PBIS Forum 18 Practice Brief:
Facility-wide PBIS: Common Questions From the Forum & Field

PBIS Leadership Forum- *Roundtable Dialogue* January 2019

Overview

As more and more agencies and facility staff consider adopting and adapting the positive behavior interventions and supports (PBIS) within residential and juvenile justice facilities, many questions have emerged related to facility-wide positive behavior interventions and supports (FW-PBIS). Per our collective work within residential and juvenile justice facilities and in tandem with PBIS Forum attendees who participated in this and past year's juvenile justice strand sessions and roundtable discussions, we provide responses and resources to some of the more common questions asked.

FW-PBIS Frequently Asked Questions

[Note: The first 3 questions were included in the 2017 Juvenile Justice Practice Brief and are still asked, so they are worth repeating (Kumm & Jolivette, 2017) with a few updated citations.] For the remaining questions, they are grouped according to the concepts of: a) **integration** (how the team can embed and combine a variety of models and methods into a single tiered framework to address the 'whole' youth across a variety of domains); b) **systems** (supports provided by the agency or facility to ensure that the FW-PBIS Leadership teams have the pedagogy and training to adopt and implement the FW-PBIS framework, access to data, and ability to identify and implement practices as well as ensure high fidelity of implementation of all practices and procedures by all staff); c) **data** (access to real-time, accurate aggregated and disaggregated data in a variety of visual and tabular formats for use by the tiered teams for data-based decision-making); and d) **practices** (evidence-based and promising strategies, interventions, and curricula validated with at-risk, vulnerable, and marginalized youth populations that can be tiered into the all – Tier I, some – Tier II, and few – Tier III logic of the framework). Resources to support an agency and facility staff and FW-PBIS Leadership team members understanding of FW-PBIS specific to these common questions are provided at the conclusion.

Q1: 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; September 2018). 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; Sprague, Jolivette, Boden, & Wang, 2019). 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.

Kristine Jolivette, Ph.D., & Sara Sanders, Ed.D., University of Alabama; Skip Kumm, MAT, University of Illinois at Chicago; David Royer, Ph.D., university of Hawai'i at Mānoa; Jeffrey R. Sprague, Ph.D., University of Oregon

PBIS Forum 18 Practice Brief:
Facility-wide PBIS: Common Questions From the Forum & Field

Q2: 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 factors 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 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.

Q3: 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 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.

Integration

Q4: I have heard other agencies/facilities have integrated the FW-PBIS framework with a trauma-informed care focus – how have they done that?
A: With the advent of new science and a better understanding of the mental health needs of the youth served in these types of settings, many accrediting entities and state/local agencies and facilities have policies which now state that part of their therapeutic and programming mission is to provide a trauma-informed care or approach to their service delivery. In 2014, the Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration (SAMHSA) produced a concept for trauma – "individual trauma results from an event, series of events, or set

KRISTINE JOLIVETTE, PH.D., & SARA SANDERS, ED.D., UNIVERSITY OF ALABAMA; SKIP KUMM, MAT, UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS AT CHICAGO; DAVID ROYER, PH.D., UNIVERSITY OF HAWAI'I AT MĀNOA; JEFFREY R. SPRAGUE, PH.D., UNIVERSITY OF OREGON

of circumstances that is experienced by an individual as physically or emotionally harmful or life threatening and that has lasting adverse effects on the individual's functioning and mental, physical, social, emotional, or spiritual well-being" (p. 7). Further, SAMHSA (2014) stated to be trauma-informed "a program, organization, or system that is trauma-informed realizes the widespread impact of trauma and understands potential paths for recovery; recognizes the signs and symptoms of trauma in clients, families, staff, and others involved with the system; and responds by fully integrating knowledge about trauma into policies, procedures, and practices, and seeks to actively resist re-traumatization" (p. 9). Thus, agencies/facilities have learned some of their existing practices (e.g., use of seclusion and restraint) used when youth display inappropriate behaviors (e.g., youth-on-youth, youth-on-staff, self-harm, noncompliance) may actually re-traumatize a youth in their care. As such, many agencies/facilities have used the FW-PBIS framework as a means to identify other more proactive practices to 'front-load' their tiered toolbox for staff use, including practices at each tier with de-escalation components. In addition, some agencies/facilities have adopted the Sanctuary Model to improve youth and staff outcomes (e.g., Elwyn, Esaki, & Smith, 2015), and others have embedded and tiered the practices of that model within the FW-PBIS framework. Others have adopted specific trauma-informed practices and infused them throughout their FW-PBIS plan. Please refer to the resources section at the end of this document for trauma-informed toolkits and training webinars. Agencies/facilities have accomplished such integration by ensuring that the teaming structures (e.g., FW-PBIS Leadership team, Sanctuary team, other teams charged with trauma-informed care) are (a) well-informed of each other's activities to decrease the likelihood of competition of resources or confusion of roll-out activities with staff and youth; (b) have team membership overlap for sharing of ideas and resources; (c) working from a joint strategic or operational plan; and (d) staff professional development activities are aligned across the common constructs of FW-PBIS and trauma-informed care. There have been growing pains in such integration as team members/staff are anecdotally reporting these two are 'competing initiatives,' much time is spent in meetings or trainings, and the roll-out merger have been slow. The notion of competing initiatives is a common misperception by staff whenever anything new is introduced to an agency. In this case, the misconception may be exacerbated given that both FW-PBIS and trauma-informed care are causing pedagogical shifts in the way staff from different disciplines within the facility need to view juvenile corrections. Even with such growing pains, those who are able to integrate the two (i.e., trauma-informed approach within the FW-PBIS framework) are observing improved youth and staff outcomes – the goal of each. In addition, this integration provides a context for staff to benefit from the trauma-informed approaches as well as set the stage for personal staff self-care.

