

# **DBHDS Behavior Support Plan Adherence Review Instrument (BSPARI)**

## **Scoring Instructions Guide & Feedback Process**

**Background:** DBHDS will evaluate the adherence of behavior treatment plans (henceforth referred to as “behavior support plans” or “BSP”) developed under the therapeutic consultation waiver service to the DBHDS/DMAS Practice Guidelines for Behavior Support Plans, as required by compliance indicators 7.20 and 29.21, Settlement Agreement provisions III.C.6.a.i-iii and V.B. As such, DBHDS has created the Behavior Support Plan Adherence Review Instrument (BSPARI) to capture the minimum BSP content areas as outlined in the regulations that govern therapeutic consultation behavioral services (see [12VAC30-122-550. Therapeutic consultation service](#)), along with the corresponding minimum elements for those BSP content areas as outlined in the [DBHDS/DMAS Practice Guidelines for Behavior Support Plans](#) (henceforth referred to as the “Practice Guidelines”). The BSPARI itself is contained on a separate Microsoft Excel document.

**Contents of this document:** This document contains the following: 1) information on weighted scoring and a basic outline of the Scoring Instructions Guide (pgs. 1-2), 2) the Scoring Instructions Guide (pgs. 3-22), 3) the review, scoring, and feedback process (pg. 23-27), 4) information on future updates to the BSPARI (pg. 28), 5) other resources and literature on quality assurance in FBA and BSP (pg. 28), and 6) an image of the BSPARI (pg. 29). A copy of the BSPARI can be provided to any reader upon request.

**Weighted scoring and outline of Scoring Instructions Guide:** There are 12 total BSP content areas outlined in regulations, of which 11 would be required for all BSPs (Note: Safety & Crisis Guidelines is required only if severe or dangerous behavior requires the prescription of the use of restrictive components as denoted in the Human Right’s Regulations such as restraint or time out, or if there is specialized safety equipment needed for an individual receiving or persons providing services). An additional area is also reviewed via the BSPARI, termed “Graphical Displays & Analysis”, which reviews graphs and associated deliverables that demonstrate that the BSP and treatment are being monitored by the behaviorist (Note: these document may only be present for Annual ISP authorization types). A weighted scoring system is utilized in the BSPARI to determine the adherence of each minimum BSP content area and related minimum elements to the Practice Guidelines, and a behavior support plan is deemed to be adequate in its adherence if it scores at least 34 out of 40 points. DBHDS believes that all components of the updated regulations for therapeutic consultation behavioral services and the associated Practice Guidelines are important, but also acknowledges that some BSP elements may be more critical to the success of the behavior plan and overall programming than others. With that noted, DBHDS has worked to align the conceptualization of a weighted scoring system in consideration of professional literature available on the topic of critical behavior support plan elements (see page 28, as well as the “resources” tab of the BSPARI).

The “Scoring Instructions Guide” (see page 3) is broken down into three columns, consisting of the following: 1) the first column outlines the required minimum BSP content areas from the regulations and associated minimum required elements from the Practice Guidelines; 2) the

second column provides the points available and associated requirements for each point designation; and 3) the third column provides an “Example of weighted score from a fictionalized BSP” section for illustrative purposes on what could be present (or lacking) to assign a particular points score. In the “Example..” section, a fictitious profile has been created, and it is assumed that this individual’s behavior support plan corresponds to an “annual ISP” authorization type as outlined in the regulations governing this service, and additionally that the plan has had two updates since its inception. Please note, it is not possible to provide every possible permutation of elements that could be present or lacking in the “Example” section of the Scoring Instructions Guide. In the first column (“Minimum BSP content areas...”), there are several minimum elements that are italicized to indicate that these are noted in the Practice Guidelines as “if applicable” or “if known”. These areas are important for behaviorists to include if the information is indeed applicable or known; however, the BSPARI does not factor these areas into the weighted scoring system as they may not be applicable for every individual, and it may be impossible for DBHDS reviewers to determine if the behaviorist has knowledge of this information or if the information is indeed applicable. For example, based on review of a behavior support plan and associated documentation submitted for an authorization for this service, it may not be possible for a DBHDS reviewer to determine if the authoring behaviorist had knowledge of the history of previous behavioral services and their impact on behavior. Additionally, in the “Example...” section, underlined text is included to help the reader or reviewer distinguish what elements are lacking that contribute to loss of points. See additional information on scoring starting on page 23 of this document.

## Scoring Instructions Guide

| <u>Minimum BSP content area &amp; minimum required elements from regulations and Practice Guidelines</u>   | <u>Weighted scores</u>   | <u>Example of weighted score from fictionalized BSP</u>   |
|--|--|---|
| <p><b>Demographics:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Individual’s name</li> <li>• DOB or age</li> <li>• Gender identification</li> <li>• Medical/behavioral health diagnostic information</li> <li>• Current living situation and location where BSP is being implemented</li> <li>• Medicaid ID</li> <li>• <i>Medications (if known)</i></li> <li>• Legal status (specifically as it relates to ability to make own decisions, such as the presence of an authorized representative or legal guardian)</li> <li>• Date of initial plan and revisions (and nature of revisions)</li> <li>• Authoring clinician’s name/credentials/contact information</li> </ul> | <p><b>1 point</b> = Minimally includes individual's name, medical/behavioral health diagnostic information, legal status, date of initial plan &amp; revisions (and nature of revisions), &amp; authoring clinician’s name/credentials/contact info</p> <p><b>0 points</b> = is missing any of the following: individual's name, medical/behavioral health diagnostic information, legal status, date of initial plan &amp; revisions (and nature of revisions), &amp; authoring clinician’s name/credentials/contact info</p> <p><i>Note: Demographic information may be located in other documentation and not on the BSP itself (e.g. in WaMS, plan for supports, part V, etc.)</i></p> | <p><b>1 point</b> = The following are listed: Charles Individual, Charles identifies as a male, DOB: 1/1/1987, Charles’ initial BSP is noted as 2/2/2021 (with update to DRA procedure on 4/9/21, update to self-monitoring program 8/17/21), Charles is his own decision maker but his mother Charlize is very involved in his life, Charles is diagnosed with autism spectrum disorder and epilepsy, behaviorist and plan author is B.F. Planner, B.F. Planner’s company contact information is listed in the header of the BSP to include name and email address, and Charles lives at the Exemplar Group Home with three other individuals. The BSP will be implemented at Exemplar Group Home and Charles’ day support setting.</p> <p><b>0 points</b> = The following are listed: Charles Individual, DOB: 1/1/1987, Charles identifies as a male, Charles lives at Exemplar Group Home with three other individuals, Charles’ initial BSP is noted as 2/2/2021 and notes updates on 4/9/21 and 8/17/21, behaviorist and plan author is B.F. Planner (with contact information listed in the header of the BSP to include name and email address). Legal status information is included in Charles’ ISP. <u>Lacks nature of BSP revisions and lacks medical/behavioral health diagnostic information, which results in a 0 score.</u></p> |
| <p><b>History &amp; Rationale:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Current and/or relevant historical info about this person and their life</li> <li>• the reason, rationale for BSP/necessity for intervention</li> </ul>  | <p><b>2 points</b> = Includes current and/or relevant historical information of person and their life; includes the reason, rationale for the BSP/necessity for intervention, includes information on dangerous behaviors (topographies,</p>   | <p><b>2 points</b> = Includes historical information on Charles’ family history and dynamics, educational history, employment history, and information about his current living situation to include relationships with housemates and staff. Brief summary of results of recent psychological and medical evaluation are included. A rationale for behavioral services is provided and is noted to address Charles’ engagement in aggression and property</p>  |

