

STANDARDS, BENCHMARKS AND INDICATORS OF COMMUNITY-WIDE DEPLOYMENT OF PBS SYSTEMS AND SERVICES		Implementation Rubric					Source of Evidence or Implementation Resources
		0 Not initiated	1 Early deployment	2 In progress	3 Near attainment	4 Fully integrated	
A. Agency Capacity¹							
Definition of standard	The agency has integrated within the framework of the organization sufficient supports and mechanisms needed to provide quality PBS-based services to their youth.						
Benchmark 1	<i>The agency has adopted a PBS policy statement as part of their Policy & Procedure manual.</i>	No PBS reference in any agency Policy and Procedures Manual	PBS references in mission statement only	PBS references in mission statement and guidance for overall PBS planning	PBS references mission, guidance and rights of youth	PBS references mission, guidance, prohibition of aversive methods and rights of youth	
Indicators of Benchmark 1	a. Agency policy demonstrates the commitment to non-aversive delivery of services, and support of PBS				No	Yes	
	b. Agency policy demonstrates the commitment to prohibiting the use of aversive procedures, including seclusion and restraints, except as critically necessary and only as part of crisis intervention planning				No	Yes	
	c. Agency policy includes procedural guidance on overall PBS planning and implementation process used by agency				No	Yes	
	d. Agency policy demonstrates the commitment to youth rights in the process of PBS –based services				No	Yes	
	e. Agency policy demonstrates the commitment to youth’s cultural preferences and lifestyle differences.				No	Yes	
Benchmark 2	<i>The agency’s job descriptions reflect the designation of roles and duties to support provision of PBS-based services.</i>	No PBS reference in any agency job description	PBS references in select team member job descriptions	PBS references in all team member job descriptions	PBS references in select team member job descriptions and PBS Specialist JD under development	PBS references in select team member job descriptions and PBS Specialist role in place	
Indicators of Benchmark 2	a. The agency’s PBS Specialist job description defines the role as the team leader for tertiary planning and services				No	Yes	
	b. Job descriptions for other team member roles have the competencies and skill sets for select K/S associated with planning, implementation and progress monitoring of tertiary services				No	Yes	
Benchmark 3	<i>The agency’s Policy & Procedure (or HR)</i>	No modification of	Hiring criteria for	Evaluation criteria for PBS	Hiring criteria for both PBS	Evaluation criteria for PBS	

¹ It is assumed that the project will develop and/or share boilerplate or sample documents that will aid agencies in the further development of Policy & Procedure manuals.

STANDARDS, BENCHMARKS AND INDICATORS OF COMMUNITY-WIDE DEPLOYMENT OF PBS SYSTEMS AND SERVICES		Implementation Rubric					Source of Evidence or Implementation Resources
		0 Not initiated	1 Early deployment	2 In progress	3 Near attainment	4 Fully integrated	
	<i>Manual defines hiring and evaluation procedures to support the ongoing continuance of PBS roles and services.</i>	hiring or evaluation of staff have been made by agency	qualifications of PBS Specialist integrated into hiring documents	Specialist integrated into Evaluation documents	Specialist and other staff with PBS related duties integrated into hiring documents	Specialist and other staff with PBS related duties integrated into evaluation documents	
Indicators of Benchmark 3	a. Criteria relative to qualification of new hires relative to PBS related duties are integrated into Hiring documents				No	Yes	
	b. Evaluation criteria for specific PBS-related duties from job description are integrated into Evaluation documents				No	Yes	
Benchmark 4	<i>The agency has the completed requisite training and meets state eligibility requirements to submit Medicaid billing for PBS services</i>	Agency is not eligible to submit Medicaid billing	Agency currently apply for eligibility to bill for Medicaid funding	Agency is eligible to submit Medicaid billing	Agency is eligibility to submit Medicaid billing; personnel currently undergoing training for PBS billing	Agency is eligibility to submit Medicaid billing and has sufficiently trained personnel to perform this task	
Indicators of Benchmark 4	a. Training is completed with the outcome being demonstration of skills to document and submit Medicaid billing for PBS services				No	Yes	
	b. The agency has fulfilled and documents meeting State of AK eligibility requirements for Medicaid billing.				No	Yes	
	Number of Benchmarks per level of deployment / Total benchmarks for standard	___/4	___/4	___/4	___/4	___/4	
	Percent per level of deployment	___ %	___ %	___ %	___ %	___ %	
Overall score for Standard A: Summation of YES scores for all indicators of the Standard							/11
B. Agency Operation²							
Definition of	The agency has integrated within its service delivery system sufficient procedures, supports and oversights needed to provide						

² It is similarly assumed that the project will develop and/or share boilerplate or sample documents that will aid agencies in the development of Job Descriptions, Forms, Assessments, and Oversight tools.

STANDARDS, BENCHMARKS AND INDICATORS OF COMMUNITY-WIDE DEPLOYMENT OF PBS SYSTEMS AND SERVICES		Implementation Rubric					Source of Evidence or Implementation Resources
		0 Not initiated	1 Early deployment	2 In progress	3 Near attainment	4 Fully integrated	
standard	quality PBS-based services to their youth..						
Benchmark 1	<i>The agency uses a PBS-driven team process for service planning, behavioral assessment, and plan formation as a primary mechanism to facilitate behavioral change.</i>	No element of the PBS process (e.g., FBA, hypothesis formation, multi-comp plan) has been initiated.	The agency has integrated FBA and basic PBS intervention planning strategies only	The agency has integrated FBA and basic PBS intervention planning strategies with the exclusion of aversive interventions	The agency has integrated the PBS tertiary process for 1 or more specific populations served, within 4 wks of initiation, but not across all clientele	The agency has integrated the PBS tertiary process for all aspects/clientele served within 6 weeks of starting services.	
Indicators of Benchmark 1	a. Agency follows tertiary program planning process by the PBS Pyramid Model				No	Yes	
	b. Agency targets completion of FBA and formation of working hypothesis within 4 weeks of initiation of services				No	Yes	
	c. Agency develops and implements a multi-component PBS plan within 6 weeks of initiation of services				No	Yes	
Benchmark 2	<i>The agency either provides or fiscally supports staff development to supports training of PBS competencies and skill sets, and role alignment to job descriptions and staff evaluation systems</i>	There are neither funds or internal training opportunities associated with PBS in place	A plan has been framed and funds identified to support one staff member for PBS training and credentialing. Training has not however yet started.	The agency is now supporting the training of at least 1 staff member that eventually leads to credentialing as a PBS specialist	The agency has a training and documentation for a designated PBS specialist only	The agency has a systemic training and documentation system that is compliant with state billing requirements for service provision	
Indicators of Benchmark 2	a. Agency develops staff development training plan to credentialing needs to support a certified PBS Specialist				No	Yes	
	b. Agency develops staff development training plan to support team personnel who have designated PBS duties and roles.				No	Yes	
	c. Agency implements and maintains documentation system for completion of training by personnel to ensure effective staff evaluation and capacity to engage in Medicaid billing for PBS services				No	Yes	
Benchmark 3	<i>Service delivery</i>	No PBS	PBS Specialist	PBS Specialist	PBS Specialist	PBS Specialist	

