Staff and Youth Buy-In Ideas for Initial and Sustainable Facility-Wide Positive Behavior Intervention and Supports Implementation Within Residential and Juvenile Facilities

Lauren J. Boden, PhD[1]**, Robin Parks Ennis, PhD**[2] iD **, Lester Allen, BA**[3]**, Davashia Williams, BA**[4]**, and Lisa Dana, BSN**[5]

Abstract

The positive behavior interventions and supports (PBIS) framework is a well-researched framework used to teach, model, and reinforce positive behavior in schools across the country. Many residential and juvenile facilities have adopted the PBIS framework to fit a 24/7 delivery model spanning facility environments and activities (known as facility-wide PBIS [FW-PBIS]); this implementation is still in its early stages. While many FW-PBIS leadership teams report improved outcomes when implementing FW-PBIS, many continue to struggle to gain initial buy-in from youth and staff as well as sustain buy-in after initial implementation. We offer suggestions from the field to promote buy-in from key stakeholders within residential and juvenile settings.

Keywords

juvenile justice, residential facilities, facility-wide positive behavioral interventions and supports, FW-PBIS

In 2015, approximately 48,043 youth were incarcerated in residential placements on any given day (Sickmund et al., 2017). Of these youth, 50% to 80% received special education services and/or had diagnoses of mental health issues (Quinn et al., 2005). Residential (e.g., hospitals, group homes, secure/non-secure juvenile) facilities serve to rehabilitate and habilitate youth in their care and return them to society; However, the majority of juvenile facilities are punitive in nature, focusing on surveillance, deterrence, and discipline with minimal consideration of long-term outcomes for incarcerated youth (Sprague et al., 2013). What is worse is that many youth are exposed to abuse, lack positive role models, and do not receive adequate services while in these settings (e.g., Jolivette & Nelson, 2010). Researchers have demonstrated that therapeutic programming in juvenile care facilities (e.g., positive discipline, transition models, counseling) can result in decreased recidivism, resulting in an increase in youth who are rehabilitated and can become contributing members of society (Griller Clark & Mathur, 2015). One way to address this need is through the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports (PBIS) implemented facility-wide (FW-PBIS; Jolivette & Nelson, 2010).

Facility-Wide PBIS

Over the past decade, researchers have begun adapting the PBIS framework for use in residential and juvenile facilities across the country (Ennis & Gonsoulin, 2015). While implementation of FW-PBIS is still in the early stages, positive outcomes have been noted (Jolivette, 2016; Jolivette et al., 2015; Jolivette & Kumm, 2018). The PBIS framework is rooted in the following key features: (a) a continuum of behavioral support focusing on prevention of problem behavior in which expected, appropriate behaviors are clearly defined; (b) consistent instruction across environments to teach appropriate behavior; (c) the use of interventions which have been empirically validated for proven

[1]Georgia State University, Atlanta, USA
[2]The University of Alabama at Birmingham, USA
[3]Georgia Department of Juvenile Justice, Atlanta, USA
[4]Montgomery County Juvenile Court - Dayton, Ohio, USA
[5]Acadia Healthcare, MT, USA

Corresponding Author:
Lauren J. Boden, College of Education and Human Development, Georgia State University, 30 Pryor Street, Atlanta, GA 30303, USA.
Email: Lboden1@gsu.edu

effectiveness; (d) measurable outcomes informed by data, practices, and systems; and (e) a process of decision making based on data (Sugai & Horner, 2002). Within residential and juvenile facilities, PBIS has been implemented both solely within the school setting (school-wide positive behavioral interventions and supports [SW-PBIS]) and across all facility environments (FW-PBIS). FW-PBIS is implemented within every facility environment and requires teaching, modeling, and reinforcing appropriate youth behavior 24 hr/7 days per week and the buy-in of almost all facility staff given high rates of staff turnover (Jolivette & Nelson, 2010).

Staff and Youth Buy-In

When implementing a framework that requires contributions from multiple stakeholders, such as FW-PBIS, buy-in, or belief in and support of an idea, is essential to its success. This topic is consistently discussed within PBIS implementation in traditional settings (e.g., Netzel & Eber, 2003) as buy-in is crucial during both the early stages of PBIS implementation and when maintaining sustainability of PBIS practices (McIntosh et al., 2016). In a single-state survey of secure juvenile facilities implementing PBIS, Scheurmann and colleagues (2013) found that respondents routinely cited a lack of buy-in, in particular from correctional and other non-educational staff, as a barrier to FW-PBIS implementation. This finding is consistent with other research in restrictive settings (e.g., Jolivette et al., 2014; Kimball et al., 2017; McDaniel et al., 2014). Kimball and colleagues (2017) noted that the majority of agency-level personnel interviewed ranked staff buy-in as the most difficult task related to FW-PBIS implementation. Although buy-in can be a barrier within traditional settings, secure-care facilities have unique characteristics that can contribute to this difficulty.

To begin, juvenile justice facilities are often characterized by high-staff turnover, a barrier that has been well documented (e.g., Sprague et al., 2013). This is a challenge to facility operations in general but is specifically concerning when a facility-wide framework is being implemented. Interestingly, successful implementation of FW-PBIS with fidelity has been linked to improved staff retention (Jolivette, 2016). Within FW-PBIS, all individuals who work with youth are responsible for teaching, modeling, and reinforcing expectations, so a lack of consistency is problematic (Kimball et al., 2017). This also affects youth as the staff with whom they interact on a daily basis may change regularly. This lack of consistency can often result in different expectations during different shifts/settings throughout the facility, which can have a negative impact on youth buy-in (Jolivette et al., 2015). Youth buy-in to FW-PBIS may also be affected by limited time in a facility when youth serve short sentences. With youth entering and exiting the facility daily, the method of teaching expectations and introducing FW-PBIS often looks much different than in traditional settings (Swoszowski et al., 2017).