Q5: How does the FW-PBIS framework and restorative practices align?
A: Restorative practices describes a method for addressing inappropriate and offending behavior, where the emphasis is focused on establishing, building, and repairing relationships rather than assigning blame and punishment (Hopkins, 2002). In recent years, there has been a shift away from more punitive approaches, towards the use of restorative practices, particularly in juvenile justice facilities where the practice has been demonstrated to be effective (Fonius, Persson, Guckenburg, Hurley, & Petrosino, 2016). For facilities interested in or currently implementing restorative practices, the primary goals of the FW-PBIS framework closely align with restorative practices goals, allowing both to be used effectively together (Lampron & Gonsoulin, 2013). FW-PBIS supports the primary goals of restorative practice (community offender responsibility, competency development, and community protection) and the combination of both can be powerful when concurrently implemented (Lampron & Gonsoulin, 2013). For example, one of the principal components of FW-PBIS is the development of facility-wide rules and expectations, a component that directly supports the development of community offender responsibility (Lampron & Gonsoulin, 2013). Additionally, the three tiers found within the FW-PBIS framework can be used to address competency development by teaching skills including academic, workforce, independent living, and social skills (Torbert, 2008). Using the three tiers, these skills can be taught to all youth through the universal curriculum delivered

KRISTINE JOLIVETTE, PH.D., & SARA SANDERS, ED.D., UNIVERSITY OF ALABAMA; SKIP KUMM, MAT, UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS AT CHICAGO; DAVID ROYER, PH.D., UNIVERSITY OF HAWAI'I AT MĀNOA; JEFFREY R. SPRAGUE, PH.D., UNIVERSITY OF OREGON

within Tier I; more individualized programs and groups within Tier II and Tier III can reach the youth who require additional support to develop and master these skills. Finally, like restorative practices, one of the goals of the FW-PBIS framework is to increase community safety within juvenile justice facilities (e.g., Jolivette & Nelson, 2010). In relation to integration, Sprague and Tobin (2017) have created a fidelity manual aligning both PBIS and restorative practices which may be helpful to FW-PBIS Leadership teams.

Systems

Q6: How do we (agency or facility) know when we are ready to explore and/or implement FW-PBIS?
A: The first step in recognizing when a facility is ready to explore and/or implement FW-PBIS is to gain the support of agency/facility leadership and administrators (Jolivette & Nelson, 2010). Only with the active support, commitment, and participation of these persons should a facility continue to explore FW-PBIS adoption and implementation. The decision to explore and implement FW-PBIS should be driven by current data and an interest in addressing problem behaviors across the facility as well as all youth domains in a proactive and positive manner. The next step is to identify the scope of FW-PBIS, determining if the implementation will be limited to a specific setting (e.g., facility school), multiple settings, or be implemented facility-wide (Jolivette & Nelson, 2010). Establishing the scope of the intervention is crucial, as it will impact the structure of the FW-PBIS leadership team, which is the next step of the process (Jolivette & Nelson, 2010). Most facilities have found implementation facility-wide to be more effective and less confusing to youth and staff than selecting a single (e.g., school, visitation) or a few facility environments for implementation. As the leadership team is created, it is crucial to ensure all staff from affected systems (i.e., disciplines) are represented on the team. For example, if FW-PBIS is to be implemented facility-wide, there should be members of the leadership team from all systems and programs. Additionally, if programs are spread out across different buildings, the team should include representatives from each location, as well as representatives from the different shifts of facility staff. Ideally, members of the leadership team should be those who have demonstrated strong leadership skills and the ability to work with staff across systems (Jolivette & Nelson, 2010). Potential members should be allowed to decline participation in the leadership team in order to avoid members who negatively affect buy-in. The leadership team should be prepared to commit to integrating the FW-PBIS framework within the facility, a process that may take several years. As a first step, the leadership team should work to obtain a commitment for implementation from 90% of the staff, the standard recommendation for staff buy-in within facilities (Jolivette & Nelson, 2010).

Q7: What are contextual variables for residential and juvenile facilities and how should they be taken into account for creating our FW-PBIS plans as well as data discussions?
A: Contextual variables are those inherent within an organization (i.e., juvenile facility) which has the potential to positively or negatively affect implementation of something (i.e., FW-PBIS). Many contextual variables within juvenile facilities have been identified which the FW-PBIS Leadership teams need to take into account when developing their FW-PBIS plans and when monitoring implementation. These contextual variables can be grouped and include, but are not limited to: (a) agency-level – outdated policies, management styles; (b) facility-level – differing/competing staff pedagogies, staffing issues; and (c) youth-level – special populations, length of stays [for a full list of contextual variables refer to Jolivette, 2016; Read & Lampron, 2012; Sprague, Jolivette, & Boden, 2014). An awareness of possible contextual variables by the FW-PBIS Leadership team can minimize the roll-back of aspects of the FW-PBIS plan. For example, behavioral expectations that inadvertently support or encourage delinquent pathways, and youth reinforcement systems youth cannot access due to their length of stay in the facility. The FW-PBIS Leadership team can be aware of these variables through open discussions as they meet.