STANDARDS, BENCHMARKS AND INDICATORS OF COMMUNITY-WIDE DEPLOYMENT OF PBS SYSTEMS AND SERVICES		Implementation Rubric					Source of Evidence or Implementation Resources
		0 Not initiated	1 Early deployment	2 In progress	3 Near attainment	4 Fully integrated	
	<i>systems of the agency utilize and support the PBS Specialist as team leader for the formation of PBS intervention plans.</i>	Specialist in place	targeted but not creden-tialed due to training needs; functions within a team	credentialed and works as part of some PBS teams; not necessarily leader role	credentialed and serving as team leader for at least 1 PBS team	leads all team meetings associated with planning and interventions for challenging behaviors	
Indicators of Benchmark 3	a. Agency recruits and hires sufficient personnel who either have PBS Specialist credentials or qualifications needed to earn a certificate upon completion of training OR , has implemented an On-the-Job staff development plan to support the credentialing of a designated staff member within one calendar year of this review..				No	Yes	
	b. The agency provides basic caseload guidance for the PBS Specialist role to ensure the professional's availability to serve the clientele in an effective manner.				No	Yes	
Benchmark 4	<i>Service delivery systems of the agency utilize and support the PBS forms for both delivery and oversight of services</i>	No PBS-based forms used by agency	Limited PBS forms for only 1 or 2 of the following categories: assessment, planning, and/or data collection	All assessment, planning and data collection forms support PBS implementation;	All assessment, planning and data collection forms support PBS implementation; CI tracked on PBS forms	All assessment, planning and data collection forms support PBS implementation; Method to track CI on PBS forms and by internal oversight group	
Indicators of Benchmark 4	a. The agency uses only PBS approved forms for assessment, designation of the plan, and collection/summary of data/performance				No	Yes	
	b. Internal process for tracking and review of incidents of use of crisis intervention procedures [preferably local human rights committee].				No	Yes	
Benchmark 5	<i>The agency has or supports a local Human Rights oversight mechanism to monitor the fidelity/use of interventions used by</i>	No process of ensuring fidelity in place with agency services	Agency conducts quarterly observations for fidelity of CI; retrain as suggested.	Agency conducts quarterly observations for fidelity of PBS and CI	Agency conducts quarterly observations for fidelity of PBS and CI; retrain as suggested	Agency tracks fidelity of both PBS and crisis interventions on quarterly and monthly basis; provides	

STANDARDS, BENCHMARKS AND INDICATORS OF COMMUNITY-WIDE DEPLOYMENT OF PBS SYSTEMS AND SERVICES		Implementation Rubric					Source of Evidence or Implementation Resources
		0 Not initiated	1 Early deployment	2 In progress	3 Near attainment	4 Fully integrated	
	<i>staff, including those used in crisis intervention.</i>					retraining as suggested by data	
Indicators of Benchmark 5	a. The agency conducts at least quarterly observations of service delivery to quantitatively measure fidelity of implementation; retrain staff as needed based on findings.				No	Yes	
	b. Follow-up interviews are conducted each month of observers of the use of crisis interventions and emergency procedures to quantitatively measure fidelity; retrain staff as needed based on findings.				No	Yes	
Benchmark 6	<i>The agency utilizes a person-centered approach for the planning of services for their youth.</i>	The agency does not utilize PCP approaches	PCP is used for initial planning of services	PCP is used for initial planning of services and is conducted by a credentialed facilitator	PCP is used for initial planning of services and for discharge, and is conducted by a credentialed facilitator; plan is integrated into services	A credentialed PCP Facilitator lead PCPing at within 2 weeks of each of the 3 transition point; planning translated into services via action planning	
Indicators of Benchmark 6	a. The agency uses PCP at entry, critical transitions or changes in placements, and exits points for service delivery, within 2 weeks of each transition point.				No	Yes	
	b. The agency accurately and fully translates PCP to services and supports, and conducts quarterly reviews to ensure relevance to the youth's needs				No	Yes	
	c. PCP is planned by a state certified PCP Facilitator.				No	Yes	
Benchmark 7	<i>Documentation and process for submission for PBS billing is accurate, timely and complete.</i>	The agency does not utilize PCP approaches	PCP is used for initial planning of services	PCP is used for initial planning of services and is conducted by a credentialed facilitator	PCP is used for initial planning of services and for discharge, and is conducted by a credentialed facilitator; plan is integrated into services	A credentialed PCP Facilitator lead PCPing at within 2 weeks of each of the 3 transition point; planning translated into services via action planning	
Indicators of Benchmark 7	a. Samples of 3 to 5 billing statements reflect accurately submitted billing that agrees with a master Medicaid billing packet that has been pre-approved by				No	Yes	