Another unique challenge many facilities face is related to the working hours of employees (Swain-Bradway et al., 2013). While school, social work, and counseling staff members may work a typical 8-hr shift, many other staff members such as correctional officers and other supervisory staff often work shifts ranging from 8 to 12 hr that begin and end at times which differ from 8-hr staff. Furthermore, the various staff groups often have very little to no interaction with one another. For example, education staff may never interact with corrections officers who work the night shift. This affects the opportunity for inter-disciplinary work, an essential piece of PBIS implementation in these settings (Jolivette & Nelson, 2010).

Purpose

Implementation of FW-PBIS within juvenile justice and residential facilities is still in its beginning stages. As a result, there is a need to disseminate information from FW-PBIS leadership teams who are implementing FW-PBIS with high rates of fidelity to those who are not yet implementing or are not successfully implementing FW-PBIS. The purpose of this article is to share ideas for effective practices to promote staff and youth buy-in during initial and sustained FW-PBIS implementation from practitioners and FW-PBIS leadership teams currently implementing FW-PBIS in juvenile justice and residential facilities throughout the United States. The ideas presented are a compilation of buy-in ideas derived from FW-PBIS leadership team members from across the country. FW-PBIS leadership teams are comprised of staff from all areas of residential and secure-care facilities (e.g., line staff, education, medical, mental health, cafeteria, administration) providing a wide range of perspectives and experiences from within the facility. In addition to the wide range of perspectives represented within each FW-PBIS team, the teams who contributed ideas to this article represent both rural and urban geographical areas and a variety of facility settings (i.e., residential care, short-term secure care, and long-term secure care). The suggestions presented in this article have been compiled from working directly with FW-PBIS leadership teams across multiple states for many years, sharing ideas with conference attendees who represented members of FW-PBIS teams, dialoging with colleagues conducting FW-PBIS research, and reviewing the literature base on FW-PBIS. We will offer suggestions for promoting buy-in during both initial FW-PBIS implementation and facilities working toward sustainability of FW-PBIS. We present suggestions from the perspective of promoting buy-in from both staff (e.g.,

educational personnel, corrections officers, mental health staff) and the youth served in the facility. Finally, we offer implications for FW-PBIS leadership teams at all stages of implementation and future research directions. This article extends the current literature on FW-PBIS buy-in within residential and secure-care facilities by sharing effective practices currently being implemented by FW-PBIS leadership teams to increase buy-in in residential and secure-care facilities across the country.

Promoting Buy-In During Initial FW-PBIS Implementation

FW-PBIS implementation, like PBIS implementation in traditional settings, is a multi-year process, often involving a training/planning year, 1 to 2 years of initial implementation, followed by years of full or sustained implementation. The needs of a facility are different during each stage of this process (Lopez et al., 2015). Therefore, the strategies to promote buy-in during initial and sustainability years are not the same. What follows are lessons learned from residential and secure-care facilities at various stages of implementation.

Initial Staff Buy-In

Researchers have noted lack of staff buy-in to be one barrier to successful implementation of FW-PBIS within residential and secure-care settings (Jolivette et al., 2015; Swain-Bradway et al., 2013). When implemented in traditional school settings, a minimum of 80% staff buy-in is recommended; however, researchers have suggested a rate of 90% to 95% staff buy-in for successful implementation of FW-PBIS in residential and secure-care facilities (Jolivette & Nelson, 2010). This higher rate of staff buy-in can be attributed to a number of contextual variables unique to residential and secure-care settings. Jolivette and Nelson (2010) cited the higher volume of staff compared with traditional school settings, implementation across shifts within secure care, competing responsibilities of staff, and the high rates of turnover—all as rationale for securing a higher rate of staff buy-in. Given these contextual variables, FW-PBIS leadership teams need to be diligent and intentional in both securing and maintaining staff buy-in to implement FW-PBIS with high rates of fidelity.

Residential and secure-care settings have a history of implementing point-based systems that are not directly linked to engaging in specific, appropriate behaviors (Sprague et al., 2013). As a result, youth simply learn what they need to do to access reinforcement (i.e., not get caught engaging in negative behavior yet not necessarily displaying appropriate behavior) without making meaningful behavior change. In addition, a punitive approach to managing behavior is often viewed as an effective behavior

management strategy as opposed to a preventive approach of reinforcing expected behavior (Jolivette & Nelson, 2010; Sprague et al., 2013; Swain-Bradway et al., 2013). On top of this, researchers have noted an overall resistance to change in current practices within a facility to be a barrier within FW-PBIS implementation (Jolivette et al., 2015; Swain-Bradway et al., 2013). A shift in thinking is needed for staff within residential and secure-care facilities to focus on actively teaching, modeling, and reinforcing the FW-PBIS expectations as opposed to implementing reactive and punitive measures. For this shift to occur, staff must understand the importance of teaching, modeling, and reinforcing appropriate behavior and be willing to engage in these behaviors across all facility environments, 24/7, with all youth in their care. Tying FW-PBIS language into all aspects of staff's jobs, all trainings, and into facility local operating policies and procedures saturates the environment with FW-PBIS (Jolivette & Kumm, 2018). The weight of securing 90% to 95% staff buy-in often falls on the FW-PBIS leadership team with support from facility and/or agency administration. Securing initial staff buy-in is a critical component to the success of FW-PBIS and should be given careful consideration upon initial adoption/implementation of FW-PBIS within residential and juvenile settings. Ideas for securing and maintaining staff buy-in are presented in Table 1 along with corresponding activities that have been implemented with positive outcomes across residential and secure-care facilities. Some of those ideas are discussed here as they relate to teaching, modeling, and reinforcing within the FW-PBIS plan.