Kristine Jolivette, Ph.D., & Sara Sanders, Ed.D., University of Alabama; Skip Kumm, MAT, University of Illinois at Chicago; David Royer, Ph.D., university of Hawaiʻi at Mānoa; Jeffrey R. Sprague, Ph.D., University of Oregon

Q8: How did those who are implementing FW-PBIS break down the silos and get all the disciplines to come to the table and work together?

A: This has been a challenge for some FW-PBIS Leadership teams, no matter which tier they represent. It is one thing to constitute a team, it is another for the team to function as a unit, work from an action plan, and make forward progress. In some instances, a volunteer from each facility discipline was secured to create the team. In other facilities, an administrator selected each person and that person was not provided a choice of team membership. In either case, the key is to have members on the tiered teams which representative of every single discipline within the facility. By doing so, every discipline is provided with an active 'voice' in the creation of the FW-PBIS plan. This provides a mechanism for sharing resources, pedagogies, data sources, and practices. These teams typically are constituted by front-line staff per discipline as they work directly with youth, work across facility environments and activities, and have the most contact with youth as compared to staff in more senior leadership positions. Plus, the functioning of the teams is improved when supervisors and other upper management staff are not involved. However, such staff are included as part of the FW-PBIS communication plan so they can actively support the team's action plan and decisions; all within the pervue of agency/facility policies. In some instances, the work of the FW-PBIS Leadership teams has resulted in streamlined processes related to assessment, data usage, and practice selection for Tiers II and III. Once the team is constituted, the premise becomes 'working smarter, not harder' in which all teams are analyzed to ensure there is no duplicity or competition across teams for resources, etc. As part of the ongoing FW-PBIS professional development these teams receive, it is imperative team functionality be taught, modeled, and reinforced. And if functionality is not observed, it is addressed and remediated. Such remediation may be provided by agency/facility FW-PBIS staff, facility leadership, or outside supporters.

Q9: Our staff, especially those who have been with the agency or facility prior to FW-PBIS, have the tendency to revert back to non-policy approved practices (e.g., negative language, response cost/punitive approaches) – how can we prevent this?

A: The tendency to revert back to non-policy approved practices can be addressed and avoided within the FW-PBIS framework. First, it is important for the PBIS leadership team to continue to monitor staff buy-in throughout and following implementation (Jolivette & Nelson, 2010). Consistent monitoring of staff buy-in (e.g., social validity surveys) allows for the leadership team to continually respond to staff concerns about FW-PBIS, provide necessary supports, and/or make changes to the plan. This is especially important because of high staff turnover, a common characteristic found in juvenile justice settings. The FW-PBIS Leadership team can implement a variety of strategies designed to promote high implementation fidelity across the facility. For example, the leadership team should create and design clear, consistent professional development on FW-PBIS (Jolivette & Nelson, 2010). This includes the initial "kickoff" where staff are introduced to FW-PBIS as well as on-going training and booster sessions. The leadership team should solicit and incorporate staff feedback when designing professional development opportunities (i.e., data-informed professional development). Another strategy to assist staff in following the FW-PBIS framework and practices is to make sure the student reinforcement system is well-planned and understood by staff. Using the reinforcement system will help staff move away from reactive, more punitive practices. It may be beneficial to devote additional time in the initial FW-PBIS training to ensure staff understand the facility reinforcement system, such as through modeling delivery of reinforcement to staff and role-playing staff delivery of reinforcement to youth. Also, it may be helpful to provide staff with examples of how other facilities and residential settings have successfully used reinforcement systems, or to provide 'challenges' to staff such as to use behavior-specific praise with the youth X number of times each day in a specified week. Furthermore, providing booster sessions throughout the year can give staff a chance to review and role play using the reinforcement system, while also providing new staff additional support in learning how to utilize the facility reinforcement

KRISTINE JOLIVETTE, PH.D., & SARA SANDERS, ED.D., UNIVERSITY OF ALABAMA; SKIP KUMM, MAT, UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS AT CHICAGO; DAVID ROYER, PH.D., UNIVERSITY OF HAWAI'I AT MĀNOA; JEFFREY R. SPRAGUE, PH.D., UNIVERSITY OF OREGON

system. Finally, facilities will want to establish a staff reinforcement system where staff can be recognized for appropriately using the FW-PBIS practices (e.g., praise notes in control for staff, recognition at staff meetings, staff member of the month). The FW-PBIS Leadership may want to use the walkthrough tool found within the FW-TFI as a means to monitor staff implementation of the plan (Jolivette, Swoszowski, & Ennis, 2017). By utilizing these practices, facilities can help prevent staff from reverting back to non-policy approved practices.