|   |   |   |
|---|---|---|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Dangerous behavior: topographies, intensities, risks and/or negative outcomes</li> <li>• Risk and benefits related to prescribed behavioral programming</li> <li>• <i>Known history of previous services and impact on behavior (if known)</i></li> <li>• <i>Trauma history (if applicable)</i></li> </ul> | <p>intensities, risks, and/or negative outcomes); and includes the risks and benefits related to prescribed behavioral programming</p> <p><b>1 point</b> = Minimally includes current and/or relevant history of person and their life, rationale for BSP, and dangerous behavior(s) (e.g. topographies, intensities, risks, and/or negative outcomes)</p> <p><b>0 points</b> = Is missing any one of these components: history or person and their life, rationale for BSP, and/or dangerous behavior(s) (e.g. topographies, intensities, risks, and/or negative outcomes)</p> | <p>destruction. Includes information to outline that Charles’ property destruction has injured staff at a previous placement via throwing hard objects that struck staff in the head, causing injury; also notes that Charles’ aggression, in particular hand strikes to the head, has the potential to injure others. Also contains information on previous history of behavioral services during Charles’ schooling years and through another in-home behavior analysis provider from 2017-2019. Additionally, includes a statement in the behavior support plan that outlines the risks of implementing the plan versus not implementing the plan as follows: “The behaviorist has reviewed the risks of implementing the behavior support plan with Charles to include, but not limited to, that there may be an initial increase in Charles’ engagement in challenging behavior prior to reduction in challenging behavior, as well as the risks of not implementing the behavior support plan to include, but not limited to, that Charles’ current engagement in challenging behavior may maintain at undesirable levels or potentially get worse. The benefits of engaging in the behavior support plan have been reviewed with Charles and may include, but are not limited to, that Charles may learn new adaptive behaviors that may improve his quality of life and that if such gains are realized, this may also positively impact those that live with and support Charles.”</p> <p><b>1 point</b> = Includes historical information on Charles’ family history and dynamics, educational history, employment history, and information about his current living situation to include relationships with housemates and staff. Brief summary of results of recent psychological and medical evaluation are included. A rationale for behavioral services is provided and is noted to address Charles’ engagement in aggression and property destruction. Includes information to outline that Charles’ property destruction has injured staff at a previous placement via throwing hard objects that struck staff in the head, causing injury; also notes that Charles’ aggression, in particular hand strikes to the head, has the potential to injure others. Also contains information on previous history of behavioral services during Charles’ schooling years and through another in-home behavior</p> |
|---|---|---|

|   |   |  |
|---|---|--|
|   |   | <p>analysis provider from 2017-2019. <u>Lacks any risk/benefit description related to prescribed behavioral programming.</u></p> <p><b>0 points</b> = Includes historical information on Charles' family history, educational history, and information about his current living situation. Contains a basic risk v. benefit statement related to utilizing behavioral services in comparison to not accessing behavioral services. <u>Lacks specific information on the rationale for the BSP, and also lacks contextual information on dangerous behaviors (simply lists that Charles engages in property destruction and aggression).</u></p>  |
| <p><b>Person centered information</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Individual's communication modality (e.g. expressive &amp; receptive capabilities, method(s) of communication, etc.)</li> <li>• Routines/current schedule</li> <li>• Individual and guardian's participation</li> <li>• What activities are enjoyed and sought by the individual</li> <li>• Preference assessment information/results</li> <li>• Individual's strengths and positive contributions</li> <li>• Particular aversions/dislikes</li> <li>• Who in the individual's life is especially preferred</li> <li>• <i>Other cultural/heritage considerations (if known)</i></li> </ul> | <p><b>3 points</b> = All minimum elements are addressed, with what activities are enjoyed and sought by the individual and preference assessment being interchangeable at this time</p> <p><b>2 points</b> = Minimally includes each of the following: communication modality, preference assessment and/or what activities are enjoyed and sought out by the individual, routines/schedule, and individual &amp; guardian's participation</p> <p><b>1 point</b> = Minimally includes each of the following: communication modality, preference assessment and/or what activities are enjoyed and sought by the individual, and routines/schedule</p> <p><b>0 points</b> = Section is not present, or is missing any of the following items: communication modality, preference assessment and/or what activities are enjoyed and sought by the individual, and routines/schedule</p> | <p><b>3 points</b> = Notes that Charles communicates verbally, but that his expressive language presents as more advanced than receptive language. Outlines results of a multiple stimulus without replacement preference assessment conducted during the assessment phase, along with results from a reinforcer survey questionnaire (both administered directly to Charles). Includes details on Charles' daily routines and schedule at the group home and day support setting. Outlines that Charles likes to maintain a tidy environment and is very helpful in cleaning his home; notes that Charles considers himself, and is considered by others, to be a caring individual, that he has excellent computer skills, that he likes interacting with others, and that he promotes his interest in fitness to other residents in his home. Notes that Charles dislikes reprimands from others and also dislikes horror movies. Charles is his own decision maker but his mother and father are close to him and part of his treatment team, particularly his mother. Charles spends considerable time working on computers and reading books on coding; he also likes action movies and classic rock music. Notes that Charles participated actively as the key information in describing the things he does not like, as well as describing the things that are most enjoyable to him. Also notes that Charles attended church regularly when living with his parents and grew up in an Episcopalian household, but that he no longer identifies as such.</p> |



*Note: Some person centered information may be located in other documentation and not on the BSP itself (e.g. in ISP, plan for supports, part V, etc.).*

**2 points** = Notes that Charles communicates verbally, but that his expressive language presents as more advanced than receptive language. Outlines results of a multiple stimulus without replacement preference assessment conducted during the assessment phase, along with results from a reinforcer survey questionnaire (both administered directly to Charles). Includes Charles' details on daily routines and schedule at the group home and day support setting. Notes that Charles dislikes reprimands from others and also dislikes horror movies. Notes that Charles spends considerable time working on computers and reading books on coding; he also likes action movies and classic rock music. Notes that Charles participated actively as the key information in describing the things he does not like, as well as describing the things that are most enjoyable to him. Lacks information on strengths and positive contributions and whom in Charles' life is especially preferred.

**1 point** = Notes that Charles communicates verbally, but that his expressive language presents as more advanced than receptive language. Outlines the results of a reinforcer survey questionnaire (administered to Charles' group home staff). Includes Charles' details on daily routines and schedule at the group home and day support setting. Notes that Charles dislikes reprimands from others and also dislikes horror movies as reported by group home staff. Notes that Charles spends considerable time working on computers and reading books on coding; he also likes action movies and classic rock music, also as reported by group home staff. Lacks information on strengths and positive contributions, whom in Charles' life is especially preferred, and Charles' participation in assessment.

**0 points** = Notes that Charles communicates verbally, but that his expressive language presents as more advanced than receptive language. Notes that Charles considers himself, and is considered by others, to be a caring individual. Lacks information on current routines/schedule; also lacks preference assessment information AND lacks information about items/activities that are sought out by the individual.

|   |   |   |
|---|---|---|
| <p><b>Functional Behavior Assessment</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• FBA conducted in location where services are occurring</li> <li>• FBA is current (since most recent shared planning meeting or statement of recent validity of function)</li> <li>• The FBA methods used are described</li> <li>• The FBA methods include descriptive and/or functional analysis (f.a.) methods</li> <li>• Setting events/motivation operations</li> <li>• Antecedents</li> <li>• Consequences</li> <li>• Data results and/or graphical displays</li> <li>• <i>Non-operant conditions that influence (if applicable)</i></li> </ul> | <p><b>8 points</b> = Uses descriptive or functional analysis (f.a) methods, and all additional required 7 elements present</p> <p><b>7 points</b> = Uses descriptive or f.a. methods, and 6 out of 7 additional required elements present</p> <p><b>6 points</b> = Uses descriptive or f.a. methods, and 5 out of 7 additional required elements present</p> <p><b>5 points</b> = Uses descriptive or f.a. methods and 4 out of 7 additional required elements present</p> <p><b>4 points</b> = Uses descriptive or f.a. methods and 3 out of 7 additional required elements present</p> <p><b>3 points</b> = Uses descriptive or f.a. methods and 2 out of 7 additional required elements present</p> <p><b>2 points</b> = Uses descriptive or f.a. methods and 1 out of 7 additional required elements present</p> <p><b>1 point</b> = Only indirect assessment methods used, and contains at least 1 of the other required elements</p> <p><b>0 points</b> = FBA content section absent, or FBA does not consist of any accepted FBA tools/methods</p> | <p><b>8 points</b> = Charles' FBA contained descriptive methods, and a functional analysis for both aggression and property destruction; the f.a. conditions (attention and control condition) are well described and were designed from the results of functional assessment interview and descriptive assessment results. The descriptive assessment is described as direct observation using ABC recording methods and was conducted at the day support setting and group home, while the functional analysis was conducted at the group home. The FBA was completed within the past ISP year, so a validity statement is not needed at this time. Graphs outline the results of the functional analysis, as well as graphs on descriptive assessment results. There is a short summary of what was learned from the functional assessment interview included. The FBA results describe the specific MOs/settings events that may set the state for challenging behavior, notes specific antecedents and consequences surrounding Charles' engagement in challenging behaviors, and also notes the potential impact of seizure events on challenging behavior.</p> <p><b>7 points</b> = Charles' FBA contained descriptive methods, and a functional analysis for both aggression and property destruction; the f.a. conditions (attention and control condition) are well described and were designed from the results of functional assessment interview and descriptive assessment results. The descriptive assessment included direct observation using ABC recording methods and was conducted at the day support setting and group home, while the functional analysis was conducted at the group home. The FBA was completed within the past ISP year, so a validity statement is not needed at this time. Graphs outline the results of the functional analysis, as well as graphs on direct observation results. There is a short summary of what was learned from the functional assessment interview included. The FBA results note specific antecedents and consequences surrounding Charles' engagement in challenging behaviors, and also notes the potential impact of seizure events on challenging behavior. <u>Potential MOs are not addressed.</u></p> <p><b>6 points</b> = Charles' FBA utilized descriptive assessment methods, as well as a functional analysis for both aggression and property destruction; the f.a. conditions (attention and control condition) are well described and were designed from the results of functional assessment interview and descriptive assessment results. The descriptive assessment is described to include direct observation using ABC recording methods and was conducted at the day support setting and group home, while the functional analysis was conducted at the group home. The FBA was completed within the past ISP year, so a validity statement is not needed at this</p> |
|---|---|---|