Initial training. Initial training on the FW-PBIS plan is a crucial piece to successful implementation of FW-PBIS within any setting. Staff across all shifts and environments are required to engage in the FW-PBIS plan, yet securing staff buy-in can prove challenging as many staff do not see aspects of the framework, such as teaching, as a part of their specific job duties (Jolivette et al., 2015). The initial training should provide staff with an understanding of the FW-PBIS framework with an explicit connection to how the framework benefits everyone within the facility. When staff are able to understand how the FW-PBIS framework can support missions of safety and security, improve staff self-efficacy, and elicit meaningful behavior change among youth (Jolivette, 2016), which in turn makes for a more enjoyable working environment for all staff, they are much more likely to put forth the effort to be active participants in the FW-PBIS plan, ensuring that the FW-PBIS expectations are being taught, modeled, and reinforced with all youth across all facility environments. FW-PBIS leadership teams are tasked with thinking creatively and strategically to ensure that the initial training is successful in securing staff buy-in. When training new hires on FW-PBIS, competency of the framework and details specific to

Table 1. Ideas for Staff Buy-In.

Idea	Rationale	Possible activities
Initial training	• Provide staff with sufficient training, feedback, and resources to increase their knowledge and skill	• FW-PBIS training should be integrated into new staff training • Provide staff with time to practice teaching, modeling, and reinforcing with targeted feedback using roll-play activities • Keep FW-PBIS resource guides in multiple locations accessible to all staff • Provide processing time with opportunities to ask questions • Use FW-PBIS local operating procedures as training tools
Continued trainings	• Provides ongoing opportunities for learning and targeting areas for growth	• Schedule monthly booster trainings targeting specific areas/expectations per data • Randomly quiz staff on the FW-PBIS expectations and reinforce those who are able to state them • Embed FW-PBIS within weekly staff meetings • Provide mentors for new staff who are struggling with implementation • Conduct trainings specifically on how to utilize resource guides
Embed FW-PBIS language within all aspects of the facility	• Embedding the FW-PBIS language within policy and procedures creates a seamless bridge between FW-PBIS and the role of staff across disciplines within the facility	• Review policy and procedure documents to remove negative language and embed FW-PBIS • Start meetings with review of the FW-PBIS expectations • Saturate the environment with FW-PBIS expectations and matrices • Schedule FW-PBIS instructional time into the master schedule
Display facility data	• Using data to show progress related to youth behavior allows staff to see improvement	• Create a data board in a common area • Set goals related to data and celebrate when goals are met • Connect data to FW-PBIS implementation
Elicit staff feedback on a continuous basis	• Promotes ownership • Solicits honest feedback via anonymity • Opens the door to new ideas • Conveys care and concern from management • Can serve as a form of data collection • Can be quick and easy to disseminate	• Conduct scheduled staff surveys targeting different aspects of PBIS in the facility • Conduct a brainstorm activity for new ideas on staff and youth reinforcement • Schedule forums to discuss the FW-PBIS plan • Utilize suggestion boxes to allow for 24/7 feedback • Specifically ask staff for feedback on barriers for implementation
Show staff appreciation	• Allows staff to feel supported and appreciated for their performance	• Staff of the month • Wall of fame • Positive notes or email • Recognition certificates
Effective and transparent communication	• Provides a safe space to allow staff to communicate their concerns • Provides ongoing support and an avenue for problem solving	• Hold open forums • Pair staff with mentors • Model transparent communication • Share the FW-PBIS action plan
Reinforce staff for engaging in the FW-PBIS expectations	• When staff are reinforced for engaging in the FW-PBIS expectations, they will continue to model these expected behaviors	• Deliver the FW-PBIS reinforcement to staff • Residents select staff of the week • Gift cards • Raffles • Jeans Days • Special Parking Spot • First choice of vacation time • Use staff group contingencies for fidelity of implementation
Publicly celebrate small victories of staff	• Teaching, modeling, and reinforcing staff behavior sets the climate for staff doing the same with youth	• Use the FW-PBIS reinforcement to "catch" staff engaging in the FW-PBIS plan
Set small, attainable goals for staff	• Setting goals for staff who may feel overwhelmed by the framework can allow for more frequent reinforcement	• Focus on one FW-PBIS expectation with the goal of implementing one resource guide during their shift • Give a certain number of "gotchas" to a staff with the goal of using all the "gotchas" to reinforce youth who they see engaging in the FW-PBIS expectations • Identify a reoccurring youth problem behavior and have the staff focus on modeling the appropriate behavior to address the problem
Survey staff for specific skills and interests	• Allowing staff to use their skills and interests in the FW-PBIS plan helps to create a sense of ownership in the framework	• Lead ad hoc groups for the creation of FW-PBIS materials • Use skills to implement specific reinforcement activities for youth and/or staff
Involve staff	• Allowing staff to take an active role in FW-PBIS planning and implementation promotes a sense of ownership	• Have staff create resource guides for the facility locations in which they work • Create ad hoc FW-PBIS groups for action items

Note. FW-PBIS = facility-wide positive behavior interventions and supports.

the facility should be assessed by the FW-PBIS. Facilities have reported many factors contributing to the success in initial training such as (a) presenting the research behind the PBIS framework; (b) connecting clearly how FW-PBIS can benefit youth and staff within the facility; (c) communicating how FW-PBIS will be integrated into all aspects of the facility, including policies and procedures; (d) eliciting staff feedback on FW-PBIS expectations, resource guides, and reinforcement plan; (e) capitalizing on preexisting meeting schedules such as daily briefings to disseminate FW-PBIS information; and (f) utilizing resources such as the Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP) Technical Assistance Center on Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports (www.pbis.org) for targeted information related to FW-PBIS implementation in residential and juvenile facilities. Table 1 details more activities to increase staff buy-in compiled from the experiences of FW-PBIS leadership teams who are currently implementing FW-PBIS.