Q10: What is the difference between agency-level policies and facility-level procedures related to FW-PBIS?
A: Policies can be defined as "a course or principle of action adopted or proposed by" an agency (e.g., juvenile agency; FW-PBIS agency policy) while procedures can be defined as "a series of actions conducted in a certain order or manner" by staff (e.g., FW-PBIS local operating procedures). When a facility designs their FW-PBIS plan, it is created based on the needs, culture, and values of the community. Facility-wide behavior expectations for youth success are determined based on input from not only the FW-PBIS Leadership team, but all staff in the facility through multiple feedback loops. This way the voices of all staff are represented in the plan, making it more likely staff in all settings will consistently teach and reinforce the facility-wide behavior expectations. Overarching the FW-PBIS plan, the central office may set policies unique to their agency, general principles that indicate the agency and individual facility's mission and local purpose for implementing FW-PBIS. Encompassing local procedures, additional policies are determined at the agency level and circulated state-wide to each facility. Each facility, then, may have leeway to determine unique procedures for implementing and carrying out the agency-level policy, and it is important to recognize the difference between broad policy and step-by-step procedures. For example, an agency may prescribe a policy of positive behavioral supports, but allow each facility to determine local procedures for what the specific behavioral expectations are, how they should be taught, and how to reinforce prosocial youth behavior. Finally, the agency may determine certain "non-negotiables" each facility must incorporate into their FW-PBIS local operating procedures in order to ensure consistency in certain domains across all facilities within the agency.

Q11: Do you really need FW-PBIS teams for each tier and how are their purposes different?
A: Different agencies and facilities will structure their teams and purposes differently, finding what works for their given context and culture. The FW-PBIS leadership team oversees the design, implementation, and monitoring of the entire facility-wide plan, and may decide to have subcommittees for Tier II and Tier III teams. In this way, each tier will have a team leader, someone who will take "ownership" of ensuring implementation at each tier with fidelity. Each team is responsible for coordinating activities at their tier, including reviewing multiple sources of data, planning and delivering professional development for all staff, collecting relevant data, and sharing data/reports with all staff. The purpose of the full FW-PBIS leadership team is to ensure the primary (Tier I) plan is implemented as designed, which includes teaching the plan to all staff in the facility, monitoring how the plan is rolled out to youth, ensuring youth (and staff) are reinforced for meeting expectations, collecting facility-wide data to inform data-based decision making, providing data-informed professional development, and revising the plan each summer as needed based on data collected (e.g., social validity). The Tier II and III teams review multiple sources of youth-level data within juvenile facilities usually on a weekly or every other week basis to determine which youth need additional supports and to connect those youth to appropriate supports and practices based on entry criteria. Additionally, the Tier II or III teams coordinate professional learning for staff in the facility to empower them with the skillsets needed to work effectively and respectfully with youth when implementing Tier II and III practices. By empowering staff, the teams prevent the need for youth to be sent to specialists for behaviors that can be prevented or managed in the setting where they are likely to occur. Some facilities will have one team that

Kristine Jolivette, Ph.D., & Sara Sanders, Ed.D., University of Alabama; Skip Kumm, MAT, University of Illinois at Chicago; David Royer, Ph.D., university of Hawai'i at Mānoa; Jeffrey R. Sprague, Ph.D., University of Oregon

coordinates both Tier II and Tier III supports, while others will have separate teams for each tier, especially when the facility is larger. The purpose of the Tier III team is similar to that of the Tier II team, designing, implementing, and monitoring the Tier III program, where providers implement interventions for youth with multiple risk factors and the most severe needs. The Tier III team ensures (a) appropriate youth have access to this level of intensive and individualized support, (b) interventionists have the training and support they need, and (c) high-fidelity implementation occurs. The Tier III team also examines youth progress monitoring and outcome data in the same way the Tier II team does in order to make data-informed decisions about next steps.

Q12: For FW-PBIS to not be the "latest and greatest, short-lived initiative of the moment," how should my agency/facility prepare? How can we increase staff buy-in and enthusiasm for FW-PBIS?
A: Increasing staff buy-in and convincing staff FW-PBIS is not a short-lived initiative is often one of the biggest challenges facility management face. The first step to increasing staff buy-in and showing there is long-term administrative commitment is by involving staff members from every department in the development and ongoing meetings regarding FW-PBIS. By giving staff a voice and allowing them to share what they think their disciplines can implement with fidelity, they are more likely to continue using FW-PBIS practices long after the initial rollout. Additionally, including staff from each discipline allows them to see the commitment being made to the process and provides them with a chance to share that commitment with their colleagues. Second, all staff should be provided sufficient and on-going professional learning on FW-PBIS, including information related to the effectiveness of FW-PBIS across the country. Many staff often think that FW-PBIS will not be effective for their population or in their setting, but numerous studies have shown FW-PBIS decreases inappropriate behaviors and allows facilities to run more efficiently. Professional learning should include resources (see the resource link to Jolivette & Kumm, 2018 at the bottom of this document) that demonstrate how other staff throughout the country are effectively using FW-PBIS to decrease disruptive behaviors. Professional learning offerings should begin with all staff when they are hired so that they are empowered with the skills needed to implement FW-PBIS with fidelity, and should be delivered on a regular basis with all staff to ensure they feel comfortable and confident delivering FW-PBIS practices. Lastly, staff should be reinforced for implementing FW-PBIS practices with fidelity. Staff can either be recognized if they are "caught" implementing FW-PBIS per procedure (e.g., a verbal behavior-specific praise or note put in their personnel file), or staff can be nominated for PBIS employee of the month.

