



Performance-based  
Standards

# PbS Executive Summary

South Carolina Department of Juvenile Justice

Report to: Director Margaret Barber

Submitted by: Dave Crowley, PbS Consultant / Coach  
March 6, 2012

170 Forbes Road, Suite 106, Braintree, MA 02184  
Phone: (781) 843-2663; Fax: (781) 843-1688  
E-Mail: [help@pbstandards.org](mailto:help@pbstandards.org); Web: [www.pbstandards.org](http://www.pbstandards.org)



## Overview

The South Carolina Department of Juvenile Justice (DJJ) represents some of the very best rehabilitative programs for youths within a correctional system that can rarely be found. The community participation, its sheer number of volunteers that surpasses the number of staff employees, community donations of time, the donation of buildings worth millions of dollars erected for youths and their families to enjoy and reconcile, teaching meaningful vocational training programs for DJJ youths, assisting with building a home for humanity in collaboration with DJJ staff and youths, lifting that same home over the fence with donated cranes and business personnel time and effort –these and many other important activities represent a host of outstanding and remarkable collaborative efforts between DJJ and its community partners on behalf of youths and their families.

DJJ staff work very hard and they are always open to critical review in the hopes of improving upon their work performance. Reform of the system is underway. Many critical, as well as programming and reintegration outcomes have improved principally due to the shared work efforts between site staff and community Intensive Supervision Officers (ISOs).

On the other hand, some existing traditional, archaic practices still exist within a somewhat reactive climate to youth behaviors. Staff lack the 'soft' verbal skills, and 'tools' necessary to effectively manage the population by more appropriately rewarding or disciplining youths.

Segregation in both the Santee Segregation Unit and the SMU 'programs' represents a repressive system of discipline and control that operates similar to an adult correctional model.

Communication opportunities within sites are limited for staff and youth. As a result, inconsistency often prevails; creative and innovative ideas are stymied; ample opportunities and openness for discussing issues and building consensus for improvement and change affecting the youth population are almost non-existent.

DJJ is now in the crossroads of moving ahead, removing barriers toward learning and growth, changing the culture from some of its more established, outmoded practices to a culture that reflects greater hope and optimism toward becoming a more complete rehabilitative model.





Director Barber is committed to implementing a positive culture, completing the reform and transforming DJJ. She is intent on providing the leadership to attain unprecedented success within the PbS national community and establishing a legacy for DJJ in the upcoming years. That legacy means operating at the highest standards of care and treatment for DJJ youths so they have the best chance for successful reintegration with their communities and families as law abiding citizens.

Below are highlights and recommendations based on the recent PbS visit:

### Highlights:

- Attended Executive Management Team Meeting (EMT) at outset of visits on January 23 – heard an amazing, touching story during the meeting by DJJ youth Shakia (17 years of age, committed murder as a 12 year old, now remorseful, involved in restorative justice project with victim's mother and now prepared to return to society). This youth involvement and discussion presented at such a high level of agency management may be a national model for any learning organization in juvenile justice to emulate.  
Through this youth's heartfelt and dramatic presentation, many critical youth centered and societal issues became important topics discussed among the EMT members with Shakia during the meeting.
- Viewed and read news media reports (TV stations, newspapers including the Wall Street Journal) of 'Raising that House', the Habitat for Humanity building effort by youths, staff and volunteers under the direction of Habitat staff -an amazing accomplishment and program!! (Understanding that this home building in collaboration with the vaunted Habitat for Humanity Project as a means of 'giving back to society' complements Director Barber's DJJ goal and her legacy toward progressive reform in South Carolina's juvenile correctional system.
- Enjoyed a special 'welcoming' discussion and evening meal with females at Willow Lane.
- Attended Trauma Training led by a DJJ Trauma Therapist -one of the most effective, outstanding training programs (if not the best) I have experienced in my career!
- Observed inspiring, dedicated campus volunteer vocational programs.
- Visited impressive, professional community county office in York County.