Staff voice. In addition to ensuring successful initial training, FW-PBIS team members have offered many other suggestions to ensuring initial staff buy-in. One such suggestion is to elicit feedback from facility staff at a high rate during training and initial implementation. When staff are given opportunities, especially prior to initial training and roll-out vetting activities, for their voice to be heard and see changes as a result, they feel like a meaningful part of the team and are more likely to take ownership in the FW-PBIS plan. In addition, feedback can be greatly beneficial to the FW-PBIS leadership team by providing opportunities for new ideas as well as a way to gather informal data on implementation. Eliciting feedback can be as easy as utilizing suggestion boxes to scheduling forums and brainstorming activities.

Resistant staff. All facilities are likely to have a handful of staff who are not bought-in to the FW-PBIS plan. This resistance from staff may be a result of one or more of the barriers discussed previously. FW-PBIS leadership teams are tasked with working with these staff to increase fidelity of implementation no matter their resistance level. Many teams have reported success in setting small, attainable goals for staff who initially have been resistant to the FW-PBIS plan. To some, implementing the FW-PBIS plan may seem overwhelming and simply too much to handle on top of their current responsibilities. Setting these goals for staff, such as delivering three gotchas during their shift to youth who are engaging in the expected behavior while pairing the gotcha with behavior-specific praise or teaching one resource guide to a small group of youth during group, are small goals that can easily be attained by every staff. Once staff have experience with the FW-PBIS plan and feel more confident in their ability to teach, model, and reinforce youth following the

appropriate guidelines, they are likely to continue doing so. FW-PBIS leadership teams also should capitalize on the strengths and interests of all staff but may want to specifically target those who are not fully bought-in to the FW-PBIS plan. Staff with specific interests (e.g., art, music) may thrive when given the opportunity to lead ad hoc groups using their specific skill set in FW-PBIS implementation. For example, a staff member with an interest in music such as DJ'ing may run a weekly DJ'ing session as a reinforcement for youth who engage in the FW-PBIS expectations. A staff member with artistic skills may be interested in helping with the creation of FW-PBIS posters and displays throughout the facility. See Table 1 for more activities related to increasing buy-in for staff who are resistant to implementing FW-PBIS with fidelity.

Initial Youth Buy-In

It has been suggested by researchers that youth, even more so than staff, have more at stake in FW-PBIS implementation as they have the biggest need for making meaningful behavior change (Jolivette et al., 2015). Without youth buy-in, there is little benefit of FW-PBIS as youth behavior will not change if youth do not believe in the process. As a result, the FW-PBIS leadership team is tasked with ensuring the FW-PBIS plan is both applicable to staff and youth in the facility and securing buy-in from all stakeholders. Ideas for securing and maintaining youth buy-in are presented in Table 2.

Youth voice. Jolivette and colleagues (2015) identified the inclusion of youth voice as a crucial aspect to securing and maintaining youth buy-in within the FW-PBIS framework. FW-PBIS in its infancy should consider youth voice in all aspects of developing the FW-PBIS plan. Focus groups and youth surveys are ways to solicit input from youth when the plan is being developed and during initial implementation for input on aspects of the FW-PBIS plan such as youth reinforcement ideas (see Table 2). FW-PBIS leadership teams may want to consider ways to solicit feedback anonymously, as often the fear or getting in trouble or how their comments will be perceived by others may affect youth's candidness. Facilities have lead weekly "council" meetings where youth provide feedback on the FW-PBIS procedures and reinforcement ideas. Leadership teams used this feedback to shape practices, a boost for youth who felt their ideas were being heard and addressed. In addition to seeking youth voice, FW-PBIS leadership teams must ensure that youth are active participants in the development and implementation of the FW-PBIS plan when possible. FW-PBIS leadership teams should actively seek out opportunities to involve youth in activities such as developing resource guides, creating facility posters, and determining an FW-PBIS mascot.

Table 2. Ideas for Youth Buy-In.

Idea	Rationale	Possible activities
Initial training	• Provide youth with sufficient training, feedback, and resources to increase their knowledge and skill	• The FW-PBIS plan should be an integral part of youth orientation • Conduct daily booster trainings during initial implementation • Ensure teaching of the FW-PBIS expectations occurs across all facility environments
Elicit youth feedback on a continuous basis	• Gives youth a voice in the FW-PBIS plan	• Youth focus groups • Comment boxes • Survey youth on specific aspects of the FW-PBIS plan • Youth council • Youth membership on the FW-PBIS leadership team • Include youth on team subcommittees
Teach the value of FW-PBIS outside of the facility	• Connecting the value of FW-PBIS to life outside of the facility can help youth understand how building strong character traits can lead to life success	• Incorporate FW-PBIS expectations and language into therapy groups • Create resource guides for intentional connection
Celebrate youth success	• Reinforcing youth success increases the likelihood of youth engaging in the FW-PBIS plan more frequently	• Reinforce youth in the moment • High rates of reinforcement in initial implementation and with struggling youth • Work with youth to set goals
Consider unique characteristics of youth in the facility	• FW-PBIS is a framework. The plan should be tailored to the characteristics of youth in the facility making the plan more relatable to youth	• Consider youth characteristics and needs prior to developing the FW-PBIS plan • Evaluate youth characteristics on a consistent basis and adjust the FW-PBIS plan as needed
Make reinforcement desirable to youth	• Youth are more willing to work for reinforcement when it is desirable	• Create surveys to allow youth input in reinforcement • Create a rotating menu of reinforcement • Add reinforcement assessment to youth intake process

Note. FW-PBIS = facility-wide positive behavior interventions and supports.