Data

Q13: Our staff come and go as fast as the youth (or some of our staff who refuse to implement FW-PBIS as written), how does one address fidelity of content knowledge and overall implementation?
A: The same approaches we use to incorporate youth and increase their buy-in should be applied to staff when developing and implementing FW-PBIS. For FW-PBIS to be implemented with fidelity, facility management should include staff from each discipline in their FW-PBIS team so the framework can have a chance to grow from the bottom up instead of being an initiative that is viewed as being a top-down management-directed initiative. Incorporating staff from each discipline and giving them a voice provides several benefits that can help new staff, as well as reluctant staff, implement FW-PBIS with fidelity. First, it allows staff to feel as if they are part of developing the framework, which should increase the likelihood they will implement practices with fidelity. Second, it allows staff to discuss what practices they think can be implemented with fidelity in their setting and with their colleagues. Third, it provides each department with a knowledgeable FW-PBIS liaison who can provide training and feedback to both new and experienced

KRISTINE JOLIVETTE, PH.D., & SARA SANDERS, ED.D., UNIVERSITY OF ALABAMA; SKIP KUMM, MAT, UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS AT CHICAGO; DAVID ROYER, PH.D., UNIVERSITY OF HAWAI'I AT MĀNOA; JEFFREY R. SPRAGUE, PH.D., UNIVERSITY OF OREGON

employees. Lastly, increasing staff engagement in the facility-wide development and implementation process allows staff to have contact with experts from other departments in their facility, which they can utilize when they need assistance training a new employee or developing a strategy to increase the fidelity of implementation for staff members who do not want to implement FW-PBIS as written. Also, the FW-TFI tool can be used to assess FW-PBIS fidelity across the tiers (Jolivette et al., 2017).

Q14: Our administration and many staff are very reactive when it comes to youth inappropriate behavior and rarely use data to make decisions, how can FW-PBIS address that?
A: The FW-PBIS framework is often described as a behavior management system for youth, but at its core, the FW-PBIS framework is a system that changes staff behavior by modifying the way staff respond to youth behavior. By properly training staff to implement FW-PBIS with fidelity, staff will learn preventative behavioral management measures that can stop inappropriate behaviors before they occur. To get staff implementing FW-PBIS to prevent inappropriate behaviors, it is first essential to provide professional learning on the basics of behaviorism so they can understand why behaviors occur and how PBIS practices are more effective at preventing inappropriate behaviors than reactive/punitive behavior management practices. Furthermore, utilizing a data-based decision-making process allows staff to identify when inappropriate behaviors are most likely to occur and what is happening before the behavior occurs so the environment can be manipulated to prevent those inappropriate behaviors from occurring. FW-PBIS framework establishes systems that set up youth for success and reinforces youth (and staff) when they engage in expected behaviors. There are numerous studies (see the resource section of this article) that indicate utilizing a data-based decision-making process within the FW-PBIS framework is more likely to reduce inappropriate behaviors than traditional punitive measures employed by juvenile facilities. Implementing FW-PBIS with fidelity can reduce workload by preventing inappropriate behaviors from occurring. Therefore, it is essential to provide professional learning to staff on how to identify the function of youth behavior in an objective manner so staff can (a) prevent inappropriate behavior and (b) avoid reinforcing inappropriate behavior through their actions when it does occur.

Q15: There is no way we could convince staff to collect anymore data – how can we use what we already collect for each tier of FW-PBIS?
A: Collecting FW-PBIS data is a challenge for many facilities, but there are several things that can be done to minimize staff workload. The first way to minimize workload is to use data that are already collected and find ways to use existing data to inform the delivery of your FW-PBIS practices. Many facilities already require staff to collect a lot of youth-specific data, which means they often have more data than they know what to do with. For instance, many facilities require staff to report on youth behavior in regular intervals (e.g., every hour), and those data can be used to determine which youth may need additional supports. Additionally, facility management should bring together staff from different disciplines to determine if any duplicate data are being collected or can be merged to reduce workload. An example of this may be teachers collecting behavioral data when the youth are in school and security collecting similar data at the same time, using multiple assessments when only when one is needed, or caseworkers counting infractions separately from other staff also collecting behavior information. Lastly, facilities can use self-monitoring to have the youth collect their own data, and then have staff randomly monitor one or two youth to determine if the youth are accurately collecting their own data. Furthermore, by providing youth with a chance to collect their own data, they may become cognizant of their actions, take greater ownership of and improve their behavior. Overall, the implementation of FW-PBIS has not resulted in collecting additional data but using existing data in a more purposeful manner for decision-making.

KRISTINE JOLIVETTE, PH.D., & SARA SANDERS, ED.D., UNIVERSITY OF ALABAMA; SKIP KUMM, MAT, UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS AT CHICAGO; DAVID ROYER, PH.D., UNIVERSITY OF HAWAI'I AT MĀNOA; JEFFREY R. SPRAGUE, PH.D., UNIVERSITY OF OREGON

Q16: Our agency thinks with FW-PBIS implementation there will be no behavior violations/infractions, is that true and what improvements have other implementing facilities observed?