- Noted numerous recent improvements as well as areas for further development. Included in significant improvements seen were the Reintegration efforts particularly those outcomes related to the intensive Supervision Officers' (ISOs) roles and collaborative work with site personnel, community, families and youths.  
\*The York Regional County Center that we visited was reflective of a most effective, efficient and professional operation toward the care and supervision of DJJ youths. Also, restraints, isolation/segregation, assaults/fights and injuries have decreased in the aggregate across the department as to both raw numbers and national rates.
- Presented visit summary to Director Margaret Barber and to Executive Management and Senior Staff representatives on February 2, 2012.
- Provided external PbS Quality Assurance review that included a comprehensive, challenging critique of DJJ operations and programs. It was particularly gratifying to have DJJ staff open and receptive to the PbS process and to this Consultant/Coach. DJJ staff once again displayed the best of 'Southern Hospitality', cooperation and professionalism in view of such assessment.

#### **PbS Site Visits made to:**

- Birchwood
- John G. Richards
- Midlands Evaluation Center
- South Carolina Detention Center
- Willow Lane Female Facility
- Upstate Evaluation Center
- Coastal Evaluation Center
- STAR Program for Aggressive Juveniles
- Strength Based Program (SBP)
- Santee Segregation Unit
- York County Community Office

#### **PbS Site Visits –Purpose:**

- 1) Discuss operations and program issues (teamwork; communications; management; personnel changes and transitions; population; facility culture; Behavior Management System inclusive of Points, Levels, Incentives, Rewards and Discipline; etc.) as they affect PbS performance.



- 2) Review/Analyze the PbS data and results in conjunction with site staff.
- 3) Coach toward the development of comprehensive, strategic Facility Improvement Plans (FIPs).
- 4) Tour facilities, observe and interact with staff and youths.
- 5) Verify the PbS data submitted by each site for the October 2011 Data Collection.
- 6) Observe the DJJ community re-integration efforts through the York County DJJ Office visit.

### Review Process

The site PbS discussions occurred in meetings with the different facility Administrative/PbS Teams. Projecting PbS data on a screen seen by all participants greatly aided the dialogue in reviewing all PbS results. (Many thanks are due to DJJ Training Staff for their patience and persistence in working with sometimes challenging internet connections.)

Included in this review were:

- 106 Outcome Measures (OMs) with 32 Critical Outcome Measures (COMs) for the campus 'corrections' or long term, treatment sites and 60 OMs with 30 COMs for Detention and the Evaluation sites.)
- Incident Report Summaries (i.e., percentages of incidents for time of day, days of the week, locations, etc.).
- Climate Summaries for Staff and Youth including 37 Staff questions and 38 Youth questions respectively.
- Youth Exit Interview Summaries -another 24 questions answered by youth exiting the 3 campus sites.

This extensive review examined performances and resultant site PbS Level attainment in all phases of operations and programs (including reintegration efforts for the 3 campus sites).

### PbS Discussion Shortcomings and Related issues

As the visits were conducted in conjunction with each facility Administrative/PbS Team by reviewing all aspects of programming, operations, Behavior Management Systems - points, levels, incentives, rewards, etc., it was noted that some disciplines were represented inconsistently or not at all. For example, two of the three sites on campus (Birchwood and John G. Richards) had limited clinical representation and all three sites on campus had very limited or no educational representation. Educational testing and improvement results were lacking. Maintenance and food service representatives were not in attendance as well, yet staff and youth drew evaluative conclusions as to the effectiveness of those disciplines in the surveys. The respective staff personnel were not there to defend or explain their results.





The Upstate and Coastal Evaluation Centers (UEC, CEC) seemed to be experiencing significant confusion over facility leadership between the Security Captains and the Facility Managers. Some definitive emotional distress was expressed as a result.

### Incident Report Verification

Overall, the Incident Reports were accurate at most sites. The only exceptions were at UEC and John G. Richards. The few issues at Upstate were readily seen and understood by their new Site Coordinator. Overall, she did a terrific job with her first data collection.

However, at John G. Richards inaccuracies noted were a reflection of a lack of thorough review, follow up on particular incidents and incomplete reporting. The incompleteness was in reference to types of restraints, injuries, and most important, Segregation Time at both the STAR and SBR Units.