STANDARDS, BENCHMARKS AND INDICATORS OF COMMUNITY-WIDE DEPLOYMENT OF PBS SYSTEMS AND SERVICES	Implementation Rubric					Source of Evidence or Implementation Resources
	0 Not initiated	1 Early deployment	2 In progress	3 Near attainment	4 Fully integrated	
	state personnel for the equivalent services and tasks.					
b.	Samples of 3 to 5 billing statements reflect requests for reimbursement to cover the full scope of services and tasks, as compared to a master Medicaid billing packet that has been pre-approved by state personnel for the equivalent services and tasks.			No	Yes	
c.	Samples of 3 to 5 billing statements demonstrate timely process of requests for reimbursement, based on State of AK required deadlines and timetables for this process.			No	Yes	
Number of Benchmarks per level of deployment / Total benchmarks for standard	___/1	___/1	___/1	___/1	___/1	
Percent per level of deployment	___ %	___ %	___ %	___ %	___ %	
Overall score for Standard B: Summation of YES scores for all indicators of the Standard						/18
C. Interagency Capacity³						
Definition of standard	Partnering agencies of a given community or region share a PBS vision and framework through a sufficiently formalized relationship that ensures the quality, consistency, and continuity of Positive Behavior Support based services for youth.					
Benchmark 1	<i>Partnering agencies develop and annually sign Memoranda of Understanding across dyads, triads or full complement of community agencies when PBS-based services are shared.</i>	Either no shared services exist or no MOU have been initiated.	At least one, but less than 50% of the youth for a designated set of agencies have shared PBS services provided under the auspices of these PBS MOU.	At least 50% of the youth for a designated set of agencies have shared PBS services provided under the auspices of these PBS MOU.	Over 50% but less than all youth the youth for a designated set of agencies have shared PBS services provided under the auspices of these PBS MOU.	All youth within a designated set of agencies who the need or potential for shared PBS services have these cooperative activities through signed MOU
Indicators of Benchmark 1	a. A signed and dated annual PBS-related MOU exists for each partner, for the agency under review.			No	Yes	

³ It is assumed that communities vary significantly as to number of and focus for agency partners. It is not necessary that all agencies of a given community partner in this effort. Rather, what is critical is the linkage across natural dyads and triads of agencies who mutually provide services to the same individual and/or his/her family.

STANDARDS, BENCHMARKS AND INDICATORS OF COMMUNITY-WIDE DEPLOYMENT OF PBS SYSTEMS AND SERVICES		Implementation Rubric					Source of Evidence or Implementation Resources
		0 Not initiated	1 Early deployment	2 In progress	3 Near attainment	4 Fully integrated	
	b. The signed MOU includes a core operating structure and calendar for regular review and re-approval of the PBS partnering relationship for shared and/or coordinated services				No	Yes	
	c. The signed MOU includes a method to disseminate the existence of the MOU across staff of partnering agencies				No	Yes	
Benchmark 2	<i>Partnering agencies jointly develop and require the use of shared forms and releases for the delivery of PBS-based shared services.</i>	None of the partnering agencies for a designated community or region use the same set of PBS forms and releases.	At least one pair of partners but less than 50% agencies use the same set of PBS forms and releases.	At least 50% of partnering agencies use the same set of PBS forms and releases.	Over 50% of partnering agencies, but less than all, use the same set of PBS forms and releases.	All partnering agencies for a designated community or region use the same set of PBS forms and releases.	
Indicators of Benchmark 2	a. The partnering agencies use only PBS approved forms for assessment, designation of the plan, and collection/summary of data/performance; similarly these partners use the same form for planning and documenting use of crisis interventions and critical events				No	Yes	
	b. The partnering agencies use the same consent processes, criteria, and informed consent forms.				No	Yes	
	c. The partnering agencies use the same timetables for completion of shared forms and consents.				No	Yes	
Benchmark 3	<i>Partnering agencies establish, implement and maintain a system of review to oversee, problem-solve and expand the MOU; results of these reviews are shared with staff in a timely and effective manner.</i>	Either no shared services exist or no reviews of MOU have been initiated.	Documents demonstrate that a regular review of the MOU for 1 set of partners has taken place.	Documents demonstrate that a regular review of the MOU for partners has taken place, with a communication system in place	Documents demonstrates that 50% of partnering agencies participate in MOU reviews, problem-solving, and updates/retraining as suggested by the indicators	Documents demonstrates that all partnering agencies participate in MOU reviews, problem-solving, and updates/retraining as suggested by the indicators	
Indicators of	a. A regular quarterly calendar is established and used by partnering agencies for				No	Yes	

STANDARDS, BENCHMARKS AND INDICATORS OF COMMUNITY-WIDE DEPLOYMENT OF PBS SYSTEMS AND SERVICES		Implementation Rubric					Source of Evidence or Implementation Resources
		0 Not initiated	1 Early deployment	2 In progress	3 Near attainment	4 Fully integrated	
Benchmark 3	the review of the MOU.						
	b. A feedback system exists across partners, relative to fidelity, human rights, and problems associated with shared implementation of PBS services to provide data for quarterly reviews and modifications of MOU				No	Yes	
	c. A process exists to communicate, in a timely and thorough manner, among shared staff changes in the MOU and perhaps PBS services. Similarly, a structure for new training of staff associated with these potential changes exists and is when possible, shared, when these changes justify them.				No	Yes	
Benchmark 4	<i>Partnering agencies jointly define and review PBS-related processes, oversight mechanisms and timelines.</i>	Either no shared services exist or no sharing of PBS services has been initiated.	Partnering agencies share forms though services continue to either vary in interventions or targeted outcomes	Partnering agencies follow same core PBS-planning and implementation process and strive for mutually agreed-upon outcomes	Partnering agencies follow same core PBS-planning and implementation process and strive for mutually agreed-upon outcomes; partner share oversight mechanism	Partners use only the cooperatively planned PBS processes as suggested through the Indicators and meet quarterly to review and update this effort together.	
Indicators of Benchmark 4	a. Partnering agencies document how they engage in PBS evaluation, including defining both the scope and manner in which processes and outcomes attained				No	Yes	
	b. Partnering agencies establish and follow at least a quarterly calendar to review elements incrementally across year, along with corresponding documentation of completion				No	Yes	
	Number of Benchmarks per level of deployment / Total benchmarks for standard	___/4	___/4	___/4	___/4	___/4	
	Percent per level of deployment	___ %	___ %	___ %	___ %	___ %	
Overall score for Standard C: Summation of YES scores for all indicators of the Standard							/11
D. Interagency Operation							
Definition of standard	Partnering agencies of a given community or region who share service delivery practices for a youth have a sufficiently formalized relationship to ensure the quality, consistency, and continuity of Positive Behavior Support based services.						