A: The implementation of FW-PBIS is not a magic wand which will erase all youth behavioral incidents, especially given the needs of the population being served. FW-PBIS is an organizational framework from which staff can work more efficiently to better align practices with the specific needs of youth. When FW-PBIS is implemented with fidelity, facilities report improved youth and staff outcomes. Nine broad improvement outcome areas have been reported by implementing facilities and include: (a) improved fidelity of implementation, (b) improved staff development and perceived feasibility and effectiveness, (c) improved staff self-efficacy, (d) increased programming engagement by youth, (e) improved relations between staff and youth, (f) improved problem-solving on how best to meet youth's needs, (g) improved usage of real-time youth and staff data, (h) increased staff accountability, and (i) decreased overall youth behavioral incidents (as reported in Jolivette, 2016). The FW-PBIS Leadership teams will want to set goals for improvement throughout FW-PBIS implementation for youth, staff, facility, and agency outcomes.

Practices

Q17: The few examples of FW-PBIS behavioral expectation examples I have seen from residential and juvenile justice facilities seem a little different than those in typical schools using SW-PBIS – is that true?

A: The same guideline holds true for FW-PBIS as it does for SW-PBIS: selecting three to five positively stated behavioral action phrases. However, FW-PBIS Leadership teams need to be extra diligent in keeping in mind contextual variables when selecting their behavioral expectations to ensure delinquency pathways are not unintentionally being reinforced. Also, these teams must remember the behavioral expectations need to relevant for both inside the facility (e.g., 'inside the fence') as those which would be supported outside the facility (e.g., 'outside the fence) in the community. Remembering this will ensure the behavioral expectations within a facility are not coercive in nature nor supporting the mentality of adult corrections which is and should be very different than juvenile corrections. Most FW-PBIS Leadership teams have created behavioral expectations which are forward-thinking and promote youth growth and self-determination premises. Examples include: (a) We are the DREAM Team – Do the right thing, Respect yourself and others, Excel in leadership, Accept responsibility, Maintain appearance; (b) Be a CHAMP – Cooperate with others, Helpful to peers and staff, Act responsibly, Maintain self-control, Promote self-esteem; and (c) Face the FACTS – Focus on yourself, Accept responsibility, Consider the consequences, Think 'self-control', Strengthen character (examples from Georgia Department of Juvenile Justice).

Q18: With such a focus on reinforcement, does that mean there are no consequences for inappropriate youth behavior as our staff think with FW-PBIS the youth can get away with anything?

A: It is a common misconception among staff that once facilities start using FW-PBIS, they can no longer deliver consequences to youth for displaying disruptive behavior; however, this is not true. "Consequence" simply means whatever happens following a behavior, and is not synonymous with punishment. However, many staff mean punishment when they ask about being able to deliver consequences. Providing education on the difference can be helpful, as consequences may be educational and supportive instead of aversive. The goal of FW-PBIS is to prevent inappropriate behaviors from occurring minimizing the need to ever use aversive procedures and using educational, supportive consequences whenever possible when inappropriate behavior does occur) by setting common facility-wide behavioral expectations, using data to make decisions, teaching youth replacement behaviors, and providing youth with tiered interventions to meet their needs, but this does not mean that there are no consequences. One of the main tenants of FW-PBIS is to provide a

Kristine Jolivette, Ph.D., & Sara Sanders, Ed.D., University of Alabama; Skip Kumm, MAT, University of Illinois at Chicago; David Royer, Ph.D., university of Hawai'i at Mānoa; Jeffrey R. Sprague, Ph.D., University of Oregon

framework for youth and staff responses to behaviors. All youth in a facility should know the expectations for their settings, and it should be clearly outlined what will occur if expectations are not met. The staff should first utilize Tier I FW-PBIS de-escalation practices to try and minimize inappropriate behaviors and instruct the youth to use a replacement behavior, but if that does not occur a pre-determined consequence laid out in the FW-PBIS framework can occur. Lastly, the main priority of every facility that houses youth is safety, and if a youth is displaying behaviors that threaten their safety or the safety of others, then a consequence may be necessary to ensure safety. Thus, the approved agency/facility consequences remain, yet it is hoped that with fidelity of implementation of FW-PBIS staff are less likely to need to implement them.

Q19: How are the tiered practices identified and by whom for those agencies and facilities implementing FW-PBIS?
A: Typically a FW-PBIS Leadership team representative of the various facility disciplines (including teachers, corrections officer, mental health, facilities management, etc.), or an agency-level leadership team if applicable, will identify Tier I practices to be received by all youth. The team will define roles and responsibilities for teaching, reinforcing, and monitoring the FW-PBIS plan. This includes how the plan will be taught to all staff in the facility and how it will be rolled out to all youth. Part of teaching the plan to youth includes resource guides/protocols for each setting in the facility which are linked to the facility-wide behavior expectation matrix. After instructing youth on the expectations defined as critical for success in various areas of the facility, staff provide opportunities for youth to practice engaging in the expected behaviors and to receive reinforcement for meeting expectations. When identifying which Tier II and Tier III practices will be provided at a facility, the FW-PBIS Leadership team will start with what is already available to youth in the facility. The team formalizes these practices by name, description, entry criteria, monitoring procedures, and exit criteria. Then the team will determine what additional supports are needed, looking for research-supported and evidence-based practices. But identifying evidence-based practices, the FW-PBIS Leadership team chooses supports that are known to produce desired outcomes for youth when implemented as intended (i.e., with high fidelity). The FW-PBIS Leadership team may identify Tier II and Tier III supports by examining research journals and/or reviewing reputable websites (please refer to the resource section below for suggestions).