As it appeared that the Segregation Time at both STAR and SBP were not reported at all, John G. Richards' segregation time would have been much higher if all the time youths were in their assigned rooms and did not have permission to leave was counted for those units. Hence, John G. Richards would have had a much higher Average Duration of Room Time (PbS, Order 9) and the corresponding percentages of Segregation Time for such releases within 4 or 8 Hours would have been much less (Order 10 and 11 –*Outcomes that sites strive to have higher percentages of*).

Unless this is corrected for veracity and completeness, John G. Richards could potentially drop to Level 1. This is because failure to follow the PbS Incident Report Definitional Compliance and Comprehensive Reporting (IR DCCR) requirement could result in removal from the national field average in addition to being assigned Level 1. (An IR DCCR form is electronically signed by Site Coordinator, Facility Administrator and State Coordinator. This form will need to be updated.)

*[All instances of true room confinement, isolation and/or segregation should be carefully entered and monitored for the April Data Collection.]*

*[It should be noted that youths in the SBP are generally out of their rooms; however according to written program guidelines, poor behavior does result in Room Restriction. It is likely that those Instances of Room Restriction were not entered into PbS as well.]*

*[It should also be noted that the new PbS Birchwood Site Coordinator did a terrific job in data entry. Much of that success can be attributed to the PbS training provided by DJJ staff.]*





## Communications

In discussing communications at each site, it appears that there is a lack of consistency in both the frequency and the effectiveness of meetings among staff. This negatively impacts good teamwork. Meetings at sites range from weekly Team Meetings to monthly or quarterly staff meetings.

The chain of communication and command seems to be broken down as well. *It does appear that all disciplines work extremely hard at their tasks;* however the lines of communication and accountability run parallel to each other without much or enough connectivity, mutual feedback and input between functions.

This tends to prevent the hard work and effort being completed in each discipline from effectively uniting toward attaining departmental goals for improved services along with the rehabilitative, caring efforts on behalf of DJJ youths. In essence, too much work remains in department silos (i.e., clinical, security, health, education) thereby negating the sharing of the collective and productive work at the expense of youth treatment and care.

In reference to youth communications, many sites meet as a team with youths as a unit or small groups too infrequently –weekly, even monthly or rarely.

Staff should understand as a team what the on-going and often changing ‘pulse’ of its youths (and staff) is in order to provide enhanced safety and security for all. Also meeting with youths helps staff identify those incentives, privileges and rewards that can be most effective for improved behavior management among youths.

Additionally, the numerous positive individual meetings staff have with youths are generally productive and should continue, but staff should realize the value of groups in developing positive peer pressure among adolescents. Having sufficient opportunities for youths to express themselves in community meetings helps them to develop responsible verbal, coping, listening, leadership and appropriate decision-making skills among peers as well as with adults - all essential toward their success in the community as law abiding citizens.

In many instances at DJJ sites, youths are not allowed to talk during mealtimes. This practice does not seem to equip and teach youths how to carry on appropriate social communications once they return to public schools.



## Teamwork

Overall as mentioned, *effective* teamwork where there are on-going opportunities for give and take sessions is lacking among the different operational functions at most sites. This appeared to be particularly true at Birchwood and John G. Richards (inclusive of Santee, the Hearing Officers, SBP and STAR) as evidenced by incomplete team participation in the PbS meetings that did not include all of these functional representatives. Clinical and education offered minimal representation, participation and input.

Clinical and Hearing Officer staff are not often available and generally do not work on evenings and weekends leaving Security without support in dealing with behavioral issues, family visits and programming during those vital times.

Such unavailability of these functional staff members during these important, sometimes challenging times for youths when school is not in session leaves security staff without a supportive team for on-site assistance and guidance.

## Leadership

Unlike the Executive Management Team where the flow of communication and direction appears to be a two way process, the decision making among upper and middle facility managers seems more arbitrary. It appears that much of the decision making comes from few managers who make decisions without sufficient information, discussion and consensus building. Two examples seen were: a detention administrator stating without asking for opinions during the PbS Team Meeting that points and levels for youths were unattainable for short term youths; another example was a statewide facility manager who refused to allow basketball playing in the short term units despite facility administrators, recreational therapists and youths (among others) expressing their desire for basketball opportunities as well as their plans to provide adequate youth sports preparation, sportsmanship, training, practice and staff supervision.