STANDARDS, BENCHMARKS AND INDICATORS OF COMMUNITY-WIDE DEPLOYMENT OF PBS SYSTEMS AND SERVICES		Implementation Rubric					Source of Evidence or Implementation Resources
		0 Not initiated	1 Early deployment	2 In progress	3 Near attainment	4 Fully integrated	
Benchmark 1	<i>Partnering agencies conduct shared PBS-based planning and progress monitoring meetings for youth for whom they share services.</i>	Either no shared services exist or agencies do not cooperate in planning and/or implementation of PBS services	Partnering agencies cooperate in the planning of PBS services for shared youth but do not coordinate implementation or reviews	Partnering agencies cooperate in the planning and implementation of PBS services for shared youth	Partnering agencies cooperate in the planning, and implementation PBS services for shared youth; agencies share data but do not have joint progress monitoring meetings	Teams from partnering agencies share all aspects of PBS planning/implementation. They jointly conduct monthly and quarterly progress monitoring meetings for all shared youth with PBS plans	
Indicators of Benchmark 1	a. Jointly drafted document describing process for conducting PBS-planning, suggested timelines for implementation and roles across partnering staff when services are shared				No	Yes	
	b. Jointly drafted document describing process for conducting progress monitoring meetings, suggested timelines for implementation and roles across partnering staff when services are shared				No	Yes	
Benchmark 2	<i>Partnering agencies develop and utilize shared forms to plan or collect shared data</i>	Either no shared services exist or agencies have not begun sharing forms	Select partnering agencies share forms for PBS assessment only	Select partnering agencies share forms for PBS assessment and plans only	Select partnering agencies share forms for PBS assessment, plans and data collection	All partnering agencies share the same forms for assessment, planning, & data collection	
Indicators of Benchmark 2	a. Partnering agencies employ a jointly drafted FBA assessment, capable of addressing the scope of a multi-component PBS intervention plan				No	Yes	
	b. Partnering agencies employ a jointly drafted PBS intervention plan forms, capable of addressing the scope of a multi-component PBS intervention plan				No	Yes	
	c. Partnering agencies employ a jointly drafted data collection forms, capable of addressing the scope of a multi-component PBS intervention plan				No	Yes	
Benchmark 3	<i>Partnering agencies develop and utilize shared process and forms for obtaining</i>	Either no shared services exist or agencies have	Select partnering agencies have begun to	Select partnering agencies share the process, and criteria	Select partnering agencies share the process, criteria and	Teams from partnering agencies share the same process	

STANDARDS, BENCHMARKS AND INDICATORS OF COMMUNITY-WIDE DEPLOYMENT OF PBS SYSTEMS AND SERVICES		Implementation Rubric					Source of Evidence or Implementation Resources
		0 Not initiated	1 Early deployment	2 In progress	3 Near attainment	4 Fully integrated	
	<i>releases of information</i>	not begun sharing the consent process	negotiate and determine shared consent processes, criteria and forms		forms for consent and releases	and criterion for informed consent, along with use of the same consent and release forms	
Indicators of Benchmark 3	a. Partnering agencies employ a jointly process for deciding across partners the process for obtaining an informed consent, it's scope and limits, and its duration				No	Yes	
	b. Partnering agencies employ a jointly format for documenting consent once provided.				No	Yes	
Benchmark 4	<i>Partnering agencies develop and employ a shared system of oversight for fidelity and use of non-aversive interventions, and monitoring of crisis interventions.</i>	Either no sharing of services exists or no steps have been taken to plan oversight of the quality and/or use of interventions	A select group of partnering agencies have adopted shared strategies for fidelity OR the limited use of interventions	A select group of partnering agencies have adopted shared strategies for fidelity and the limited use of interventions	All partnering agencies have adopted shared strategies for fidelity and the limited use of interventions	All partnering agencies have adopted shared strategies for fidelity and the limited use of interventions; each meet regularly to review data and jointly respond to PBS delivery issues	
Indicators of Benchmark 4	a. The partnering agencies conduct at least quarterly observations of service delivery to quantitatively measure fidelity of implementation; retrain staff as needed based on findings.				No	Yes	
	b. The partnering agencies conduct follow-up interviews each month of observers of the use of crisis interventions and emergency procedures to quantitatively measure fidelity; retrain staff as needed based on findings.				No	Yes	
	c. Partnering agencies establish and implement a joint calendar to conduct observations and interviews, and engage in follow-up.				No	Yes	
	Number of Benchmarks per level of deployment / Total	___/4	___/4	___/4	___/4	___/4	

STANDARDS, BENCHMARKS AND INDICATORS OF COMMUNITY-WIDE DEPLOYMENT OF PBS SYSTEMS AND SERVICES		Implementation Rubric					Source of Evidence or Implementation Resources
		0 Not initiated	1 Early deployment	2 In progress	3 Near attainment	4 Fully integrated	
	benchmarks for standard						
	Percent per level of deployment	___ %	___ %	___ %	___ %	___ %	
Overall score for Standard D: Summation of YES scores for all indicators of the Standard							/10
E. Use of a PBS Planning Process							
Definition of standard	The agency adopts a preventative & proactive treatment approach through the use of the evidence-based PBS-planning process to first formulate a working hypothesis, and then frame a multi-component PBS Implementation Plan for the individuals and their families for who they serve.						
Benchmark 1	<i>A sampling of 3-5 plans demonstrate an accurate and individualized approach to planning and implementation of the Functional Behavioral Assessment process</i>	Either the agency has not initiated implementation of PBS services or no files reflect implementation of FBA	50% of the files reflect only basic implementation of FBAs	50% of the files reflect implementation of 3 types of FBA and linkage of data to formation of a working hypothesis	50% of the files reflect full implementation of the FBA indicators	100% of the files reflect full implementation of the FBA indicators	
Indicators of Benchmark 1	a. Plans reflect use of at least 3 types of assessment formats, including direct observation (ABA, FAOF), rating scales, self-assessments, checklists, and interviews, across the sampling of plans.				No	Yes	
	b. Data from across 2 or more types of assessments are used to formulate a working hypothesis as to the nature of the problematic behaviors				No	Yes	
	c. Input for the assessment data is provided by a variety of individuals, across the multiple settings and activities in which the youth engages				No	Yes	
Benchmark 2	<i>A sampling of 3-5 plans demonstrate an accurate and complete formation of working hypotheses</i>	Either the agency has not initiated implementation of PBS services or no files reflect development of a working hypothesis	50% of the files reflect only basic implementation of a working hypothesis	50% of the files reflect implementation of more complex working hypotheses, accurately within a 3-term model framework	50% of the files reflect full implementation of the working hypotheses for problematic and new skills, as suggested by the indicators	100% of the files reflect full use of the FBA process to form working hypotheses; the hypothesis suggest complex functions; competing behaviors have	