time. Graphs outline the results of the functional analysis, as well as graphs on direct observation results. There is a short summary of what was learned from the functional assessment interview included. The FBA section also notes a potential impact of seizure events on challenging behavior. The FBA results outline in detail specific maintaining consequences for Charles' challenging behaviors, but the antecedents that are particular to Charles' challenging behavior are not described, and possible MOs are not articulated.

**5 points** = Charles' FBA has descriptive methods, which are described as including direct observation, ABC recording techniques, and scatterplot analysis occurring in both settings. Additionally, a functional assessment interview was conducted (indirect assessment). The FBA was completed within the past ISP year, so a validity statement is not needed at this time, and the FBA was completed in both settings where services will take place. There is also a short summary of what was learned from the functional assessment interview included. There is a short summary statement outlining suggested function of behaviors from the descriptive assessment and possible antecedent "triggers", but lacks graphical displays or other associated data results. The specific consequences particular to Charles' challenging behavior, as well as possible MOs, are not articulated.

**4 points** = Indirect and descriptive assessment methods were used and described, including ABC recording methods, a functional assessment interview, and a behavior rating checklist. The FBA was completed within the past ISP year, so a validity statement is not needed at this time. The FBA notes it was conducted at both settings where services will take place. Though there is a brief summary of the FBA results to outline possible function for both behaviors in a few sentences, but the summary lacks articulation of the specific antecedents and consequences for Charles' challenging behaviors, lacks any type of graphical display or data summary from the FBA methods used, and lacks any specific MOs/setting events that may set the stage for challenging behavior.

**3 points** = Indirect and direct assessments were used during an FBA conducted in 2018; these are described as a behavior rating checklist, a functional assessment interview, and ABC recording techniques and being completed by a previous behaviorist. The FBA has a brief results section that notes "attention" is the function for both behaviors and outlines a few specific consequences particular to



Charles and those in his environment. The FBA was conducted at Charles' previous group home setting in 2018 and lacks any indication that it has been reviewed by the current behaviorist (no statement of validity). The FBA lacks any description of potential antecedents, MOs/setting events, and has no data or graphical display of FBA results.

**2 points** = The FBA indicates that both "indirect and descriptive assessment methods were used in the FBA", but does not describe specifically what methods/tools were used. The FBA does articulate in detail specific consequences that predictably occur after challenging behavior and notes that "this was determined by a previous behaviorist through the FBA process at Charles' previous group home in 2018". The FBA was not conducted in the current setting(s) and there is no statement of validity from the current behaviorist of the previous FBA. The FBA is lacking MO's/setting events, data or graphical display based on the indirect and direct assessment, and does not give any indication of specific antecedents to Charles' challenging behavior(s).

**1 point** = Charles' FBA used only indirect assessment methods, which are listed as a behavior rating checklist and a functional assessment interview. The FBA includes antecedents & consequences surrounding challenging behaviors and notes it was completed at the group home and day support settings. The FBA was completed during the current ISP year, so a validity statement is not needed. There is no information on possible MO's/setting events, and the FBA lacks graphical displays or any data results. Though the FBA contains several minimum elements, the FBA is critically lacking descriptive (or f.a.) assessment methods and relies only on indirect assessment methods, which results in an automatic score of 1 (regardless of the presence or absence of other elements).

**0 points** = There is a section in the BSP labeled "FBA", which outlines that Charles' challenging behavior is most likely a result of his autism spectrum diagnosis and social skill deficits associated with this diagnosis. This section states that this hypothesis was based on review of psychological records that contained results from an accepted assessment instrument that is used in the diagnosis of autism spectrum disorder. All elements are lacking; there were no acceptable FBA methods used, which results in a score of 0.

|   |   |   |
|---|---|---|
| <p><b>Hypothesized functions</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Hypothesized functions listed</li> <li>• Functions match to typical operant functions for all behaviors</li> </ul>  | <p><b>2 points</b> = All minimum elements addressed for all behaviors</p> <p><b>1 point</b> = Functions match to typical operant functions, but one or more behaviors that are targeted for decrease in the BSP do not have a corresponding function (i.e. the function is not listed and/or the behavior was not assessed in the FBA process but has associated interventions in the BSP)</p> <p><b>0 points</b> = Functions are listed for some or all behaviors, but one or more of the functions applied is not an accepted function of behavior (e.g. “anger”, “revenge”); OR functions are not listed for any behaviors, content area absent.</p>             | <p><b>2 points</b> = This section notes the hypothesized functions for both aggression and property destruction are both are attention</p> <p><b>1 point</b> = The hypothesized functions for aggression is listed as “attention”. Property destruction is also listed in this section, but it does not have a corresponding function.</p> <p><b>0 points</b> = There is hypothesized function for aggression listed as “attention”, but the hypothesized function for property destruction is noted to be “anger”.</p>   |
| <p><b>Behaviors targeted for decrease</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Lists each behavior targeted for decrease</li> <li>• Operational definition</li> <li>• Inclusion in definition of examples/non-examples</li> <li>• Methods of measurement for each behavior</li> </ul> | <p><b>3 points</b> = lists behaviors targeted for decrease, has operational definition for each behavior, has a method of measurement for each behavior, and has examples and/or non-examples for some or all behaviors</p> <p><b>2 points</b> = lists behaviors targeted for decrease, has operational definition for each behavior, has a method of measurement for each behavior, but does not utilize any example and/or non-example descriptions in any behavioral definitions</p> <p>OR lists behaviors targeted for decrease with operational definition for each, but there are behaviors targeted in the plan that are not defined; the behaviors that</p> | <p><b>3 points</b> = defines aggression as follows: Aggression (Frequency): Any instance of Charles striking another person with a fist, hand, arm, and/or leg. Examples include but are not limited to Charles striking his hand against another individual’s body with a closed fist, Charles kicking another person with his leg(s), or Charles slapping another person with an open hand. Non-examples include Charles patting another person on the back with an open hand in appropriate contexts (e.g. congratulating a peer). As aggressive behaviors often occur in rapid succession, count each episode as one instance (e.g. there may be multiple strikes that occur during an aggressive episode); instances are separated by 2 minutes absence of engagement in any of these topographies. Defines property destruction as follows: Property destruction (Frequency): Any instance of Charles tipping over or throwing furniture items. Examples include Charles throwing a lamp, Charles tipping over a table, or Charles picking up a chair and throwing it. As property destruction often occurs in rapid succession, count each episode as one instance (e.g. there may be multiple instances of throwing a chair that occurs during an episode of property destruction),</p> |