Such arbitrary decisions tend to stifle staff and youth morale, inhibit good ideas from being expressed, increase youth's idle time, decrease healthy outlets, along with preventing youth privilege earning capacities.

Poor leadership in this manner can also potentially, inadvertently and indirectly lead to additional assaults and fights among adolescents unable to work off energy, pent up frustrations and / or earn privileges.





Needless to say, youths learning to get along with their peers in healthy competition or youths behaving in order to earn rewards and privileges daily for positive behavior are two features of adolescent development opportunities that should be contemplated within a 'Can Do' leadership model.

### Training

It appears that the basic staff training provided at DJJ is geared around safety and order as is presented by most juvenile correctional systems' initial orientation training programs.

However as such systems realize the importance and value of limiting room confinement / isolation / segregation for the true development and rehabilitation of its youths, staff require a significant amount of training in trauma, adolescent development theory, building positive youth relationships, appropriate role modeling, understanding the rationale and benefits behind incentives and reward systems versus discipline and punishment, listening and negotiation skills, the value of consistent positive communication, etc.

- The trauma training that I was invited and privileged to attend and that is mandatory for DJJ youth care staff was the best training I have participated in during my career -outstanding!! All staff should receive additional related training regarding trauma and its effect on youths along with the above adolescent development/relationship themes

### Discipline, Punishment (Santee, STAR, SRP) and Hearings

This area has been the Achilles' heel for DJJ since its entry into PbS. The four major outcomes that have principally affected DJJ's performance are: 1) the Use (Numbers) of Room Confinement, Isolation and/or Segregation; 2) the Average Duration of those; 3) and 4) the Use of Isolation and / or Segregation under 4 hours and 8 hours respectively.

These four outcomes represent 4 of the 30-32 (depending on whether they are Detention/Evaluation or Corrections site) Critical Outcomes Measures (COMs). Losing 4 COMs makes it almost impossible for a site to attain higher than Level 2 because a site cannot generally lose more than 5 of the COMs in comparison to the national PbS field.

The good news is that the Use of Room Confinement, Isolation and/or Segregation have decreased over time in relation to the rate *based on site's current population as well as to raw numbers*. This is and continues to be reduced - very impressive progress! This has occurred without any





apparent, significant reported staff concerns of greater danger and fear for them as well as for youths by using less Isolation / Segregation as a result of reduced isolation used.

Six (6) of the seven (7) PbS DJJ sites have *for the most part* dipped below the field average in usage and duration. This is an accomplishment that DJJ can certainly be proud of. This past data collection (October, 2011) was the first time that Birchwood dropped below the field average for the Average Duration of Room Confinement, Isolation and/or Segregation. However, because Birchwood was just below the field average for Outcome Order 9 (Average Duration), Outcome Measures Order 10 and 11 (Youth Released from Room Confinement, Isolation and/or Segregation within 4 and 8 hours respectively), Birchwood was lower than the field average (both outcomes that a site would want higher than the field.)

**Santee** - A number of campus leaders involved at Birchwood have done a most commendable job in working youths out of the Santee Segregation Unit once they regained control resulting in a lower average duration of Isolation / Segregation than the field.

- *John G. Richards averaged 68 hours (or nearly 3 days) of Room Confinement, Isolation and/or Segregation in October per use. This did not account for the unreported youths in STAR or SBP. Even with 68 Average hours, John G. Richards was still 3.6 times higher than the PbS field average. Again, the 68 Average Hours of Segregation could not be validated and was probably much higher!*

The youths interviewed at Santee were in control of their emotions as they have been in PbS visits to either Santee or SMU over the years. Most Department of Justice compliance findings require that a youth be released from Room Confinement, Isolation and/or Segregation once they have regained control and no longer pose an *immediate* threat to the safety of youths and staff alike.

Therefore, the current practice of holding youths at Santee longer than the time it takes for the youths to regain control, and they are no longer an imminent threat to the safety of themselves or others, would most likely be a violation according to most Department of Justice findings. This principle would also apply to the above mentioned room time in STAR and SBP.