STANDARDS, BENCHMARKS AND INDICATORS OF COMMUNITY-WIDE DEPLOYMENT OF PBS SYSTEMS AND SERVICES		Implementation Rubric					Source of Evidence or Implementation Resources
		0 Not initiated	1 Early deployment	2 In progress	3 Near attainment	4 Fully integrated	
						been accurately targeted and portrayed within the 3-term model.	
Indicators of Benchmark 2	a. Function(s) of the target behavior are ID'ed directly from data and results of the FBA, and is communicated in the plan in the form of the 3-term contingency model.				No	Yes	
	b. The function or multiple functions of the behavior are addressed directly through PBS intervention plan				No	Yes	
	c. Competing behavior(s) ID'ed which serve either equivalent function(s) or are incompatible with target.				No	Yes	
Benchmark 3	<i>A sampling of 3-5 plans demonstrate accurate and consistent commitment to teaching new skills as a primary intervention strategy</i>	Either the agency has not initiated implementation of PBS services or no files training of new skills	50% of the files reflect only basic training of new skills	50% of the files reflect training of new skills, within natural contexts and times, and include social and/or communication strategies	75% of the files reflect training of new skills, within natural contexts and times, and include social and/or communication strategies	100% of the files reflect full implementation of the new skill instruction indicators	
Indicators of Benchmark 3	a. At least one age and contextually appropriate new social or behavioral skill will be taught through this plan				No	Yes	
	b. While targets new skills may be at times taught in simulated contexts, they are also always taught in the actually places, times, and activities where they are naturally required.				No	Yes	
	c. Whenever possible, specific communication skills are targeted to address either functional equivalent skills or increased comprehension by the youth				No	Yes	
Benchmark 4	<i>A sampling of 3-5 plans demonstrate accurate and consistent commitment to prevention of problem behaviors with use of</i>	Either the agency has not initiated implementation of PBS services or address prevention	50% of the files reflect only basic attempt to prevent triggers through setting events or antecedent	50% of the files reflect training or use of strategies to prevent triggers through setting events or	75% of the files reflect training or use of strategies to prevent triggers through setting events or	100% of the files reflect full implementation of the prevention and self-management	

STANDARDS, BENCHMARKS AND INDICATORS OF COMMUNITY-WIDE DEPLOYMENT OF PBS SYSTEMS AND SERVICES		Implementation Rubric					Source of Evidence or Implementation Resources
		0 Not initiated	1 Early deployment	2 In progress	3 Near attainment	4 Fully integrated	
	<i>setting event and/or antecedent related strategies</i>	and/or setting events	strategies	antecedent, and use of self management	antecedent, and use of self management	strategies	
Indicators of Benchmark 4	a. Strategies are employed to recognize triggers and engage in preventive activities or stress/anger reduction before an incident can take place				No	Yes	
	b. Setting events have been identified that set the stage for the problematic behavior to take place so that either new skills can be taught in their stead or the SE can be avoided or modified so as to not serve in the same way.				No	Yes	
	c. Self-management strategies are used to teach the youth to recognize characteristics of the context or antecedents that can trigger problematic behavior so that s/he can self-control his/her behavior more independently				No	Yes	
Benchmark 5	<i>A sampling of 3-5 plans demonstrate accurate and consistent commitment through the selection and use of strategies to reduce behaviors</i>	Either the agency has not initiated implementation of PBS services or PBS approaches to behavioral reduction	50% of the files reflect only basic attempt to use reinforcement strategies to promote behavioral reduction	50% of the files reflect to use reinforcement and self-monitoring and evaluation strategies	75% of the files reflect to use reinforcement and self-monitoring and evaluation strategies; supports and expectations from lesser restrictive settings guide implementation	100% of the files reflect full implementation of the reduction approaches suggested through the indicators	
Indicators of Benchmark 5	a. The overall plan is aligned to primary and secondary outcomes and supports so that attainment of target behaviors from the plan naturally facilitates inclusion within less restrictive settings and services.				No	Yes	
	b. DRO or DRL approach with gradually changing criterion to reduce the frequency or duration of the problematic behavior rather than conventional use of overcorrection, response cost, or administration of TO				No	Yes	
	c. Self-monitoring, s-evaluation & s-reinforcement are used to teach the youth to recognize the occurrence of the problematic behavior and set/assess personal reduction goals.				No	Yes	
	d. The agency follows a data-driven decision process and oversight system relative to the choice to modify plans allowing gradually less positive and more structured approaches, and perhaps if necessary, more intrusive and				No	Yes	

STANDARDS, BENCHMARKS AND INDICATORS OF COMMUNITY-WIDE DEPLOYMENT OF PBS SYSTEMS AND SERVICES		Implementation Rubric					Source of Evidence or Implementation Resources
		0 Not initiated	1 Early deployment	2 In progress	3 Near attainment	4 Fully integrated	
	aversive interventions						
Benchmark 6	<i>A sampling of 3-5 plans demonstrate accurate and consistent commitment through the process used for determination and delivery of reinforcement</i>	Either the agency has not initiated implementation of PBS services or age-appropriate reinforcement approaches have not been implemented	50% of the files reflect only basic attempt to use reinforcement that is individualized based on age, preference, history or context.	50% of the files reflect to effective reinforcement selection strategies	75% of the files reflect to effective reinforcement selection strategies; Negative reinforcement through warnings and threats are prohibited or only used with caution or guidance	100% of the files reflect full implementation of the effective reinforcement strategies as suggested by the indicators	
Indicators of Benchmark 6	a. Process for determination of positive reinforcement builds from either a self-assessment or preference process, and results in the use of only age-appropriate events, activities, or tangibles				No	Yes	
	b. Self-management, monitoring, and evaluation are used as preferred methods to ultimately gauge decisions associated with awarding reinforcement				No	Yes	
	c. There is a clear pattern across the sampling of 3-5 plans that negative reinforcement is avoided as a means to control or shape behavior.				No	Yes	
Benchmark 7	<i>Designation and use of crisis intervention strategies is consistent with agency policy relative to prohibition of select interventions, and oversight of other less aversive ones.</i>	Either the agency has not initiated implementation of PBS services or PBS-based crisis intervention procedures have not been trained and deployed	50% of the files reflect only basic designation of a crisis intervention plan and strategies.	50% of the files reflect to full designation of a crisis intervention plan that is aligned to newly approved policies on conditional use of intervention; staff have been trained in their selective usage and methods to	75% of the files reflect to full designation of a crisis intervention plan that is aligned to newly approved policies on conditional use of intervention; staff have been trained in their selective usage and methods to	100% of the files reflect full implementation of the crisis intervention plans, as suggested by the indicators; all associated staff have been trained in their implementation and documentation	