|  |  |   |
|--|--|---|
|  | <p>are defined have a system of measurement and include examples and/or non-examples for some or all behaviors</p> <p><b>1 point</b> = lists behaviors targeted for decrease and has operational definition for each behavior. Lacks measurement method. May or may not utilize any example or non-example descriptions in any behavioral definitions. OR, lists behaviors targeted for decrease and has operational definition for each behavior, but not all behaviors that have associated strategies in the BSP are defined (may or may not also contain a system of measurement and/or example or non-example descriptions for behavior definitions that are listed).</p> <p><b>0 points</b> = Only lists target behaviors and/or list target behaviors and definitions, but definitions are not objective and/or lack specificity. May or may not have measurement or examples/non-examples. OR, no behaviors listed, content area absent.</p> | <p>instances are separated by 2 minutes absence of engagement in any of these topographies.</p> <p><b>2 points</b> = includes a definition of aggression as follows: Aggression (Frequency): Any instance of Charles striking another person with a fist, hand, arm, and/or leg. As aggressive behaviors often occur in rapid succession, count each episode as one instance; instances are separated by 2 minutes absence of engagement in any of these topographies. Includes a definition of property destruction as follows: Property destruction (Frequency): Any instance of Charles tipping over or throwing furniture items. As property destruction often occurs in rapid succession, count each episode as one instance; instances are separated by 2 minutes absence of engagement in any of these topographies. <u>Does not utilize any examples or non-examples for either behavior.</u></p> <p>OR, includes the same information as above for this 2 point possibility, however there is a strategy for self-injurious behavior in the body of the BSP and it is not defined anywhere in the plan.</p> <p><b>1 point</b> = includes a definition of aggression as follows: Aggression: Any instance of Charles striking another person with a fist, hand, arm, and/or leg. Examples include but are not limited to Charles striking his hand against another individual's body with a closed fist, Charles kicking another person with his leg(s), or Charles slapping another person with an open hand. Non-examples include Charles patting another person on the back with an open hand in appropriate contexts (e.g. congratulating a peer). Includes a definition of property destruction as follows: Property destruction: Any instance of Charles tipping over or throwing furniture items. <u>Is most critically lacking a system of measurement, which is not indicated in this section or elsewhere in the BSP.</u></p> <p>OR, includes the same information as above for this 1 point possibility, however <u>there is a strategy for self-injurious behavior in the body of the BSP and it is not defined anywhere in the plan.</u></p> |
|--|--|---|

|   |  |  |
|---|--|--|
|   |  | <p><b>0 points</b> = Property destruction is mentioned in the history &amp; rationale section of the BSP; however, this behavior is not operationally or has a system of measurement. Lists aggression, and defines it as follows: Aggression (Frequency): hitting, kicking<br/> <u>Is lacking an operational definition for property destruction and has no system of measurement for that behavior. Is lacking an objective and well formulated operational definitions for aggression.</u></p>  |
| <p><b>Behaviors targeted for increase</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Lists each behavior targeted for increase</li> <li>• Operational definition</li> <li>• Inclusion in definition of examples/non-examples</li> <li>• Methods of measurement for each behavior</li> </ul> | <p><b>3 points</b> = lists behaviors targeted for increase, has operational definition for each behavior, has a method of measurement for each behavior, and has examples and/or non-examples for some behaviors<br/> <b>2 points</b> = lists behaviors targeted for increase, has operational definition for each behavior, has a method of measurement for each behavior, but does not utilize any example and/or non-example descriptions in any behavioral definitions<br/> OR lists behaviors targeted for increase with operational definition for each, but there are behaviors targeted in the plan that are not defined; the behaviors that are defined have a system of measurement and include examples and/or non-examples for some or all behaviors<br/> <b>1 point</b> = lists behaviors targeted for increase and has operational definition for each behavior. Lacks measurement method. May or may not utilize any example or non-example descriptions in</p> | <p><b>3 points</b> = Defines “Mands for attention” as follows: Mands for attention (Occurrence/non-occurrence): Any instance of Charles using words to ask for attention and/or assistance from others. Examples include, but are not limited to, Charles asking a staff member to assist him with laundry, or Charles asking a peer to join him on a computer activity. Non-examples include Charles asking for cessation or delay of demand activities, or Charles engaging in “Mands for attention” but paired with challenging behavior occurring within approximately 1 minute of the “Mand for attention”. At the end of each hour, circle on data sheet if Charles has engaged in this behavior at least 1 time (occurrence) or not engaged in this behavior (non-occurrence) during the previous hour.</p> <p><b>2 points</b> = Defines “Mands for attention” as follows: Mands for attention: (Occurrence/non-occurrence): Any instance of Charles using words to ask for attention and/or assistance from others. At the end of each hour, circle if Charles has engaged in this behavior at least 1 time (occurrence) or not engaged in this behavior (non-occurrence) during the previous hour. <u>Lacks examples and/or non-examples.</u><br/> OR, includes the same information as above for this 2 point possibility, however there is a strategy for promoting “mands for break” in the body of the BSP and it is not defined anywhere in the plan.</p> <p><b>1 point</b> = Lists only “Mands for attention” as follows: Mands for attention: Any instance of Charles using words to ask for attention and/or assistance from others. <u>Most critically, lacks a system of measurement as it is not</u></p> |

|   |  |   |
|---|--|---|
|   | <p>any behavioral definitions. OR, lists behaviors targeted for increase and has operational definition for each behavior, but not all behaviors that have associated strategies in the BSP are defined (may or may not also contain a system of measurement and/or example or non-example descriptions for behavior definitions that are listed).</p> <p><b>0 points</b> = Only lists behaviors and/or list behaviors and definitions, but definitions are not objective and/or lack specificity. May or may not have measurement or examples/non-examples. OR, no behaviors listed, content area absent.</p> | <p><u>noted in this section or elsewhere in the BSP; also lacks examples/non-examples.</u></p> <p>OR, includes the same information as above for this 1 point possibility, however there is a strategy for promoting “mands for break” in the body of the BSP and it is not defined anywhere in the plan.</p> <p><b>0 points</b> = Lists “Mands for attention” as follows: Mands for attention: (Occurrence/non-occurrence): Charles should be prompted by staff to ask for attention instead of engaging in challenging behavior when he begins to exhibit pre-cursor behaviors.</p> <p><u>Lacks an operational definition for Charles’ desirable behavior; the behavioral definition is instead an antecedent strategy that outlines an expectation for staff behavior(s).</u></p>  |
| <p><b>Antecedent interventions</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Tactics promote environment in which functionally equivalent replacement behaviors (FERB) acquisition will occur</li> <li>• Tactics that address setting events and/or motivating operations (MOs)</li> <li>• Tactics/de-escalation strategies that address immediate antecedents and/or precursors</li> <li>• Strategies that describe stimuli that should or should not be present</li> </ul> | <p><b>4 points</b> = All minimum elements addressed</p> <p><b>3 points</b> = Includes 3 of 4 minimum elements</p> <p><b>2 points</b> = Includes 2 of 4 minimum elements</p> <p><b>1 point</b> = Includes 1 of 4 minimum elements</p> <p><b>0 points</b> = Section not addressed, missing all 4 elements, and/or section includes strategies that are generic and not specific to the individual and their behavior</p>   | <p><b>4 points</b> = Outlines low levels of staff attention, as well as phone calls with mother, to be potential motivating operations/setting events for seeking staff attention (either via challenging behaviors or desired behaviors) and has specific information on non-contingent attention provided by staff at specific time frames throughout Charles’ daily schedule. Outlines that staff will prompt Charles to engage in replacement behavior (mand for attention) if he is observed pacing or talking to himself. Outlines that Charles’ daily schedule is available to Charles and indicates on the schedule times when attention and/or assistance may not be readily available (e.g. when staff at home are preparing meals, when staff at day support are transitioning between activities with individuals---uses a green, yellow, red card system in conjunction with the daily schedule to indicate attention availability from staff); schedule contains a self-monitoring checklist for Charles to include rules for desired behavior, contingencies for desired and undesired behaviors, completion of preferred mindfulness activity when staff unavailable, etc. Notes that it has been reported by Charles’ parents that he may engage in aggression within an hour or so following seizure activity and includes that staff will provide high levels of attention and comfort</p> |