**STAR** – apart from programming participation, youths in the STAR program spend a significant amount of time in their rooms that is not counted for PbS reporting. This particular time was not reported in October as well.



**SBP** - As observed in the 'Rounds', a weekly meeting with individual youths regarding recent behaviors, much of the discussion was focused on youths' negative behaviors in order to have youths understand and work on their 'strengths' toward avoiding such negative behaviors. Some youths were puzzled with this approach until a Social Worker present interpreted the discussion to youths with a more simple, youth oriented explanation.

According to the program description, if a youth misbehaves, he can receive room restriction for the day. If that occurred and does most likely happen or if youths are in their rooms w/o permission to leave for 15 minutes or longer at times during the day, those times were not tracked and/or reported.

### **Secure Units –SMU and Santee**

- Finally, SMU and Santee are difficult physical buildings and environments for any effective programming or rehabilitation to occur in.
- Santee and SMU unit characteristics : 1) both secure within the fence of the campus, 2) secured units in and of themselves, 3) further secured with separate locked caged wings, 4) have individual locked doors/cells for youths and 5) Santee: practice requires additional security of handcuffing and shackling youths when exiting out of their rooms.
- The units physically along with the multiple levels of security seem quite unnecessary, archaic, depressing and certainly not conducive toward youth growth and development. (They actually seem like they could hold the likes of most notorious adult fugitives and criminals.)

### **Hearings**

For some reason (*staff convenience?*) hearings occur Tuesdays-Thursdays with Mondays and Fridays as 'Administrative Days'. Hearings are also conducted through a secured door with a barred window barrier. Youths are on one side of the door with a Security Officer and the Hearings Officer on the other side of the door. This practice is disturbing and probably an unjust practice toward a fair, impartial hearing.

[Since the recent PbS visit, information was received indicating that the Hearings now occur Monday – Friday and the Hearing Officer will not use his/her locked door for protection unless the youth displays threatening behavior.]

The time assignments given are more reflective of an adult prison punishment model for poor behavior. That practice is not in the best interests of appropriate youth development and is not consistent with preparing youth for community re-entry.



Adolescent Development Theory and experience indicates that youths 'live for the moment', are impulsive and act out (sometimes violently) unreasonably when provoked. Youths generally regain control in relative short periods of time after an incident and are ready to move along. Their discipline (or punishment) ought to follow the same course. Dialoguing, processing behavior and events as well as resolving and mitigating issues are more suitable strategies for teaching youths more appropriate behaviors.

Extended isolation assignments are contrary to current advised practices even if youths have assigned days of isolation and segregation reduced.

Three youths confined at Santee during the PbS visit who allegedly assaulted another youth had been assigned 45-60 days for an incident they adamantly denied. Supposedly the incident happened in the gymnasium or in the adjacent locker room and was not witnessed by staff or other youth. Also, they weren't charged for two 2 days after the supposed incident occurred.

Was their hearing fair? Is that time appropriate? Was there an investigation? Was there a serious injury? Did the assigned staff supervise adequately? Was the assigned officer's supervisor reprimanded? Who was responsible? Where was the total accountability? Was the real problem youth or staff related or was it a combination of both????

### **Suicidal Ideation and/or Behavior**

Once staff have identified a particular youth as suicidal, whether the youth has demonstrated suicidal behavior or has expressed thoughts concerning suicide (ideation), the youth is sent to Segregation for a day or longer where they are supposedly continuously observed by a staff member monitoring a camera. Staff monitoring cameras are only human and cannot be counted on to safeguard an at risk youth for extended periods of time.

This practice is questionable and potentially dangerous as youths are in a locked room *without a staff member being at arm's length*. It also increases the total of segregation time.

Most important, the practice does not seem to safely correspond with proven research of youths in confinement who have successfully committed suicide while in room confinement.

### **Behavior Management: Levels, Points, Incentives and Rewards**

This is a vital area that is handled inconsistently from site to site. (Detention does not even have any such program, mistakenly believing that youth are not in the facility long enough -many, if not most of the better, detention sites have a system of points and/or levels.)





- A Behavior Management System that provides daily rewards/incentives for positive youth behavior is critical toward a positive culture.