Clear and systematic implementation. Also essential is making sure the expectations and procedures for accessing reinforcement are clear to all youth. By explicitly teaching the expectations and building a sense of pride in appropriate behavior, youth reported making connections between PBIS behavioral expectations and life when they leave the facility (Jolivette et al., 2015). Many facilities have taken an approach similar to those used in traditional school settings by building excitement with an initial kick-off where fun activities take place (e.g., talent show, special recreational privileges) and FW-PBIS is discussed. Other facilities have addressed this by discussing expectations each morning and setting personal goals for the day, by focusing on a specific expectation. Once expectations and routines are established, it is important that staff are consistent in implementation. Youth shared feelings of frustration when staff implemented procedures inconsistently or when new staff were unaware of the FW-PBIS system (Jolivette et al., 2015).

Promoting Buy-In During FW-PBIS Sustainability

Fixsen et al. (2005) described the phases of PBIS implementation in traditional settings, including (a) exploration and adoption, (b) program installation, (c) initial implementation, (d) full operation, (e) innovation, and (f) sustainability. For facilities reaching the sustainability stage, the goal is to maintain FW-PBIS practices long term even when facility or entity changes occur. Here, we offer perspectives for both staff and youth buy-in to facilitate sustainability.

Sustainability Staff Buy-In

Sustaining staff buy-in requires continuous and intentional evaluation of FW-PBIS by the FW-PBIS leadership team. FW-PBIS implementation will not be successful if the plan is simply put in place and not subjected to continual reflection and adjustment to improve areas in which fidelity of implementation is low. FW-PBIS teams should continually seek to monitor fidelity of implementation using a measure such as the Facility-Wide Tiered Fidelity Inventory (FW-TFI; Jolivette et al., 2017). These data-based tools allow FW-PBIS leadership teams to assess all areas of the FW-PBIS plan and identify areas in which improvement is needed. Often, the areas in which fidelity is low are related to lack of implementation and can be directly connected to problems with staff buy-in. In addition to monitoring fidelity of implementation, the FW-PBIS team should continually monitor facility-wide

data (e.g., youth-on-youth assaults, youth-on-staff assaults, discipline referrals) and share these data with staff. Using data, action plans are continually updated and the team sets new goals for FW-PBIS implementation. These data are then shared with staff in a transparent way as a means to communicate how FW-PBIS increases safety and job satisfaction within the facility. Using data, the FW-PBIS leadership team is able to target areas where fidelity of implementation may be affected by low staff buy-in. An extensive list of activities to sustain staff buy-in is listed in Table 1, and several are discussed here.

Ongoing training. Jolivette and colleagues (2015) noted staff inconsistency to be one barrier of FW-PBIS implementation and suggested that FW-PBIS leadership teams ensure FW-PBIS is an integral part of training for new hires even after initial implementation, to make sure all staff have the necessary knowledge for implementation. FW-PBIS teams across the country have noted the importance of not only making initial training on the FW-PBIS plan a part of new hire orientation, but the importance of ensuring that continuing education is an integral part to the FW-PBIS plan. Researchers have noted the prevalence of differing expectations for youth as a result of lack of collaboration from staff to have an adverse effect on youth buy-in (Jolivette et al., 2015). The FW-PBIS leadership team should continually provide booster trainings for all staff based on areas of weakness identified through data, providing staff with the necessary knowledge to improve FW-PBIS implementation, and ensuring all staff are implementing FW-PBIS with fidelity. Booster trainings need to be scheduled on a predictable and ongoing basis and in such a way that all staff are able to attend. Ensuring all staff have been trained, understand the FW-PBIS plan, and are able to implement the plan with fidelity is a key piece to sustaining both staff and youth buy-in. To gauge staff knowledge, FW-PBIS leadership teams can conduct random "quizzes" in which staff are asked to state the FW-PBIS expectations, how they taught the expectations, and how they reinforce youth for displaying the behavioral expectations. These "quizzes" will give insight into the needs of staff in regard to further or more intensive training. FW-PBIS leadership teams also have embedded FW-PBIS into scheduled facility walkthroughs conducted by facility and/or agency administrators as an additional buy-in/implementation check.

Staff feedback. In addition, FW-PBIS teams should elicit staff feedback on an ongoing basis. Eliciting feedback through anonymous surveys, comment boxes, or open discussions allows staff to feel heard as well as provides the FW-PBIS team with a larger base for ideas. Staff who are engaging with youth in a facility on a daily basis may have valuable feedback related to the FW-PBIS plan, including, but not limited to: (a) teaching strategies; (b) content within

resource guides; (c) youth behaviors that need to be targeted more frequently for instruction; and (d) ideas for youth and staff reinforcement. It is important to note that, unlike schools, not all staff will have access to email during work shifts; therefore, traditional pen-and-paper surveys may be necessary just as announcements may be communicated via an on-site bulletin board or by the time clock.