|                                  |  |   |
|----------------------------------|--|---|
|                                  |  | <p>surrounding seizure activity for approximately 2 hours afterward (to include following physician’s seizure protocol).</p> <p><b>3 points</b> = Outlines that staff will prompt Charles to engage in replacement behavior (mand for attention) if he is observed pacing or talking to himself. Outlines that Charles’ daily schedule is available to Charles and notes that the schedule contains a self-monitoring checklist for Charles to include rules for desired behavior, contingencies for desired and undesired behaviors, completion of preferred mindfulness activity when staff unavailable, etc. <u>Does not adequately address particular MOs/setting events.</u></p> <p><b>2 points</b> = Outlines low levels of staff attention, as well as phone calls with mother, to be potential setting events for seeking staff attention (either via challenging behaviors or desired behaviors) and that staff will provide attention to him non-contingently at specific timeframes throughout the day. Outlines that if Charles is observed to pace or talk to himself, staff should begin delivering high levels of attention immediately. <u>Lacks stimuli that should/should not be present, and though MO and de-escalation of pre-cursors are included, these are staff driven and strategies lack promotion of FERB for Charles.</u></p> <p><b>1 point</b> = Has specific information on non-contingent attention provided by staff at specific time frames throughout Charles’ daily schedule. <u>Lacks stimuli that should/should not be present, lacks specific strategies on pre-cursors or antecedents, and lacks promotion of FERB.</u></p> <p><b>0 points</b> = Section includes that proactively, Charles’ staff should be respectful and use person centered language when interacting with him. <u>Lacks strategies that address MOs/setting events, lacks stimuli that should/should not be present, lacks specific strategies on pre-cursors or antecedents, and lacks promotion of FERB.</u></p> |
| <b>Consequence interventions</b> | <b>4 points</b> = All minimum elements addressed | <b>4 points</b> = tactics include minimizing reinforcement to the greatest extent possible when challenging behaviors occur (e.g. refraining from   |

|   |  |  |
|---|--|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Tactics incorporate a function-based treatment approach for challenging behavior</li> <li>• Tactics use the least-restrictive approach for challenging behavior</li> <li>• Tactics minimize the reinforcement of challenging behavior(s)</li> <li>• Specific information included on inclusion of preferences/reinforcers, schedule of reinforcement, and/or expectations for learning environment/materials/teaching conditions to increase desirable behavior</li> </ul> | <p><b>3 points</b> = Includes 3 of 4 minimum elements</p> <p><b>2 points</b> = Includes 2 of 4 minimum elements</p> <p><b>1 point</b> = Includes 1 of 4 minimum elements</p> <p><b>0 points</b> = Section not addressed, missing all 4 elements, and/or section includes strategies that are generic and not specific to the individual and their behavior</p> | <p>commenting specifically on Charles’ engagement in challenging behavior and instead separating from Charles and asking him politely to go to his room---use of red stimulus card on schedule to note that staff attention is not available until Charles regains calm behavior); prompting and reinforcing “mands for attention”, the use of mindfulness techniques, and referencing daily schedule when pre-cursors are observed; teaching simulations when problem behavior is not occurring to promote practice of replacement behaviors; use of self-monitoring/self-management protocol, and rehearsing mindfulness based techniques in simulations. Includes high levels of attention when replacement behavior occurs (and describes this as a continuous schedule of reinforcement with elevated, high quality attention from staff).</p> <p><b>3 points</b> = tactics include minimizing reinforcement to the greatest extent possible when challenging behaviors occur (e.g. refraining from commenting specifically on Charles’ engagement in challenging behavior); prompting “mands for attention”, and the use of mindfulness techniques; teaching simulations when problem behavior is not occurring to promote practice of replacement behaviors; and rehearsing mindfulness based techniques in simulations. <u>Lacks schedule of reinforcement information for replacement behavior, lacks information on teaching materials/conditions (e.g. use daily schedule and color card system to indicate attention availability, self-monitoring protocol).</u></p> <p><b>2 points</b> = tactics include minimizing reinforcement to the greatest extent possible when challenging behaviors occur (e.g. refraining from commenting specifically on Charles’ engagement in challenging behavior); prompting “mands for attention”, and the use of mindfulness techniques; teaching simulations when problem behavior is not occurring to promote practice of replacement behaviors; and rehearsing mindfulness based techniques in simulations. <u>A tactic is included that includes removing a preferred activity for multiple days when problem behavior occurs, without indication as to any other less instructive strategies that can be used or</u></p> |
|---|--|--|

|  |  |   |
|--|--|---|
|  |  | <p><u>indication as to why punishment procedure would stay in place across multiple days. Lacks schedule of reinforcement information for replacement behavior, lacks information on teaching materials/conditions (e.g. use daily schedule and color card system to indicate attention availability, self-monitoring protocol).</u></p> <p><b>1 point</b> = tactics include minimizing reinforcement to the greatest extent possible when challenging behaviors occur (e.g. refraining from commenting specifically on Charles’ engagement in challenging behavior); <u>however, a tactic is included that includes removing a preferred activity for multiple days when problem behavior occurs, without indication as to any other less instructive strategies that can be used or indication as to why punishment procedure would stay in place across multiple days. Nothing is indicated in this section as to how to promote or reinforce replacement behaviors when they occur. Lacks information on teaching materials/conditions (e.g. use daily schedule and color card system to indicate attention availability, self-monitoring protocol)</u></p> <p><b>0 points</b> = Section notes that when challenging behavior occurs, those interacting with Charles should tell him to “knock it off, Charles” in a firm but polite voice, and to be prepared to call for extra staff members if the situation escalates. <u>Lacks all minimum elements; strategies do not incorporate function-based treatment, do not use the least restrictive approach, do not promote reinforcement of desirable behavior and do not describe expectations for the learning environment, schedule of reinforcement, etc. The described strategy may in fact serve as a positive reinforcer for challenging behavior(s).</u></p> |
| <p><b>Safety &amp; Crisis Guidelines (when applicable)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Safety gear outlined</li> <li>• Crisis protocol or where to obtain the protocol</li> </ul> | <p><b>1 point</b> = Outlines safety gear (if applicable), supports needed to ensure safety of person and others, crisis protocol or where to obtain, and topographies/intensities/negative</p> | <p><i>Note: A 1 will be scored if the programming does not require this level of intervention</i></p> <p><b>1 point</b> = Charles’ BSP emphasizes in this section the necessity for staff donning arm guards and contacting additional staff when aggression or property destruction occurs to obtain a blocking pad; notes that the crisis</p>   |

|   |   |  |
|---|---|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Describes topographies, intensities, &amp; negative outcomes (if not included elsewhere in BSP)</li> <li>• Describes supports needed to ensure safety of person and others</li> <li>• <i>If restraint or time out is included, notes debriefing procedures</i></li> <li>• <i>If restraint or time out is included, notes criteria for release or refers to provider P&amp;P</i></li> </ul> | <p>outcomes (if not included elsewhere in BSP). If applicable, includes restraint/time out criteria (or refers to provider P&amp;P) and debriefing procedures.</p> <p><b>0 points</b> = Not addressed but should be given the parameters of the procedures listed in plan, or areas are addressed but the guidelines are dangerous, and/or in clear violation of Human Rights regulations</p> <p><i>Note: If in clear violation of Human Rights regulations or are dangerous, DBHDS reviewer will contact local human rights advocate</i></p> | <p>protocol and associated policies and procedures of each provider (group home and day support) will be followed by staff based on the setting where services are taking place. Notes that arm guards are used to minimize injury to staff when blocking strikes from Charles if he attempts to aggress towards body or head, and that a blocking pad can be used for protection as well from strikes or if objects are thrown. This section includes that these safety gear items are used for staff protection based on history of staff being injured during aggressive and/or property destructive episodes. There is no prescription for restraint, but notes to follow the procedures of the group home and day support for situations that become imminently dangerous.</p> <p><b>0 points</b> = Charles' BSP does not contain any reference to use of safety gear or reference to emergency policy and procedures of providers. <u>A zero is scored here as it is clear in other parts of the BSP that this section is necessary based on the previously described history of severity of aggression and property destruction.</u></p>  |
| <p><b>Plan for training</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Outlines a plan for training staff, family, or other supporters that notes behaviorist obtaining and reviewing data</li> <li>• Plan incorporates a behavior skills training (BST) approach</li> <li>• Training record (or plan for training itself based on authorization type) is available in WaMS related to recent review period</li> </ul>            | <p><b>3 points</b> = All minimum elements addressed</p> <p><b>2 points</b> = Has 2 out of 3 elements, one of which must be use of BST type approach to training</p> <p><b>1 point</b> = Has at least 1 element present, but lacks a BST type approach to training</p> <p><b>0 points</b> = Section not addressed, and/or section is not specific enough to determine the plan for training. Training record may or may not be present (based on authorization type)</p>   | <p><i>Note: If the authorization type is a secondary authorization and training has not yet occurred, score this section as if training record is present</i></p> <p><b>3 points</b> = The author of the BSP notes that the plan for training includes direct care staff and managers at the group home and day support settings, and that a pyramidal staff training approach will be utilized with the managers. The plan for training outlines that a behavior skills training type approach will be utilized where instruction, modeling, rehearsal, and feedback will be provided to all staff working with Charles, with a particular focus on the managers in separate focused training sessions. This section notes that data are being collected at this time on a data sheet that the behaviorist has created and that the behaviorist will obtain copies of the data sheets via secure email from the managers of both settings every three weeks. Section notes that a minimum monthly training is anticipated throughout the course of the authorization period. Record review in WaMS demonstrates that there are numerous instances of training occurring over the plan year (e.g. signed and dated training logs with staff names, training topic, length of training)</p> |