The Level (or reward and recognition) system at DJJ is inconsistent overall, very limited and is generally determined by School or Clinical evaluation with few opportunities for other staff to provide valuable input. All disciplines interacting with youths ought to have the opportunity to share in youth evaluations toward this end where youths earn privileges and/or rewards for positive behavior on a daily basis.

As the DJJ culture changes and higher expectations are made of staff, the 'tools' of having incentives and rewards based on earning through good/positive behaviors are needed for their support. Staff who no longer have the 'easy' option and route of sending a youth to 'lockup' to be 'out of sight, out of mind' not only need to develop positive relationships, but they will also need the means (tools) of rewarding youths who display positive behaviors and peer leadership instead. A Behavior Management System needs to be creative and clearly understood by all staff and youth. To be effective such system ought to highlight Positive Youth Outcomes.

Unless there has been serious injury to staff or youth, youths should not be held in any of the categories of Room Confinement, Isolation or Segregation any longer than it takes them to calm down and no longer are a threat to the safety of themselves or others. Research shows that to do so otherwise greatly increase the chances for suicide and actually reinforces the dynamics related to misbehavior.

(Additional information for Behavior Management will be provided in the following Recommendation Section of this report along with related attached items in addendum.)

### **Community Involvement, Volunteers, Reintegration**

Community involvement and volunteerism at DJJ may be one of the best (if not the best) programs in the country and perhaps worldwide. It may be a national model.

Campus evening and weekend programs are staffed (some directed) by volunteers working in collaboration with security and/or vocational staff. Such examples recently observed: carpentry, woodworking, art, tiling and upholstery repair clearly had the undivided attention of the DJJ youths in attendance. Some youths expressed impressive (and realistic) plans for opening businesses that may be needed skills and trades in a difficult economy.

- According to the October 2010 Data Collection results, community reintegration efforts by DJJ have improved impressively. ISOs are more responsive to data input, to their assigned youths and their families as well as to their collaborative efforts in working





with DJJ holding facilities. It is unclear as to what stage of similar development Probation Officers (POs) are at.

- As mentioned, the work production and professionalism at the York Community Center was most impressive and a PbS visit highlight. One DJJ youth (York client) described his current situation as well as his services and supervision. He viewed this process as fair, meaningful and caring. He clearly felt that the relationship he had with his assigned worker was positive for him and his family. It appeared that his worker has been a positive role model in his life.

## Recommendations

### Positive Youth Outcomes

1. Develop a point and level system for daily youth evaluation, recognition and rewards/privileges.

One successful model allows for a youth to earn up to 100 points in a day - 7 days a week. All staff disciplines working with youths participate in awarding points for good, positive, expected behavior throughout the day (from wake up through bedtime).

This includes wake up and hygiene, transitions and movements, community meeting behavior and participation, recreation time, meals, chores, assigned work, sports, vocational activities, homework, all treatment requirements (corrections only), all programming, evening activities, bedtime hygiene and other, etc., etc., .....

- [Bonus points are awarded for extra chores, significant treatment accomplishments, positive peer leadership actions, etc.]

It is important that youths earn points for appropriate behaviors completed and not have points taken away.

Over time successful point achievement along with performance in programming and / or treatment (corrections) means greater freedoms and privileges within a facility structure. This is the level system youths can attain that gives them increasingly more desirable living statuses. There is an overlap with points however in that points are achieved daily while levels are achieved over a time period. Certainly in detention the time gap between levels has to be developed according to the average time youths are in the facility. Many facilities have a process where youths must build their case, apply and justify the reasons for higher level consideration and





achievement. Within a level system it is important not to take away all levels due to an instance of misbehavior. One level drop in such instance is preferred in a positive culture.

Establishing a host of daily rewards and incentives are necessary for such systems. Some examples are: late nights, extra phone calls, extra visits, special visits, extra food, extra snacks, personal use of video games, selected work assignments, pet therapy, pet care (dog, cat, lizard, fish, snakes, insects), agriculture club, flower and/or gardening, bicycle and / or scooter riding, minimal monetary/canteen earning allowance, TV programming, canteen privileges, staff and youth birthday celebrations, mealtime point reviews, honor room(s), honor dorms, campus camping, marathons, track and field events, celebratory barbeques, landscaping and campus beautification projects with maintenance staff, outside the fence athletic games and tournament participation, youth mentoring system (using ROTC youths?), internal campus pass walking system, building homes for humanity *outside* the fence, campus tournaments, access to unit refrigerator and /or microwave, supervised/unsupervised community passes, etc., etc....