Staff reinforcement and self-care. Finally, FW-PBIS teams have reported success in sustaining staff buy-in through publicly celebrating staff for implementing the FW-PBIS plan. Similarly, to youth, staff want to know when they are doing well. Recognizing staff for implementing the FW-PBIS plan can be as simple as a "You did a great job delivering reinforcement to Jadon when he was exhibiting appropriate line movement" to designating a special monthly parking space for staff recognition. Researchers also have looked at the importance of staff self-care as a means to support facility-wide implementation (Jolivette et al., 2018). As previously mentioned issues, burnout and staff turnover are significant barriers to FW-PBIS implementation (e.g., Jolivette et al., 2015). To address staff stress and burnout, Jolivette and colleagues (2018) applied that the PBIS logic to staff self-care ideas at the Tier 1 level included the use of mindfulness exercises and an employer health and wellness plan; at Tier 2, targeted workplace self-care groups and infusion of gratitude into workplace practices; and Tier 3 included self-care action plans or supervisor recommended health and wellness activities. By engaging in self-care, staff may exhibit greater satisfaction and effectiveness in their jobs contributing to sustained PBIS buy-in and improved implementation.

Sustainability Youth Buy-In

It is imperative that youth voice continue to be an ongoing consideration in the FW-PBIS plan to sustain youth buy-in. Researchers have suggested that FW-PBIS leadership teams intentionally seek out youth voice as a means to improve their FW-PBIS plans through methods such as focus groups, comment boxes, surveys, and/or inviting a youth to be a member of the FW-PBIS leadership team (Jolivette et al., 2015). FW-PBIS leadership teams should seek out youth voice in regard to all aspects of the FW-PBIS plan. FW-PBIS leadership teams across the country have noted success in sustaining youth buy-in through having open communication with youth. Some teams note a simple conversation to discover what youth desire along with willingness for the team to adjust the FW-PBIS plan can greatly affect youth buy-in. In focus groups conducted by Jolivette and colleagues (2015), not only did youth provide valuable feedback on many aspects of the FW-PBIS plan (e.g., teaching of expectations, reinforcement systems), youth also were able to articulate meaningful ways in which FW-PBIS has

benefited them short and long term and ways in which they will continue to maintain positive behavior change once returning home. Activities related to including youth voice within the FW-PBIS plan are listed in Table 2.

Ongoing training. The population of youth within residential and juvenile settings changes on a daily basis, greatly affecting sustained youth buy-in to the FW-PBIS plan (Swain-Bradway et al., 2013). Given this, intentional planning and systematic teaching need to take place to ensure that youth entering the facility are immediately introduced to the FW-PBIS plan and the FW-PBIS expectations are taught and modeled consistently (Swoszowski et al., 2017). FW-PBIS leadership teams have noted success when incorporating teaching of the FW-PBIS plan into intake processes for all youth; establishing youth understand the framework, know the expectations, and understand the reinforcement system; and including the FW-PBIS plan into youth and family handbooks. In addition, teams have sought ways to incorporate systematically teaching the FW-PBIS expectations during targeted times of the day (e.g., prior to leaving the unit each morning, during opening announcements in school, during group therapy). Some of this teaching is brief (i.e., reviewing the expectations) while some teaching is more targeted (i.e., using a resource guide specific to an area of needed improvement for youth). Ensuring FW-PBIS is embedded into all activities and in all facility environments ensures that youth and staff are consistently being exposed to FW-PBIS.

Youth reinforcement. Finally, reinforcement systems are another integral piece of sustaining youth buy-in. When reinforcing expected youth behavior, staff must follow specific guidelines to ensure youth are being reinforced in a way in which meaningful behavior change can occur. These guidelines include (a) providing immediate, positive reinforcement when the behavior occurs; (b) directly linking the behavior with the FW-PBIS expectations with specific language; and (c) ensuring the reinforcement provided aligns with the FW-PBIS plan. Facility staff who are not "bought in" to the FW-PBIS plan may reinforce youth based on other contingencies or may not reinforce youth at all. In addition to ensuring that the expected behaviors are being reinforced in accordance to guidelines within the FW-PBIS plan, the FW-PBIS leadership team needs to be intentional in ensuring the reinforcements accessible to youth are (a) desirable to all youth, (b) adhere to all policies and procedures, and (c) cannot be used to gamble or barter. In focus group interviews with youth, Jolivette and colleagues (2015) found that while youth generally had a positive view of the reinforcement they were able to access, there was a common theme in which youth requested access to reinforcement

that was activity based and allowed them to move. Moving away from traditionally food-based reinforcement systems can prove challenging for many juvenile facilities. Ideas for increasing youth buy-in through reinforcement procedures and choosing desirable reinforcers are presented in Table 2.

Discussion

Buy-in is a critical piece of PBIS implementation, with increased challenges when PBIS is implemented in residential and secure-care facilities under a 24/7 model. To secure and maintain buy-in, FW-PBIS leadership teams must consider the specific needs of staff and youth and the unique contextual variables of each setting during initial and sustained FW-PBIS implementation. Here, we offer implications for FW-PBIS leadership teams and researchers working in these facilities.