**2 points** = The author of the BSP notes that the plan for training includes direct care staff and managers at the group home and day support settings, and that a pyramidal staff training approach will be utilized with the managers. The plan for training outlines that a behavior skills training type approach will be utilized where instruction, modeling, rehearsal, and feedback will be provided to all staff working with Charles, with a particular focus on the managers in separate focused training sessions. This section notes that data are being collected at this time on a data sheet that the behaviorist has created and that the behaviorist will obtain copies of the data sheets via secure email from the managers of both settings every three weeks. Section notes that a minimum monthly training is anticipated throughout the course of the authorization period. There is no training record available in WaMS for review (for annual reviews only)

**1 point** = author of the BSP notes that the plan for training includes direct care staff and managers at the group home and day support settings being provided with a copy of the plan and that the plan will be reviewed in a team meeting at each setting. Lacks a BST type approach to training, which will likely be more effective than a didactic style training. This section notes that data are being collected at this time on a data sheet that the behaviorist has created and that the behaviorist will obtain copies of the data sheets via secure email from the managers of both settings every three weeks. Section notes that a minimum monthly training is anticipated throughout the course of the authorization period. Record review in WaMS demonstrates that there are numerous instances of training occurring over the plan year (e.g. signed and dated training logs with staff names, training topic, length of training)

**0 points** = Author notes that all staff are provided with a copy of the BSP and that they will sign off that they receive it. Notes that data will be collected on a data sheet created by the behaviorist. Lacks specificity on



|  |   |  |
|--|---|--|
|  |   | <u>training, does not make an attempt at a BST type approach to training, does not have any record of the training occurring.</u>  |
| <p><b>Appropriate signatures</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Plan is signed and dated by individual (or legal guardian/authorized representative) upon initiation</li> <li>Contact information for guardian or individual is included in signatures</li> <li>If a restrictive component is included, updated consent is included and matches timeline (if applicable)</li> </ul>  | <p><b>1 point</b> = Minimally, the plan is signed and dated by the individual or legal guardian (or authorized representative) upon initiation</p> <p><b>0 points</b> = Section missing entirely, or BSP is not signed by individual or guardian/AR. Zero points will be provided if a restrictive component is included but the signature and date by the individual (or their decision maker) does not coincide with the timeline for when this component was added.</p> <p><i>Note: contact information or guardian or individual may be included in other documentation outside of the BSP (e.g. in ISP, WaMS, plan for supports, part V, etc.)</i></p> | <p><b>1 point</b> = BSP is signed by Charles and is dated to coincide with initiation of the plan. Additionally, Charles' contact information is listed in his ISP.</p> <p><b>0 points</b> = BSP is only signed and dated by the behaviorist. Charles' contact information is listed in his ISP. <u>Lacks signature and associated date from Charles.</u></p>  |
| <p><b>Graphical displays and analysis</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Visual display (e.g. graphs) for each targeted behavior (must include behavior for increase and decrease)</li> <li>Summary progress statement present for graphs</li> <li>Graphs represent entire necessary review period</li> <li>Graphs have indicators that demonstrate decision making and/or analysis is occurring (e.g. phase lines, arrows) based on behavior trends and/or dates of revision to plan</li> </ul> | <p><b>5 points</b> = All elements addressed for each target behavior (decrease &amp; increase), graphs have entirety of review period, or if some data are absent, has acceptable explanation as to why any data are missing is included (either in summary on graphs)</p> <p><b>4 points</b> = Graphs present for all behaviors (decrease and increase). Visual analysis indicators present to indicate decision making occurring (based on behavior trends and/or dates of plan revisions) for at least 1 graph but may be missing from others. Summary statement is present for at least one graph but may be missing from others.</p>                   | <p><b>5 points</b> = Graphs are included for aggression, property destruction, and mands for attention, which represent the entire review period since the previous authorization. There are visual indicators (e.g. phase lines) on the graphs to indicate the two treatment changes that occurred, as well as other indicators (e.g. arrows) that notate significant life events that may impact behavior (such as Charles' known seizure activity, visits from parents to the group home). Each data point on the graph represents a week, though there are several gaps in the data weeks across the entire plan year (which are noted in the summary statement as to reason why: staff changes at group home on several different weeks, Charles went on vacation for 3 weeks with family). A brief summary statement on progress is present for each behavior being tracked.</p> <p><b>4 points</b> = Graphs are present for aggression, property destruction, and mands for attention. There are visual indicators (e.g. phase lines) on the aggression graph to indicate the two treatment changes that occurred, as</p> |

- *Graphs demonstrate that data review is occurring monthly if restraint or time out is included*

Graphs may be missing some data from the review period, but has explanation as to why (either in summary or on graphs)

**3 points** = Graphs are present for some behaviors, but missing a graph for one or more behaviors. For the graphs present, there is a summary statement present for each, and visual analysis indicators present to indicate decision making is occurring (based on behavior trends and/or dates of plan revisions); graphs may be absent of some data over the review period and but has explanation as to why (either in summary or on graphs). OR, score as a 3 if graphs are present for all behaviors and any of the follow scenarios occur: a) summary statement is present for at least one graph but missing from others; visual analysis indicators are missing on all graphs; all data is present for all graphs, or some data are missing and an explanation is provided; b) summary statement is present for at least one graph but missing from others; visual analysis indicators are present on all or some graphs; some data are missing but there is no explanation as to why; c) summary statements are present for all graphs, visual analysis indicators are present on at least 1 graph, but data are missing with no explanation as to why, or d) graphs are present for all behaviors and summary statement is

well as other indicators (e.g. arrows) that notate significant life events that may impact behavior (such as Charles’ known seizure activity, visits from parents to the group home); however, these are not present on the property destruction or mands for attention graph. Each data point on the graph represents a week, though there are several gaps in the data weeks across the entire plan year (which are noted in the summary statement as to reason why: staff changes at group home on several different weeks, Charles went on vacation for 3 weeks with family). A brief summary statement on progress is present for each behavior being tracked.

**3 points** = Graphs are present for aggression and property destruction. There are visual indicators (e.g. phase lines) on the graphs to indicate the two treatment changes that occurred, as well as other indicators (e.g. arrows) that notate significant life events that may impact behavior (such as Charles’ known seizure activity, visits from parents to the group home). Each data point on the graph represents a week, and there are several gaps in the data weeks across the entire plan year; the gaps in data are explained in a brief summary statement for both graphs. There is no graph or associated information for “mands for attention”.

**2 points** = Graphs are included for aggression and property destruction, which represent the entire review period since the previous authorization. There are visual indicators (e.g. phase lines) on the attention graph to indicate the two treatment changes that occurred, as well as other indicators (e.g. arrows) that notate significant life events that may impact behavior (such as Charles’ known seizure activity, visits from parents to the group home). Each data point on the graph represents a week, and there are several gaps in the data weeks across the entire plan year; the gaps in data are explained in a summary statement for the aggression graph. There is no graph or associated information for “mands for attention”. A brief summary statement on progress is present for aggression but not for property destruction, and the property destruction graph also lacks visual analysis indicators.

present for all graphs, but visual analysis indicators are missing and data is missing without an explanation as to why.