- This development would be even more successful by incorporating the community in planning for support and participation.

2. Create a slogan associated with building Positive Youth Outcomes with a Four (4) positive youth comments to One (1) negative comment as a ratio goal.

*Some useful staff resources:*

**PbS Standards Caption on Levels:**

-“Facility has a behavior management system that relies on rewards and incentives. This system specifies how youth can earn daily and weekly rewards/points and the rewards youths can achieve through positive behavior and program participation.”

-“Facility has a level system based on youths’ progress and associated risk that increases youths’ freedom in the facility as well as their responsibility and





accountability.”

“ Level system is tied to an incentive-based behavior management and pass policy, as well as to reintegration plans, furloughs, home visits, and passes.”

#### **Related Addendum:**

(Note, despite the national focus on Positive Youth Outcomes and related behavior management, various strategies and literature are limited.)

- a. **Behavior Management Resource Guide** - draft by Susan Guarino-Ghezzi, Ph.D. and Carlo Morrissey, Ed.D. (attached).
- b. **Behavior Motivation Program**, Maine Division of Juvenile Services. \*Note: This has been updated considerably. Maine will soon forward their latest model when completed. I will forward once received (attached).
- c. **Comments on a Youth Merit and Sanction System**, JPA and Associates, Ltd. Justice Consultants. (attached)
- d. \* **Behavior Management System Manual**, City of Philadelphia, 01280 Department of Human Services, Division of Juvenile Justice Services, Philadelphia Youth Study Center. Many jurisdictions have found this to be an excellent resource (attached).

### **Isolation/Segregation/Room Confinement**

#### **PbS Standards Caption on Isolation:**

“Isolation is used to neutralize out-of-control behavior and redirect it into positive behavior and should not be used as punishment.”

1. Ensure that John G. Richards has the support and quality assurance oversight provided so that all instances of Isolation and/or Segregation along with number and types of restrains are reported accurately and consistently.
2. Follow related Department of Justice findings regarding isolation: *‘Juveniles may be isolated and locked in their rooms as an immediate response to out-of-control behavior that endangers the juvenile, other juveniles, or staff’.*
3. Phase out and close SMU (both programs) dispersing staff resources among Santee, John G. Richards and Birchwood and / or other placements to work on Positive Youth Outcomes.





4. Develop policy for limited Use of Santee or other Isolation / Segregation that restricts time assignments for most offenses. Provide clear direction, protocol and restrictions for all assigned Isolation and Segregation periods inclusive of those behaviors resulting in serious injury.
5. Consider other options for isolation instead of Santee; i.e., capital or community funding assistance to develop locked room(s) within existing dorms or other nearby options for refurbishing buildings.
6. Allow youths to circulate within Segregation Unit unless they present an immediate danger to the safety of themselves or others.
7. Discontinue practice of using mechanical restraints for youths coming out of Segregation Rooms unless they present a clear and present danger.
8. Develop additional innovative alternatives to 'lock-up'. (Some Security staff suggested that many instances of misbehavior could be resolved by walking with youths away from incidents and processing events - with such a beautiful campus that makes much sense). *Seek further alternatives from other staff.*
9. Increase staffing in Detention and Evaluation Units to impact a reduction in Assaults/Fights.

[While verifying Incident Reports, there appeared to be a number of presumably unproved attacks on youth within the residential section of the units. Despite this anecdotal observation, DJJ sites as an aggregate have experienced a reduction in the number of assaults/fights as well as in rates. The assaults reviewed involved a youth striking another unsuspecting youth by fists with a number of hard blows to youth's head before staff were able to intervene.]

[As observed during site tours, often there appeared to be one staff assigned to a residential unit of approximately 15-25 youths. This ratio in the residential unit areas can make it very difficult for one staff to know what specifically is going on among the population he/she is supervising.]





