork.org/jj)
- National Center on Mental Health in Juvenile Justice
  - [www.ncmhjj.com](http://www.ncmhjj.com)
- Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration
  - [www.samhsa.org](http://www.samhsa.org)
- What Works Clearinghouse
  - [www.ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc](http://www.ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc)

# **PBIS Forum 17 Practice Brief:**

## **Facility-wide PBIS Implementation as Viewed by Roundtable Participants and From the Field**

---

PBIS Leadership Forum- *Roundtable Dialogue*

December 2017

**Q: How can all the diverse types and configurations of secure and non-secure juvenile facilities implement the same framework?**

**A:** PBIS is a framework for which to better organize one's systems, data, and practices so it is very adaptable to the different juvenile facility types, configurations, populations served, lengths of stays, and any other contextual factor unique to the facility (e.g., Jolivette & Nelson, 2010; Jolivette et al., 2015; Jolivette, Swoszowski, & Ennis, 2013). As the FW-PBIS Leadership Teams are constructing their FW-PBIS systems, data, and practices, they would take into account such contextual variables to best meet the needs, per their data, of the youth they serve. That is, every FW-PBIS plan would be different, yet it would still adhere to the tenets of the PBIS framework. This flexibility is a hallmark of the PBIS framework and one which makes it appealing to juvenile agencies and facilities who want a proactive and preventative evidence-based framework to address the behavioral and discipline needs of their youth that fits within their mission and vision statements. Many juvenile agencies implementing FW-PBIS have begun sharing aspects of their FW-PBIS plans on their websites which also reinforces the adaptability of it across types and configurations.

**Q: How can we link FW-PBIS implementation with other initiatives such as family/community engagement?**

**A:** Many juvenile facilities implementing FW-PBIS have been able to do this, and their FW-PBIS Leadership Teams have done so in many different ways taking into account their facility contextual variables. A common way in which we observed such blending is related to the FW-PBIS reinforcement system. Some facilities have added family-related privileges and events for the youth to earn and then involve their family. For example, youth may earn extra visitations, longer visitations, visitations with board games/cards to use during the visit, additional or longer phone calls, invites to mother/auntie/grandma and son dances, stamps with stationery/cards to send messages home, head shots (pictures) of themselves to send home, and positive phone calls to home by facility staff who provide positive updates on their child's progress and growth. Families who have benefited from their youth earning such privileges anecdotally report more positive relations with their child and to the facility as well as support for FW-PBIS implementation while youth report an increased and maintained buy-in to FW-PBIS (Jolivette, Boden, Sprague, Ennis, & Kimball, 2015). In terms of community engagement, we have observed FW-PBIS Leadership Teams also use the FW-PBIS reinforcement system to promote greater connections with the community at-large and with facility to school transitions. For example, youth may earn community outings, longer community outings, overnight passes with approved family, and access to outside vocational speakers. Some agencies have specifically linked all of their 'initiatives' to the PBIS framework and produced written materials detailing their programming and treatment with engagement in mind. These include FW-PBIS brochures, family and youth handbooks, and on-line materials with details of the FW-PBIS plans, contingencies, contacts for questions/clarifications, and data usage. Some agencies/facilities have also created family/community training materials on FW-PBIS in hopes that elements of it can be used once youth transition out of the facility.

**Q: How do we build a sense of community among FW-PBIS implementers?**

**A:** This question has arisen over the past several years at the PBIS Leadership Forum from those who attend the juvenile justice strand. We will continue to offer a roundtable on juvenile justice and keep the format and topics of the roundtable flexible to meet the current needs of the field and those who are attending the PBIS Leadership Forum. We encourage those in attendance to network and share their contact information as well as their implementation ideas (both facilitators and barriers) with others. Also, we suggest that those interested in or currently implementing FW-PBIS (a) contact those who have presented on their FW-PBIS efforts the past three years at the PBIS Leadership Forum as their names and affiliations are part of the archived schedule; (b) visit the PBIS TA Center's website ([www.pbis.org](http://www.pbis.org)) and look for resources and ideas under the community button (a resource list will be posted shortly and updated frequently) as well as the

# PBIS Forum 17 Practice Brief: Facility-wide PBIS Implementation as Viewed by Roundtable Participants and From the Field

---

PBIS Leadership Forum- *Roundtable Dialogue*

December 2017

NDTAC TA Center's website ([www.neglected-delinquent.org](http://www.neglected-delinquent.org)) and look for tools and webinars specific to juvenile justice and PBIS; (c) contact those in the field who are conducting research on ideas related to the feasibility and effectiveness of FW-PBIS implementation; (d) check the strands and sessions at professional conferences for juvenile justice and PBIS content; and (e) contact agencies/facilities who are implementing FW-PBIS for ideas to share and to possibly schedule either time with some of their FW-PBIS Leadership Team members or a site-visit to learn more about their implementation efforts. Overall, for those interested in FW-PBIS and the community undertaking such work, to become a consumer of this science through reading journals, attending conferences, leading discussions, etc.