**2 points** = Graphs are present for some behaviors, but missing a graph for one or more behaviors. For the graphs present, at least 1 of the following items are included for each of the graph(s) present: summary statement or visual analysis indicators (based on behavior trends and/or dates of plan revisions). Data may be inclusive of entire review period or there may be some data missing; if data are missing on any graph, there is an explanation as to why. OR, score as a 2 if graphs are present for all behaviors, but summary statement is only present for some graphs, and visual analysis indicators are missing and data is missing without an explanation as to why.

**1 point** = Graphs are present for some behaviors, but missing a graph for one or more behaviors. For the graph(s) present, score as a 1 if any of the graph(s) do not contain a summary statement and/or visual indicators (based on behavior trends and/or dates of plan revisions) AND some data are missing with no explanation as to why. OR, score as a 1 if for the graph(s) present if summary information and/or visual analysis indicators are present, but there is some data missing and there is no

**1 point** = Graphs are present for aggression and property destruction. There is no graph for the replacement behavior (mands for attention). The graphs for aggression and property destruction lack any visual indicators. There is summary statement for aggression, but not for property destruction. There are a substantial amount of data gaps on multiple weeks that do not have any explanation on the graphs themselves or in the summary statement.

**0 points** = Only raw data sheets are uploaded into WaMS. A summary statement on progress is included in documentation. Lacking graphical displays and associated elements that should be present for those graphs.

*Note for reviewing "Graphical Displays and Analysis" section in a secondary authorization period: If graphical displays are present, evaluate the graphs based on what is available as well as any written information provided by the behaviorist about the presence or absence of data. If graphs are not yet available, provide a score based on the how behaviors targeted for decrease as well as increase are named, defined, and have a method for measurement. For example, if no graphs are yet available, but behaviors for increase and decrease are named, operationally defined, and set up for measurement, provide 5 points. If no graphs are yet available, but only behaviors for decrease are named, defined, and set up for measurement, provide 3 points.*

|  |   |  |
|--|---|--|
|  | <p>explanation as to why. OR, score as a 1 if all graphs are present, but all of the following are missing: summary statements, visual indicators (based on behavior trends and/or dates of plan revisions), and data is missing (with no explanation as to why).</p> <p><b>0 points</b> = No graphs present at all, and/or only raw data sheets provided, and/or section is not addressed at all. If restraint or time out is included in the plan and the graphs (or other documentation) reveal that data review is <u>not</u> occurring at least monthly as required, an automatic 0 score is applied regardless of the presence or absence of other elements.</p> <p><i>Note: as it relates to absence of visual analysis indicators on graphical display, if there is no evidence that there has been a plan revision, DBHDS reviewer will make a determination based on data trends if it appears that a plan revision should have occurred and will score accordingly. Should this occur, this can be discussed with the behaviorist during the feedback process.</i></p> |  |
|--|---|--|

## **Review, Scoring, and Feedback Process**

*Each DBHDS reviewer is a Licensed and Board Certified Behavior Analyst® with extensive experience in the assessment and treatment of challenging behavior. The DBHDS reviewers will obtain a sample of behavior support plans and associated documentation; the reviewers will then utilize the BSPARI in review of behavior support plans and associated documentation that is provided in WaMS by the behaviorist (e.g. part V/plan for supports, FBA, BSP, graphs, session notes, training information, etc.) and determine if the required elements are present (and adequate), not present (or inadequate), or in some cases not applicable (e.g. components of “Safety & Crisis Guidelines”). The reviewer uses the dropdown feature on BSPARI to select a √ (in some cases a √√) to indicate presence and adequacy, an X to indicate absence or inadequacy, or N/A if the element is not applicable to the person and their behavior support plan.*

*As an example, the following may constitute a √ for the minimum element of “plan for training incorporates a BST approach”: The training plan outlines an approach where the behaviorist will provide instruction on tactics, model the tactics, foster rehearsal for trainees, and deliver feedback to trainees to increase their implementation fidelity.*

*As an example, the following would constitute an X for the minimum element of “plan for training incorporates a BST approach”: The training plan notes that trainees will receive a copy of the BSP to review on their own.*

*As an example of selecting “N/A”, if there is no safety gear required and this is indicated as such in the plan, the reviewer would select “N/A” from this section.*

*The BSPARI has automated, coded scoring logic internally embedded that calculates scores for each BSP content area section, as well as the total overall score, to align with the Scoring Instructions Guide methodology outlined above. Any BSP content areas that receive the maximum possible score will have the “Point for BSP Content Area” highlighted in green; if maximum scores are not obtained, this section will highlight in red and the behaviorist should review the “Resources” tab, as the “Resources” tab will highlight in red relevant resources which may be useful to the behaviorist. It is recommended that for any required areas that are highlighted in “red” on the resource tab that the behaviorist access the resources to improve future iterations of the behavior support plan under review (as well as generalize the knowledge garnered to other future behavior support plans). The “Resources” tab consists of journal articles, internet resources, suggested book chapters, and links to regulations or associated guidance; when possible, resources are hyperlinked to the related digital object identifier (DOI) or related web location for ease of access. Additionally, there is a section on the BSPARI that indicates “DBHDS Reviewer Summary” that the DBHDS reviewer may use to capture key points to share with the behaviorist during the feedback process. Each BSPARI is saved by DBHDS reviewers for behaviorist feedback and reporting purposes, as well as to guide future BSPARI updates and training and resource needs for the behaviorist community.*



In three BSP content areas of the BSPARI, there are possibilities for double tick-marks, represented as √√ in the dropdowns on the BSPARI. These sections are “Behavior Targeted for Decrease”, “Behaviors Targeted for Increase”, and “Graphical Displays and Analysis”. The logic for selecting a single tick (√) versus a double tick (√√) is outlined in the table below for each BSP content area and related minimum element. The concepts of “none” or “inadequate” = X, “some” = √, and “all” = √√ may be helpful to scorers in addition to the specifics noted below.

| BSP Content Area                | Minimum required element                                     | When reviewer should use a double tick mark (√√)  | When reviewer should use a single tick mark (√)  |
|---------------------------------|--|---|--|
| Behaviors Targeted for Decrease | Lists each behavior targeted for decrease (row 58 on BSPARI) | <p>All behaviors targeted for decrease that have an intervention in the BSP are also listed in the section of the BSP that outlines targeted behaviors and definitions.</p> <p>Example: Aggression and property destruction have interventions in the BSP. Aggression and property destruction are both listed in the section of the BSP that outlines targeted behaviors and definitions. OR Aggression and property destruction have definitions in the BSP, and the interventions in the BSP are applicable to both behaviors (even if they are not itemized as such in this area).</p> <p>Reviewer selects √√ from drop down on row 58, then proceeds to evaluate rows 59-61 for operational definitions, measurement, and examples/non-examples to arrive at score for this section.</p> | <p>There are behaviors targeted for decrease that have an intervention, but one or more of these behaviors are not listed in the section of the BSP that outlines targeted behaviors and definitions.</p> <p>Example: Aggression and property destruction have interventions in the BSP. Only aggression is listed in the section of the BSP that outlines targeted behaviors and definitions.</p> <p>Reviewer selects √ from drop down on row 58, then proceeds to evaluate rows 58-61 for operational definitions, measurement, and examples/non-examples to arrive at score for this section.</p> |