STANDARDS, BENCHMARKS AND INDICATORS OF COMMUNITY-WIDE DEPLOYMENT OF PBS SYSTEMS AND SERVICES		Implementation Rubric					Source of Evidence or Implementation Resources
		0 Not initiated	1 Early deployment	2 In progress document.	3 Near attainment document.	4 Fully integrated	
Indicators of Benchmark 7	a. A clearly delineated crisis intervention plan is included as part of the PBS plan				No	Yes	
	b. Specific behaviors are spelled out within the plan as prerequisite conditions for use of crisis intervention strategies.				No	Yes	
	c. The specific procedures for use of crisis interventions are spelled out within the plan, along with conditions/limits for use, duration, and documentation. Strategies emphasize use of non-confrontation, deceleration approaches				No	Yes	
	d. Those more intrusive procedures that have been considered acceptable under the agency's Policy and Procedure must be formally trained to staff prior to usage, with each occurrence of their usage documented as part of the data collection system for the plan.				No	Yes	
	e. Those procedures, relative to types of seclusion, restraint and administration of medication, which are prohibited through the agency's Policy manual, are noted <u>on the plan as prohibited</u> when there is a risk of their usage as part of Crisis Intervention.				No	Yes	
	Number of Benchmarks per level of deployment / Total benchmarks for standard	___/7	___/7	___/7	___/7	___/7	
	Percent per level of deployment	___%	___%	___%	___%	___%	
Overall score for Standard F: Summation of YES scores for all indicators of the Standard							/24
F. Use of a PBS Implementation Process							
Definition of standard	The agency utilizes those evidence-based strategies, processes, forms and oversight systems needed to deliver multi-component PBS services for individuals and/or his/her family that while being responsive to his/her behavioral needs, serve also to prevent future challenges.						
Benchmark 1	<i>A sampling of data from 3-5 PBS plans demonstrate a reliable, functional and relevant data collection system has been selected and systematically</i>	Either the agency has not initiated implementation of PBS services or no formal system of data collection is	50% of the files reflect only basic documentation of regular data collection on measures from PBS plans.	50% of the files reflect documentation of regular data review, with evidence of linkage to the FBA and focus	75% of the files reflect documentation of regular data review, with evidence of linkage to the FBA and focus	100% of the files reflect full implementation of the data collection system as determined by the indicators;	

STANDARDS, BENCHMARKS AND INDICATORS OF COMMUNITY-WIDE DEPLOYMENT OF PBS SYSTEMS AND SERVICES		Implementation Rubric					Source of Evidence or Implementation Resources
		0 Not initiated	1 Early deployment	2 In progress	3 Near attainment	4 Fully integrated	
	<i>implemented as a basis for progress monitoring</i>	evident		on assessment of progress toward reduction and/or acquisition.	on assessment of progress toward reduction and/or acquisition. There is written evidence of initial stages of reliability training for data collection.	all staff are trained reliability in data collection as new measures are introduced.	
Indicators of Benchmark 1	a. There is a direct association between the types and scope of measures collected through intervention and the FBA to ensure validity.				No	Yes	
	b. The agency engages in reliability training to establish agreement among staff when new methods of data collection are introduced.				No	Yes	
	c. Collection is limited to only those measures targeted for reduction or acquisition, or those indirect measures which directly contribute to increased use or participation in lesser restrictive environments				No	Yes	
Benchmark 2	<i>A sampling of data from 3-5 PBS plans demonstrate that data analysis and system of regular review of the PBS plan takes place and is relevant and effective.</i>	Either the agency has not initiated implementation of PBS services or no formal system of data analysis is evident.	50% of the files reflect only basic documentation of regular data analysis on measures from PBS plans.	50% of the files reflect documentation of regular data analysis, with evidence of linkage to the FBA and focus on assessment of progress toward projected criteria for reduction and/or acquisition.	75% of the files reflect documentation of regular data analysis, with evidence of linkage to the FBA and focus on assessment of progress toward reduction and/or acquisition. There is written evidence of initial linkage to the PCP.	100% of the files reflect full implementation of the data analysis system as determined by the indicators; there is at least quarterly reporting on how progress contributes to the PCP .	
Indicators of Benchmark 2	a. Data are summarized relative to performance on all measures associated with the plan and their relevance to the initial FBA findings.				No	Yes	
	b. Data are reviewed at least weekly and summarized at least monthly in a manner that relates to targeted criteria for each measure and initial findings				No	Yes	

STANDARDS, BENCHMARKS AND INDICATORS OF COMMUNITY-WIDE DEPLOYMENT OF PBS SYSTEMS AND SERVICES		Implementation Rubric					Source of Evidence or Implementation Resources
		0 Not initiated	1 Early deployment	2 In progress	3 Near attainment	4 Fully integrated	
	from the FBA						
	c. Data are summarized in a functional manner, with special concern associated with how change improves or impacts quality of life, or specific targets suggested from Person-centered Planning.				No	Yes	
	d. Data decisions from regular review that result in changes in the selection, implementation or discontinuation of interventions are communicated to staff in a timely and effective method prior to formal implementation of revised plans.				No	Yes	
	e. New interventions incorporated into the plan as a function of regular data reviews are trained as needed to staff prior to implementation.				No	Yes	
Benchmark 3	<i>A sampling of data from 3-5 PBS plans demonstrate that training of new interventions is done with staff prior to implementation.</i>	Either the agency has not initiated implementation of PBS services or no formal system of training is evident.	50% of the files reflect only basic documentation of regular training of interventions from PBS plans.	50% of the files reflect documentation of regular training of interventions from PBS plans prior to implementation	75% of the files reflect documentation of regular training of interventions from PBS plans prior to implementation; evidence is present to suggest initial effort to train modifications prior to implementation.	100% of the files reflect documentation of regular training of interventions from PBS plans prior to implementation, be it initial deployment or for modified strategies.	
Indicators of Benchmark 3	a. Training is conducted prior to implementation plan or intervention implementation.				No	Yes	
	b. The agency conducts at least quarterly observations of service delivery to quantitatively measure fidelity of implementation; retrain staff as needed based on findings.				No	Yes	
	c. Training is conducted on an ongoing basis with changes in interventions made in the plan.				No	Yes	
	Number of Benchmarks per level of deployment / Total	___/3	___/3	___/3	___/3	___/3	