Q20: Why do we need entrance and exit criteria for Tiers II and III?
A: It is important for each facility's Tier II and Tier III interventions to have clearly defined entrance and exit criteria in order to be transparent about the data-based decision making employed. By clearly listing specific scores/data markers on facility-wide measures or other data collected as part of regular facility practices (e.g., intake assessments, universal screeners, behavioral infractions, medical visits, unit logs), all youth will be able to have equitable access to Tier II and Tier III interventions and all stakeholders will know when youth are ready to exit each support. By relying on data instead of staff nomination or anecdotal opinion, facilities are less likely to overlook youth who need more than what Tier I provides. In other words, entrance and exit criteria help close the gap in access, which aids a facility's efforts to close gaps in outcomes between subgroups of youth. Without entry criteria and a systematic way to use them in a data-informed decision-making process, youth who need Tier II and Tier III supports to be successful may not receive them. Without exit criteria, youth who start receiving an intervention may continue to receive it when it is no longer necessary and could be provided to other youth in need instead. Most FW-PBIS Leadership teams have established their own entrance and exit criteria based on thresholds specific to their facility's resources and youth data.

Kristine Jolivette, Ph.D., & Sara Sanders, Ed.D., University of Alabama; Skip Kumm, MAT, University of Illinois at Chicago; David Royer, Ph.D., university of Hawai'i at Mānoa; Jeffrey R. Sprague, Ph.D., University of Oregon

Q21: What are some practices being used by other facilities at Tiers II and III?
A: For FW-PBIS practices to be most effective, they should fit the contextual needs of the youth served and be delivered with fidelity by staff. Therefore, when selecting and integrating new Tier II and Tier III practices, always consider what your youth need and what your facility has the resources to implement with fidelity without causing too much additional work for your staff. To do this, it is best to use interventions that can be intensified across tiers, and interventions that build on Tier I interventions, instead of training staff to collect different data and implement entirely new interventions. One commonly used Tier II intervention that builds on Tier I is check-in and check-out, which involves having a staff member who has a positive relationship with a youth checking-in on the youth early in the day or before an event where the youth typically displays problem behavior, and then checking-out with the youth after. To intensify check-in and check-out to a Tier III intervention, staff can assess youth's behavior to determine its function (i.e., why the youth displays the behavior) and then have the staff member conducting the check-in and check-out intervention work with the youth to learn functionally equivalent replacement behaviors (an ensure all staff reinforce the replacement behavior so it maintains and generalizes). To meet the needs of youth who require Tier II and III mental health services along with their behavioral practices, facilities can have mental health staff train other staff to conduct small group sessions where youth have an opportunity to discuss their emotions. For other ideas reported by FW-PBIS Leadership teams and researchers see the resources below.

Resources Related to These Questions and Appropriate for Juvenile Corrections Practice Identification (this is not an exhaustive list):

- Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Model Program Guides (https://www.ojjdp.gov)
- National Institute of Justice (https://www.nij.gov)
- Bureau of Justice Assistance (https://www.bja.gov)
- Crime Solutions (https://www.crimesolutions.gov)
- Blueprints for Healthy Youth Development (https://www.blueprintsprograms.org)
- Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration (https://www.samhsa.gov)
- OSEP Ideas That Work (https://osepideasthatwork.org)
- The National Technical Assistance Center for the Education of Neglected or Delinquent Children and Youth (https://neglected-delinquent.ed.gov)
- Council of Juvenile Correctional Administrators (https://cjca.net)
- Youth.gov (https://youth.gov/youth-topics/juvenile-justice/)

FW-PBIS Resources Across Topics and Tiers and Supporting Websites for These Questions

- Jolivette, K., & Kumm, S. (2018). *Resources for facility-wide PBIS implementation in juvenile corrections and residential settings/facilities: From adoption consideration to initial implementation to sustained implementation.* National Technical Assistance Center on Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports. https://www.pbis.org/community/juvenile-justice/fwpbis-resources

KRISTINE JOLIVETTE, PH.D., & SARA SANDERS, ED.D., UNIVERSITY OF ALABAMA; SKIP KUMM, MAT, UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS AT CHICAGO; DAVID ROYER, PH.D., UNIVERSITY OF HAWAI'I AT MĀNOA; JEFFREY R. SPRAGUE, PH.D., UNIVERSITY OF OREGON

PBIS Leadership Forum- *Roundtable Dialogue*   January 2019

- National Child Traumatic Stress Network: Child Welfare Trauma Training Toolkit https://www.nctsn.org/resources/child-trauma-toolkit-educators
- National Technical Assistance Center on Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports https://www.pbis.org
- Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration https://www.samhsa.gov/

References

Elwyn, L. J., Esaki, N., & Smith, C. A. (2015). Safety at a girls secure juvenile justice facility. *Therapeutic Communities: The International Journal of therapeutic Communities, 36*(4), 209-218.