|   |  |  |   |
|---|--|--|---|
| <p><i>Behaviors Targeted for Increase</i></p>   | <p><i>Lists each behavior targeted for increase (row 64 on BSPARI)</i></p> | <p><i>All behaviors targeted for increase that have an intervention in the BSP are also listed in the section of the BSP that outlines targeted behaviors and definitions.</i></p> <p><i>Example: Mand for attention has interventions in the BSP. Mand for attention is listed in the section of the BSP that outlines targeted behaviors and definitions. OR Mand for attention has definitions in the BSP, and the interventions in the BSP are applicable to this behavior even if it is not itemized as such.</i></p> <p><i>Reviewer selects vv from drop down on row 64, then proceeds to evaluate rows 65-67 for operational definitions, measurement, and examples/non-examples to arrive at score for this section.</i></p> | <p><i>There are behaviors targeted for increase that have an intervention, but one or more of these behaviors are not listed in the section of the BSP that outlines targeted behaviors and definitions.</i></p> <p><i>Example: Mand for break and mand for attention have interventions in the BSP. Only mand for attention is listed in the section of the BSP that outlines targeted behaviors and definitions. There are no strategies for mand for break and the strategies for mand for attention are not applicable as there are different contingencies surrounding evoking and reinforcing this mand.</i></p> <p><i>Reviewer selects v from drop down on row 64, then proceeds to evaluate rows 65-67 for operational definitions, measurement, and examples/non-examples to arrive at score for this section.</i></p> |
| <p><i>Graphical displays &amp; analysis</i></p> | <p><i>Visual display for each targeted behavior (row 101)</i></p>          | <p><i>Every behavior targeted for decrease and increase is present on graph(s).</i></p> <p><i>Example: Aggression, property destruction, mand for attention are all targeted behaviors. Each behavior is represented on a graph.</i></p>   | <p><i>There are behaviors that are targeted that are not present on graph(s).</i></p> <p><i>Example: Aggression, property destruction, and mand for attention all targeted behaviors. There is only a graph depicting aggression and property destruction.</i></p>  |

|                               |  |   |   |
|-------------------------------|--|---|---|
|                               |  | <p>Reviewer selects √√ from drop down on row 101. Proceed to evaluate “Summary statement for each graph” (row 102).</p> <p><b>Note: Once the selection from row 101 is made, the remaining rows (102-104) are evaluated on the graphs that are present.</b></p>   | <p>Reviewer selects √ from drop down on row 101. Proceed to evaluate “Summary statement for each graph” (row 102).</p> <p><b>Note: Once the selection from row 101 is made, the remaining rows (102-104) are evaluated on the graphs that are present.</b></p>  |
| Graphical displays & analysis | Summary statement for each graph (row 102)                                       | <p>For the graphs that are present, there is a summary statement that outlines progress on each behavior.</p> <p><i>Example: There are graphs for aggression, property destruction, and mands for attention. There is a summary statement outlining progress/summarizing the progress for each behavior.</i></p> <p>Reviewer selects √√ from drop down on row 102. Proceed to evaluate “Graphs have indicators...” (row 103).</p> | <p>For the graphs that are present, a summary statement only partially summarizes the information.</p> <p><i>Example: There are graphs for aggression and property destruction. There is a brief and adequate summary statement for aggression, but not for property destruction.</i></p> <p>Reviewer selects √ from drop down on row 102. Proceed to evaluate “Graphs have indicators...” (row 103).</p> |
| Graphical displays & analysis | Graphs have indicators that demonstrate decision making...is occurring (row 103) | <p>For the graphs that are present, visual indicators (i.e., arrow indicating psychotropic medication change) are present on each graph.</p> <p><i>Example: There are three separate graphs for aggression, property destruction, and mands for attention. Each graph has an arrow indicating the medication change.</i></p>  | <p>For the graphs that are present, visual indicators (i.e., arrow indicating psychotropic medication change) are present on some but not all graphs.</p> <p><i>Example: There are three separate graphs for aggression, property destruction, and mands for attention. Only the graph for aggression has the arrow indicating the medication change.</i></p>   |

|  |  |   |   |
|--|--|---|---|
|  |  | <p>Reviewer selects √√ from drop down on row 103. Proceed to evaluate “Graphs represent entire necessary review period” (row 104).</p> <p><b>Note: for this section, if there have not been changes to the plan or other updates in documentation that should be captured on the graphs, and if the trends and levels indicate desired responding for all graphs, the reviewer will select √√</b></p> | <p>Reviewer selects √ from drop down on row 103. Proceed to evaluate “Graphs represent entire necessary review period” (row 104).</p> <p><b>Note: for this section, if there have not been changes to the plan or other updates in documentation that should be captured on the graphs and if the trends and levels indicate desired responding for some but not all graphs, the reviewer will select √</b></p> |
|--|--|---|---|

An X would be selected for the corresponding minimum element by the reviewer if there are no graphs, if there are no summary statements, if changes or updates that should be captured on the graph(s) are not on the graph(s), or if changes were warranted based on visual analysis of graphs by the reviewer but there were no changes indicated.

For “Graphs represent entire necessary review period (if any data absent, indication as to why is included)” (row 104), there is only a possibility of a single tick (√) or an X. The reviewer should select the single tick (√) if for the graphs that are present, all data is included, or if for the graphs present, some data are missing but there is an adequate reason provided in the documentation (e.g., the person was hospitalized for a month, significant staff turnover at group home led to missing a week of data). The reviewer should select the X if for the graphs that are present, there are gaps in the data and there is not an adequate reason provided as to why in the documentation.

A feedback process for behaviorists is outlined as follows and is intended to highlight areas of strength in behavior support plans and offer suggestions and resources for ways to improve any areas that lack adherence to the Practice Guidelines. Subsequent to a BSP review and scoring, DBHDS will provide a copy of the scored BSPARI to the behaviorist using HIPAA compliant methods. DBHDS will also offer to the behaviorist an opportunity to discuss the results of the BSPARI with the DBHDS scorer. DBHDS will maintain a record of each BSPARI that is scored; if multiple reviews of inadequate scores are found for a behaviorist or behaviorist provider group, and there is evidence that the scores are not improving across reviews, DBHDS may require a phone or secure video conference meeting with the behaviorist to discuss the results of the BSPARIs that have been completed and provide additional resources and training suggestions for the behaviorist. The overarching goal of the BSPARI and the feedback process is to ensure that high quality behavioral services are delivered to all recipients of therapeutic consultation behavioral services.

## **Future updates to the BSPARI**

DBHDS reviewers will conduct intermittent and independent interscorer agreement reviews to ensure that the scoring is being consistently applied across DBHDS reviewers, as well as to ensure that the BSPARI is capturing the critical components of the regulations and Practice Guidelines relevant to therapeutic consultation behavioral services. Accordingly, and based upon any future changes to the regulations or Practice Guidelines associated with this service, as well as updates and developments in the professional literature and within the field, DBHDS may make updates to the BSPARI and will share these updates with the behaviorist community. DBHDS will review the “Resources” tab semi-annually to ensure that linked articles are active, as well as to provide updates based on recent developments in the field.

## **Resources on Quality Assurance in FBA & BSP**

Additionally, see the “Resources” tab of the BSPARI for references and resources that are relevant to each BSP content and minimum required content area.

Browning-Wright D., Saren D., & Mayer G. R. (2013). The behavior support plan-quality evaluation guide, II. Available at: <http://www.pent.ca.gov>

Kroeger, S. D., & Phillips, L. J. (2007). Positive behavior support assessment guide: Creating student-centered behavior plans. *Assessment for Effective Intervention*, 32(2), 100-112

Lewis-Palmer, T., Todd, A. W., Horner, R. H., Sugai, G., & Sampson, N. (2004). Individual Student Systems Evaluation Tool. Eugene: Educational and Community Supports, University of Oregon.

Quigley, S.P., Ross, R.K., Field, S. & Conway, A.A. (2018). Towards an essential understanding of the essential components of behavior analytic service plans. *Behavior Analysis in Practice*, 11(4), 436-444.

Tarbox, J., Najdowski, A.C., Bergstrom, R., Wilke, A., Bishop, M., Kenzer, A., Dixon, D. (2013). Randomized evaluation of a web-based tool for designing function-based behavioral intervention plans. *Research in Autism Spectrum Disorders*, 7, 1509-1517.

Wardale, S., Davis, F.J., Vassos, M., & Nankervis, K. (2016). The outcome of a statewide audit of the quality of positive behaviour support plans. *Journal of Intellectual & Developmental Disability*, 43(2), 202-212.

Williams, D.E. & Vollmer, T.R. (2015). Essential components of written behavior treatment plans. *Research in Developmental Disabilities*, 36, 323-327.

Willis, T.J., Lavigna, G.W., & Donnellan, A.M. (2011). *Behavior Assessment Guide*. The Institute for Applied Behavior Analysis, Los Angeles, CA.