Implications for Leadership Teams

FW-PBIS leadership teams should be cognizant of the unique contextual variables within their facilities when considering how to best plan for youth and staff buy-in. While the ideas shared within this article are ones that have been successfully applied in a variety of residential and secure-care facilities across the country, not every idea will work for every facility. FW-PBIS leadership teams should consider their environment as well as youth and staff characteristics and needs prior to planning how to secure and sustain buy-in. For example, in some cases, many staff may not have access to email while on duty. For these facilities, it would be ineffective to survey staff or establish open lines of communication via email as many staff would not be able to easily participate. A paper survey kept at the main entrance where all staff access each day would be a better option to ensure all staff have access and are able to participate. Youth characteristics and needs also vary greatly and should be considered. It is unlikely that all youth within a facility would buy-in to the acronym "We MAN UP—Make positive decisions, Accept responsibility, Nourish our mind and body, Uplift our peers, Participate appropriately" if the youth were both male and female. FW-PBIS leadership teams should continually consider the unique characteristics of their facility and make changes to their FW-PBIS plan as needed.

Similarly, being cognizant of youth and staff voice is an important consideration for FW-PBIS leadership teams. The team should work diligently to elicit feedback from both youth and staff on all variables of the FW-PBIS plan including foreseen barriers to FW-PBIS implementation. As noted previously, allowing key stakeholders to have a voice in and of itself promotes buy-in.

When FW-PBIS leadership teams work diligently to create and maintain a training plan, they are better able to

ensure youth and staff alike stay knowledgeable of the FW-PBIS plan. Training plans consider the unique characteristics of the facility and ensure all staff and youth receive booster sessions as well as ongoing initial training for new hires and youth entering the facility. These trainings must be detailed, covering all aspects of the FW-PBIS plan, and should occur on a predictable and frequent schedule.

Implications for Staff

Previous researchers have demonstrated that staff working within residential and secure-care facilities have the opportunity to make a lasting impact on the lives of this country's most vulnerable youth (e.g., Jolivette et al., 2015). Usually, this requires staff to change their mind-set from a punitive approach to a proactive and preventive one, focused on teaching, reinforcing, and monitoring youth behavior (Ennis & Gonsoulin, 2015; Jolivette et al., 2014). First, this work starts with a mind-set that is invested in the future of youth. Staff need to be willing to see youth in their care as individuals who are able to achieve and be willing to support youth as they work to improve their character and skills (Jolivette & Kumm, 2018). Second, staff will be more successful with implementation when they approach the task with vulnerability and open communicate. Staff must have a safe space to work through problems and personal struggles related to FW-PBIS implementation and their interactions with youth and staff (Jolivette et al., 2019). Finally, staff need to be open to feedback from their peers and willing to learn. As noted by facility partners, changing "old" patterns is challenging (e.g., Kimball et al., 2017). Staff need to be willing to walk alongside their peers as they learn to shift their mind-set toward youth in their care, focusing on teaching, modeling, and reinforcing expected, appropriate behavior. For success, researchers have demonstrated that staff should be able to operate from a mind-set of working to improve the lives of the youth they work with as this is the true purpose of such facilities (Jolivette & Nelson, 2010).

Future Research Directions

As facilities look for ways to increase buy-in among youth and staff, the list of areas of future research is long and ever-growing as researchers continue to learn as more and more residential and juvenile settings are adopting and implementing FW-PBIS. A place to start may be in the area of social validity or the acceptability of the goals, procedures, and outcomes of any intervention (Wolf, 1978). Researchers have demonstrated that adult perceptions of an intervention can affect the fidelity with which they implement the intervention (Lane et al., 2009). Researchers in these facilities should look for ways to measure social validity and also guide FW-PBIS leadership teams in making adjustments

based on staff feedback and/or providing a better rationale for why certain practices have been identified.

As discussed, ongoing training on the PBIS framework is necessary for both staff and youth who are new to the facility. Researchers should seek to find standard practices for facilities to adopt. This may require researchers to think outside of the traditional PBIS box to respond to the unique needs of residential and juvenile facilities. For example, facilities have explored ways to use a traditional Tier 2 intervention, check-in/check-out with all new youth to help them better understand the expectations from Day 1, as check-in/check-out is designed to give youth more frequently feedback on PBIS expectations (Swoszowski et al., 2017). Using interventions that are traditionally implemented as Tier 2 interventions at different tiers may be needed based on data and beneficial for youth needs related to buy-in. Developing these algorithmic procedures will help take some of the guess work out of this training process.

As it pertains specifically to staff and youth buy-in, more research is needed to evaluate specific strategies to increase buy-in for staff and youth. Little is known about which strategies result in the highest levels of buy-in for both initial and sustained implementation. Also, it is of interest for researchers to investigate the levels of buy-in based on tier of implementation. For example, does accessing youth voice as it pertains to Tier 1 versus Tier strategies change the level of buy-in for specific youth? Finally, researchers must determine what metrics should be used to measure buy-in from all stakeholders within residential and juvenile facilities.

Another area of immediate need is to better understand whether or not FW-PBIS has decreased both staff turnover and youth negative behaviors and recidivism. Anecdotally, there is evidence to suggest that FW-PBIS has resulted in greater job satisfaction and decreased turnover. However, tracking this information is difficult within these settings. Future researchers should work with facilities to collect and analyze this information, so further conclusions can be drawn.

Conclusion

While the implementation of FW-PBIS within residential and juvenile facilities is still relatively new, positive results are being recognized across the country. While many residential and juvenile facilities continue to implement FW-PBIS with success, many others struggle to maintain high levels of fidelity of implementation, often associated with lack of staff and youth buy-in (Jolivette et al., 2015; Swain-Bradway et al., 2013). FW-PBIS implementation is essential in residential and juvenile facilities as they serve the country's most vulnerable youth (Quinn et al., 2005). The FW-PBIS framework is one way to support youth from

a rehabilitative and habilitative approach with the goal of successful reentry into the community.