## Resources

A full resource list with descriptive notes will be posted soon on [www.pbis.org](http://www.pbis.org) under 'community' and 'juvenile justice.'

A new video related to a state juvenile agency multi-year FW-PBIS implementation can be found at <https://www.pbis.org/training-video/videos>

## References

- Alonzo-Vaughn, N., Bradley, R., & Cassavaugh, M. (2015). PBIS in Arizona Department of Juvenile Corrections: How tier II practices build upon tier I. *Residential and Treatment of Children and Youth, 32*, 321-333.
- Ennis, R. P., & Gonsoulin, S. G. (2015). Multi-tiered systems of support to improve outcomes for youth in juvenile justice settings: Guiding principles for future research and practice. *Residential Treatment for Children and Youth, 32*, 258-265.
- Fernandez, M. A., Doyle, C., Koon, R., & McClain, D. (2015). Managing disruptive and violent juvenile offenders in the Georgia Department of Juvenile Justice. *Corrections Today, September/October*.
- Fernandez, M. A., McClain, D., Brown Williams, B., & Ellison, P. (2015). PBIS in Georgia Department of Juvenile Justice: Data dashboard and radar reports utilized for team data-based decision-making with facility team leader perspectives. *Residential Treatment for Children and Youth, 32*, 334-343.
- Jolivet, K. (2016). *Multi-tiered systems of support in residential juvenile facilities*. Washington, DC: The National Technical Assistance Center for the Education of Neglected or Delinquent Children and Youth (NDTAC).
- Jolivet, K., Kimball, K. A., Boden, L. J., & Sprague, J. R. (2016). The utility of a multi-tiered behavioral system in juvenile corrections: The positive behavior interventions and supports (PBIS) framework. *Corrections Today, 78*, 42-47.
- Jolivet, K., McDaniel, S. C., Sprague, J. SR., Swain-Bradway, J., & Ennis, R. P. (2012). Embedding the PBIS framework into the complex array of practices within AE settings: A decision-making approach. *Assessment for Effective Intervention, 38*, 15-29.

# **PBIS Forum 17 Practice Brief:**

## **Facility-wide PBIS Implementation as Viewed by Roundtable Participants and From the Field**

---

PBIS Leadership Forum- *Roundtable Dialogue*

December 2017

- Jolivet, K., & Nelson, C. M. (2010). Adapting positive behavioral interventions and supports for secure juvenile justice settings: Improving facility-wide behavior. *Behavioral Disorders, 36*, 28-42.
- Kimball, K., & Jolivet, K. (2015). *Facility-wide PBIS*. National Technical Center on Positive Behavior Interventions and Supports. [www.pbis.org](http://www.pbis.org)
- Lampron, S., & Gonsoulin, S. (2013). PBIS in restrictive settings: The time is now. *Education and Treatment of Children, 36*, 161-174.
- Marrow, M. T., Knudsen, K. J., Olafson, E., & Bucher, S. E. (2012). The value of implementing TARGET within a trauma-informed juvenile justice setting. *Journal of Child & Adolescent Trauma, 5*(3), 257-270. doi:10.1080/19361521.2012.697105
- Myers, D. M., & Farrell, A. F. (2008). Reclaiming lost opportunities: Applying public health models in juvenile justice. *Children and Youth Services Review, 30*, 1159-1177.
- Sprague, J. R., Jolivet, K., & Nelson, C. M. (2014). Applying positive behavior intervention and supports in alternative education programs and secure juvenile facilities. In H. M. Walker & F. M. Gresham (Eds.), *Evidence-based practices for addressing school-related behavior problems and disorders* (pp. 261-276). New York, NY: Guilford.
- U.S. Departments of Education and Justice. (2014). *Guiding principles for providing high-quality education in juvenile justice secure care settings*. Retrieved from <http://www2.ed.gov/policy/gen/guid/correctional-education/guiding-principles.pdf>