STANDARDS, BENCHMARKS AND INDICATORS OF COMMUNITY-WIDE DEPLOYMENT OF PBS SYSTEMS AND SERVICES		Implementation Rubric					Source of Evidence or Implementation Resources
		0 Not initiated	1 Early deployment	2 In progress	3 Near attainment	4 Fully integrated	
	benchmarks for standard						
	Percent per level of deployment	___ %	___ %	___ %	___ %	___ %	
Overall score for Standard F: Summation of YES scores for all indicators of the Standard							/11
G. Measures of Individual and Systemic Impact							
Definition of standard	Short and long-term data obtained from implementation of PBS Interventions should demonstrate impact beyond simply immediate and maintained reduction of problematic behaviors. Rather, personal and standardized indicators of quality of life, reduction of critical incidents, and utilization of community supports (i.e., measures of Primary and Secondary Outcomes for the Community-based PBS Pyramid Model) should change with effective implementation across all three levels of the Pyramid Model.						
Benchmark 1	<i>Summation of impact for each youth served through PBS plans demonstrates multiple forms of positive impact for the individual and population of youth served by the agency.</i>	No progress demonstrated or no data collected through implementation of PBS planning	Positive impact demonstrated for 1 of 5 individual indicators	Positive impact demonstrated across 2 to 3 of 5 of the individual indicators	Positive impact demonstrated across 4 of 5 of the individual indicators	Positive impact demonstrated across each of the 5 individual indicators	
Indicators of Benchmark 1 ⁴	a. Individual and average number and percentage of new preventative and/or competing skills attained at projected criterion within 6, 9, and 12 months of implementation for each youth				No	Yes	
	b. Individual and average number and percentage of problematic behaviors reduced to projected criterion within 6, 9, and 12 months of implementation for each youth				No	Yes	
	c. Aggregate number, average and percentage of new preventative and/or competing skills attained at projected criterion within 6, 9, and 12 months of implementation for all youth with PBS plans served by agency				No	Yes	
	d. Aggregate number, average and percentage of problematic behaviors reduced to projected criterion within 6, 9, and 12 months of implementation for all youth with PBS plans served by agency				No	Yes	
	e. Total number/percentage of new PBS plans for youth served by agency during fiscal year.				No	Yes	

⁴ Note that a more demonstrative indicator for these measures can be obtained by gathering this same information for all youth served by the agency during the same periods of time who do conventional, non-PBS plans.

STANDARDS, BENCHMARKS AND INDICATORS OF COMMUNITY-WIDE DEPLOYMENT OF PBS SYSTEMS AND SERVICES		Implementation Rubric					Source of Evidence or Implementation Resources
		0 Not initiated	1 Early deployment	2 In progress	3 Near attainment	4 Fully integrated	
Benchmark 2	<i>Summation of impact for each youth served through PBS plans demonstrates positive changes across conventional measures collected by agency</i>	No progress demonstrated or no data collected through implementation of PBS planning	Positive impact demonstrated for 1 of 4 individual indicators	Positive impact demonstrated across 2 of 4 of the individual indicators	Positive impact demonstrated across 3 of 4 of the individual indicators	Positive impact demonstrated across each of the 4 individual indicators	
Indicators of Benchmark 2	a. Number of critical incidents (CI) filed by agency during first month of the fiscal year; cumulative total and monthly average across the entire year.				No	Yes	
	b. Number of CI filed during the first month / number of youth served with PBS plans;				No	Yes	
	c. Cumulative number of CI filed over the entire / cumulative number of youth served with PBS plans for same period;				No	Yes	
	d. Monthly average number of CI filed over the entire / monthly average number of youth served with PBS plans for same period;				No	Yes	
Benchmark 3	<i>Summation of impact for each youth served through PBS plans demonstrates the reduction of occurrence of severe critical incidents across key behavioral concerns.</i>	No progress demonstrated or no data collected through implementation of PBS planning	Positive impact demonstrated for 1-2 of 7 individual indicators	Positive impact demonstrated across 3-4 of 7 of the individual indicators	Positive impact demonstrated across 5-6 of 7 of the individual indicators	Positive impact demonstrated across each of the 7 individual indicators	
Indicators of Benchmark 3	a. Frequency per month (rate) of documented aggression toward others by individuals on PBS plan; monthly average for youth served by agency on PBS plans.				No	Yes	
	b. Frequency per month (rate) of documented self-injurious behaviors where medical attention was needed, by individuals on PBS plan; monthly average for youth served by agency on PBS plans.				No	Yes	
	c. Frequency per month (rate) of documented property damage costing \$10.00 or more to repair/replace, by individuals on PBS plan; monthly average for youth served by agency on PBS plans.				No	Yes	
	d. Frequency per month (rate) of documented running away or failing to attend required programs/school services by individuals on PBS plan; monthly				No	Yes	

STANDARDS, BENCHMARKS AND INDICATORS OF COMMUNITY-WIDE DEPLOYMENT OF PBS SYSTEMS AND SERVICES	Implementation Rubric					Source of Evidence or Implementation Resources
	0 Not initiated	1 Early deployment	2 In progress	3 Near attainment	4 Fully integrated	
	average for youth served by agency on PBS plans.					
	e. Frequency per month (rate) of documented illegal substance use or abuse by individuals on PBS plan; monthly average for youth served by agency on PBS plans.			No	Yes	
	f. Frequency per month (rate) of documented engagement in sexually explicit or inappropriate behavior, by individuals on PBS plan; monthly average for youth served by agency on PBS plans.			No	Yes	
	g. Frequency per month (rate) of documented incidents that require police action, support and/or reporting, by individuals on PBS plan; monthly average for youth served by agency on PBS plans.			No	Yes	
Benchmark 4	<i>Summation of impact for each youth served through PBS plans demonstrates the use of new support or other more natural and inclusive services</i>	No progress demonstrated or no data collected through implementation of PBS planning	Positive impact demonstrated for 1 of 4 individual indicators	Positive impact demonstrated across 2 of 4 of the individual indicators	Positive impact demonstrated across 3 of 4 of the individual indicators	Positive impact demonstrated across each of the 4 individual indicators
Indicators of Benchmark 4	a. Increased utilization of more typical agency services because of improved behavioral control			No	Yes	
	b. Increase utilization of inclusive community resources and services because of improved behavioral control			No	Yes	
	c. Number and percentage of youth on PBS plans who have made positive changes in residence to lesser restrictive or supervised settings			No	Yes	
	d. Number and percentage of youth on PBS plans who have made positive changes in use of community services to lesser restrictive or supervised settings.					
	Number of Benchmarks per level of deployment / Total benchmarks for standard	___/4	___/4	___/4	___/4	___/4
	Percent per level of deployment	___ %	___ %	___ %	___ %	___ %
Overall score for Standard G: Summation of YES scores for all indicators of the Standard						/20