ORCID iD

Robin Parks Ennis https://orcid.org/0000-0002-8620-4199

References

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.

Fixsen, D. L., Naoom, S. F., Blase, K. A., Friedman, R. M., & Wallace, F. (2005). *Implementation research: A synthesis of the literature* (FMHI Publication #231). Louis de la Parte Florida Mental Health Institute, The National Implementation Research Network, University of South Florida

Griller Clark, H., & Mathur, S. R. (2015). Merging two worlds: A tier two model to promote transition of youth from residential settings to the community. *Residential Treatment of Children & Youth*, *32*, 280–298.

Jolivette, K. (2016). *Multi-tiered systems of support in residential juvenile facilities. 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., Boden, L. J., Sprague, J. R., Ennis, R. P., & Kimball, K. K. (2015). Youth voice matters: Perceptions of facility-wide PBIS implementation in secure residential juvenile facilities. *Residential Treatment of Children & Youth*, *32*, 299–320.

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/resource/resources-for-facility-wide-pbis-implementation-in-juvenile-corrections-and-residential-settings-facilities-from-adoption-consideration-to-initial-implementation-to-sustained-implementation

Jolivette, 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.

Jolivette, K., Patterson, D. P., Swoszowski, N. C., McDaniel, S. C., Kennedy, C., & Ennis, R. P. (2014). SWPBIS in a residential school for students with emotional and behavioral disorders: First years of implementation and maintenance follow-up focus group. *Residential Treatment of Children & Youth*, *31*, 63–79.

Jolivette, K., Swoszowski, N. C., & Ennis, R. P. (2017). *Facility-wide PBIS Tiered Fidelity Inventory*. https://www.pbis.org/resource/facility-wide-tiered-fidelity-inventory-fw-tfi

Jolivette, K., Swoszowski, N. C., Kumm, S., Sanders, S., & Ansley, B. M. (2019). Embedding staff self-care into the PBIS all, some, and few logic for those working in juvenile correctional and residential settings. *The Journal of Correctional Education*, *70*, 2–19.

Kimball, K. A., Jolivette, K., & Sprague, J. R. (2017). Agency-stakeholder reflections: Perspectives of state-wide adoption of the PBIS framework in juvenile facilities. *Journal of Correctional Education*, 68(2), 17–36.

Lane, K. L., Kalberg, J. R., Bruhn, A. L., Driscoll, S. A., Wehby, J. H., & Elliott, S. N. (2009). Assessing social validity of school-wide positive behavior support plans: Evidence for the reliability and structure of the Primary Intervention Rating Scale. *School Psychology Review*, *38*, 135–144.

Lopez, A., Williams, J. K., & Newsom, K. (2015). PBIS in Texas juvenile justice department's division on education and state programs: Integrating programs and developing systems for sustained implementation. *Residential Treatment for Children and Youth*, *32*, 344–353.

McDaniel, S. C., Jolivette, K., & Ennis, R. P. (2014). Barriers and facilitators to integrating SWPBIS in alternative education settings with existing behavior management systems. *Journal of Disability Policy Studies*, *24*, 247–256. https://doi.org/10.1177/1044207312465471

McIntosh, K., Mercer, S. H., Nese, R. N., Strickland-Cohen, M. K., & Hoselton, R. (2016). Predictors of sustained implementation of school-wide positive behavioral interventions and supports. *Journal of Positive Behavior Interventions*, *18*, 209–218.

Netzel, D. M., & Eber, L. (2003). Shifting from reactive to proactive discipline in an urban school district. *Journal of Positive Behavior Interventions*, *5*, 71–79.

Quinn, M. M., Rutherford, R. B., Leone, P. E., Osher, D. M., & Poirier, J. M. (2005). Youth with disabilities in juvenile corrections: A national survey. *Exceptional Children*, *71*, 339–345.

Scheuermann, B. K., Duchaine, E., Bruntmyer, T., Nelson, M., Wang, E., & Lopez, A. (2013). Perceptions of coaching activities to support PBIS implementation in secure juvenile correctional facilities. *Education and Treatment of Children*, *36*, 147–160.

Sickmund, M., Sladky, T. J., Kang, W., & Puzzanchera, C. (2017). *Easy access to the census of juveniles in residential placement*. www.ojjdp.gov/ojstatbb/ezacjrp/

Sprague, J. R., Scheuermann, B., Wang, E., Nelson, C. M., Jolivette, K., & Vincent, C. (2013). Adopting and adapting PBIS for secure juvenile justice settings: Lessons learned. *Education and Treatment of Children*, *36*, 121–134.

Sugai, G., & Horner, R. H. (2002). Introduction to the special series on positive behavior support in schools. *Journal of Emotional and Behavioral Disorders*, *10*, 130–135.

Swain-Bradway, J., Swoszowski, N. C., Boden, L. J., & Sprague, J. R. (2013). Voices from the field: Stakeholder's perspectives on PBIS implementation in alternative educational settings. *Education and Treatment of Children*, *36*, 31–46.

Swoszowski, N. C., Evanovich, L. L., Ennis, R. P., & Jolivette, K. (2017). Evaluating implementation of check in/check out in alternative educational settings: Stakeholder perspectives. *Residential Treatment of Children and Youth*, *34*, 107–121.

Wolf, M. M. (1978). Social validity: The case for subjective measurement or how applied behavior analysis is finding its heart. *Journal of Applied Behavior Analysis*, *11*, 203–214.