Fronius, T., Persson, H., Guckenburg, S., Hurley, N., & Petrosino, A. (2016). *Restorative justice in U.S. schools: A research review.* WestEd Justice & Prevention Research Center.

Hopkins, B. (2002). Restorative justice in schools. *Support for Learning, 17*(3), 144-149.

Jolivette, 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). https://neglected-delinquent.ed.gov/sites/default/files/NDTAC-IssueBrief-508.pdf

Jolivette, K., & Nelson, C. M. (2010). Adapting positive behavioral interventions and supports for secure juvenile justice settings: Improving facility-wide behavior. *Behavioral Disorders, 36*(1), 28-42.

Jolivette, 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.

Jolivette, K., Swoszowski, N. C., & Ennis, R. P. (September, 2017). Facility-Wide Tiered Fidelity Inventory (FW-TFI): Facility-Wide Positive Behavior Interventions and Supports for 24/7 Delivery Models, v. 0.1. OSEP National Technical Assistance Center on Positive Behavioral Interventions & Supports. https://www.pbis.org/common/cms/files/pbisresources/FW-TFI%20DRAFT%20v%200.1%20Jolivette%20Swoszowski%20Ennis.pdf

Kimball, K., & Jolivette, K. (2015). *Facility-wide PBIS.* National Technical Assistance Center on Positive Behavior Interventions and Supports. https://www.pbis.org/Common/Cms/files/Forum15_Presentations/RDQ%2014%20Brief%20-%20Juvenile%20Justice.pdf

Kumm, S., & Jolivette, K. (2017). *Facility-wide PBIS implementation as viewed by roundtable participants and from the field.* National Technical Assistance Center on Positive Behavior Interventions and Supports. http://www.pbis.org/Common/Cms/files/Forum17_Presentations/RDQ%2010%20Brief%20-%20Juvenile%20Justice.pdf

KRISTINE JOLIVETTE, PH.D., & SARA SANDERS, ED.D., UNIVERSITY OF ALABAMA; SKIP KUMM, MAT, UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS AT CHICAGO; DAVID ROYER, PH.D., UNIVERSITY OF HAWAI'I AT MĀNOA; JEFFREY R. SPRAGUE, PH.D., UNIVERSITY OF OREGON

Lampron, S., & Gonsoulin, S. (2013). PBIS in restrictive settings: The time is now. *Education and Treatment of Children*, *36*(3), 161-174.

Read, N., & Lampron, S. (2012). *Supporting student achievement through sound behavior management practices in schools and juvenile justice facilities: A spotlight on positive behavioral interventions and supports.* The National Evaluation and Technical Center for the Education of Children and Youth Who are Neglected, Delinquent, or At Risk. Washington, DC. Retrieved from https://neglected-delinquent.ed.gov/sites/default/files/docs/SupportingStudentAchievement.pdf

Sprague, J. R., Jolivette, K., & Boden, L. (2014, Oct.). *Implementing PBIS in secure care facilities: Adaptations for systems, data, and practice changes.* Paper presented at the PBIS Forum, Rosemont, Illinois.

Sprague, J. R., Jolivette, K., Boden, L. J., & Wang, E. (2019). Implementing facility-wide positive behavior interventions and supports in secure juvenile correction settings: Results of an evaluation study. *Manuscript submitted for publication.*

Sprague, J. R., & Tobin, T. (2017). Aligning positive behavioral interventions and supports and restorative practices: An implementation fidelity manual. Retrieved from https://www.researchgate.net/profile/Tary_Tobin/publication/313674270_ALIGNING_POSITIVE_BEHAVIORAL_INTERVENTIONS_AND_SUPPORTS_AND_RESTORATIVE_PRACTICES_AN_IMPLEMENTATION_FIDELITY_MANUAL/links/58a29731aca272046aafecea/ALIGNING-POSITIVE-BEHAVIORAL-INTERVENTIONS-AND-SUPPORTS-AND-RESTORATIVE-PRACTICES-AN-IMPLEMENTATION-FIDELITY-MANUAL.pdf

Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration. *SAMHSA's concept of trauma and guidance for a trauma-informed approach.* HHS Publication No. (SMA) xx-xxxx. Rockville, MD: Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration, 2014. Retrieved from http://www.traumainformedcareproject.org/resources/SAMHSA%20TIC.pdf

Torbet, P. (2008). *Pennsylvania's juvenile justice system goals.* Pittsburgh, PA: National Center for Juvenile Justice.

KRISTINE JOLIVETTE, PH.D., & SARA SANDERS, ED.D., UNIVERSITY OF ALABAMA; SKIP KUMM, MAT, UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS AT CHICAGO; DAVID ROYER, PH.D., UNIVERSITY OF HAWAIʻI AT MĀNOA; JEFFREY R. SPRAGUE, PH.D., UNIVERSITY OF OREGON