Summary of Pre and Post Implementation Scores

Site: _____

Reviewer(s): _____

Date: _____

Benchmark Scores as a Metric for Assessment of Implementation Progress

Multiply the fraction (e.g., Rubric Score/4) times the weight (0 to 4) associated with the level. Total the 5 sets of points and divide by the number of benchmarks.

A. Agency Capacity (4 Benchmarks)

Not initiated	<u> </u> /4 (%)	x	0	=	<u> </u> 0 points
Early deployment	<u> </u> /4 (%)	x	1	=	<u> </u> points
In progress	<u> </u> /4 (%)	x	2	=	<u> </u> points
Near attainment	<u> </u> /4 (%)	x	3	=	<u> </u> points
Fully integrated	<u> </u> /4 (%)	x	4	=	<u> </u> points

Total points = + + + + =
 Total points → / 4 =
 (Degree of Implementation Score for Standard A)

B. Agency Operation (7 Benchmarks)

Not initiated	<u> </u> /7 (%)	x	0	=	<u> </u> 0 points
Early deployment	<u> </u> /7 (%)	x	1	=	<u> </u> points
In progress	<u> </u> /7 (%)	x	2	=	<u> </u> points
Near attainment	<u> </u> /7 (%)	x	3	=	<u> </u> points
Fully integrated	<u> </u> /7 (%)	x	4	=	<u> </u> points

Total points = + + + + =
 Total points → / 7 =
 (Degree of Implementation Score for Standard B)

C. Interagency Capacity (4 Benchmarks)

Not initiated	<u> </u> /4 (%)	x	0	=	<u> </u> 0 points
Early deployment	<u> </u> /4 (%)	x	1	=	<u> </u> points
In progress	<u> </u> /4 (%)	x	2	=	<u> </u> points
Near attainment	<u> </u> /4 (%)	x	3	=	<u> </u> points
Fully integrated	<u> </u> /4 (%)	x	4	=	<u> </u> points

Total points = + + + =
 Total points → / 4 =
 (Degree of Implementation Score for Standard C)

D. Interagency Operation (4 Benchmarks)

Not initiated	<u> </u> /4 (%)	x	0	=	<u> </u> 0 points
Early deployment	<u> </u> /4 (%)	x	1	=	<u> </u> points
In progress	<u> </u> /4 (%)	x	2	=	<u> </u> points
Near attainment	<u> </u> /4 (%)	x	3	=	<u> </u> points
Fully integrated	<u> </u> /4 (%)	x	4	=	<u> </u> points

Total points = + + + =
 Total points → / 4 =
 (Degree of Implementation Score for Standard D)

E. PBS Planning Processes (7 Benchmarks)

Not initiated	<u> </u> /7 (%)	x	0	=	<u> </u> 0 points
Early deployment	<u> </u> /7 (%)	x	1	=	<u> </u> points
In progress	<u> </u> /7 (%)	x	2	=	<u> </u> points
Near attainment	<u> </u> /7 (%)	x	3	=	<u> </u> points
Fully integrated	<u> </u> /7 (%)	x	4	=	<u> </u> points

Total points = + + + + =
 Total points → / 7 =
 (Degree of Implementation Score for Standard E)

F. PBS Implementation Processes (3 Benchmarks)

Not initiated	<u> /3 </u> (%)	x	0	=	<u> 0 </u> points
Early deployment	<u> /3 </u> (%)	x	1	=	<u> </u> points
In progress	<u> /3 </u> (%)	x	2	=	<u> </u> points
Near attainment	<u> /3 </u> (%)	x	3	=	<u> </u> points
Fully integrated	<u> /3 </u> (%)	x	4	=	<u> </u> points

Total points = + + + + =
 Total points → / 3 =
 (Degree of Implementation Score for Standard F)

G. Measures of Individual and Systemic Impact (4 Benchmarks)

Not initiated	<u> /4 </u> (%)	x	0	=	<u> 0 </u> points
Early deployment	<u> /4 </u> (%)	x	1	=	<u> </u> points
In progress	<u> /4 </u> (%)	x	2	=	<u> </u> points
Near attainment	<u> /4 </u> (%)	x	3	=	<u> </u> points
Fully integrated	<u> /4 </u> (%)	x	4	=	<u> </u> points

Total points = + + + =
 Total points → / 4 =
 (Degree of Implementation Score for Standard G)

Now transfer each standard's Degree of Implementation Score from pages 21 and 22 to corresponding cell below to calculate score for overall implementation

Sum of	+	+	+	+	+	+	=	/7 =	%
Degree score for Standard A	Degree score for Standard B	Degree score for Standard C	Degree score for Standard D	Degree score for Standard E	Degree score for Standard F	Degree score for Standard F	Total Implementation Score for the 7 Standards	% of PBS QA Model Implemented	

Indicator Scores as a Metric for Assessment of Implementation Progress

1. Total Indicators scored YES for Standard A /11 (%)
2. Total Indicators scored YES for Standard B /18 (%)
3. Total Indicators scored YES for Standard C /11 (%)
4. Total Indicators scored YES for Standard D /10 (%)
5. Total Indicators scored YES for Standard E /24 (%)
6. Total Indicators scored YES for Standard F /11 (%)
7. Total Indicators scored YES for Standard G /20 (%)
8. Total Indicators scored YES overall across 7 standards /105 (%)