## Hearings

1. Train Hearing Officers in youth development principles as noted in training.
2. Provide mock experiences for staff in training to understand the negative and destructive impact of being treated as a youth charged and found guilty with facility offense(s) from the initial charge of offense(s), transport to Santee, experiencing the current Hearing process; spending 1-2 hours in isolation for impact example, being let out of cell during that isolation time in handcuffs and leg shackles to speak with someone and then being returned to the cell.
3. Require hearings to be heard 7 days per week ending staff convenience hearing schedule.
4. Incorporate efficient integration of youths back into population within Hearing Officers, unit management, clinical and security staff job descriptions. Evaluate associated success and expected performance in staff evaluation process.
5. Consider placing Hearings and Santee protocols under Legal for supervision, accountability, fairness and appropriate change.

## PbS Accountability

1. Require PbS Site Coordinators to provide weekly statistics and aggregate monthly on the Use and Average Duration of all Room Confinement, Segregation and Isolation; Assaults/Fights; Physical and Mechanical Restraints; and Injuries for EMT agenda incorporation.
2. Assign Legal to conduct periodic Quality Assurance reviews regarding the accuracy of the identified outcomes.
3. Direct Legal in conjunction with Research to compile aggregated data monthly, quarterly, semi-annually and annually for the above identified issues for: campus sites; Detention; and Evaluation Centers with site breakdowns.





## Clinical

1. Review protocol for suicidal behavior and ideation as related to use of Santee and Isolation / Segregation.
2. Assess current clinical schedule for evening and weekend staff assignments when clinical presence is needed.
3. Schedule clinical staff for evenings and weekends. A good practice is for staff to work at least one evening and one weekend day keeping in mind that youth are attending school Monday - Friday.
4. Require clinical staff to participate in all unit/site Administrative / PbS Meetings.
5. Assist in developing youth related training issues.

## Training

1. Provide significant basic orientation, On the Job Training (OJT) and in-service staff training in:
  - a. Positive staff / youth relationships
  - b. Appropriate role modeling
  - c. Trauma
  - d. Adolescent Development Theory
  - e. Positive Youth Outcomes
  - f. Interpersonal Skills
  - g. Negotiation and Listening Skills
  - h. Value of Youth Incentives, Rewards, Points and Level System
  - i. Teambuilding

### PbS Training Standards Caption:

"Staff training program includes adolescent development curriculum that features the value of positive over negative reinforcement in dealing with youths."

"The adolescent development





portion of staff training presents the negative repercussions and ineffectiveness of long-term isolation and the rationale for shorter brief isolation periods."

2. Administer testing on youth related issues for staff comprehension.
3. Link monthly staff reviews, annual staff evaluations and staff promotions with DJJ direction and care of youths

## Communication

1. Establish clear chain of command and communication at each location.
2. Develop Staff Meeting Requirements (minimum):
  - a. Weekly administrative/PbS team meetings with all disciplines participating,
  - b. Weekly discipline (function) meetings,
  - c. Weekly Shift Meetings
  - d. Daily shift briefings for each shift.
  - e. Monthly or quarterly all staff meetings
  - f. Submitted Monthly Meeting reports on meetings attendance, agendas and notes to Deputy Director's Office
3. Require 1-2 daily (7 days a week) youth community meetings at all PbS sites including security, clinical, other staff and / or community representatives. *(Consider allowing quiet conversation during mealtimes.)*
4. Encourage staff teamwork and cooperation among disciplines by singling out and praising staff daily from different disciplines for work in integrating Positive Staff Outcomes.
5. Submit notes and other documentation of ideas and feedback received by staff and youths in respective meetings for effectiveness to Deputy Director's Office.
6. Develop a staff recognition system statewide for those staff proven to promote and lead DJJ goals of Positive Youth Development and teamwork toward changing the culture.
7. Direct all disciplines to attend Site Administrative/PbS Team Meetings.



## Quality Assurance / Research

1. Develop standards for quality assurance review in PbS performance to ensure:
  - a. Effectiveness of communication through review of documentation and observation of meetings;
  - b. Teamwork and leadership development among staff and youth to include frequency of staff meetings,
  - c. Occurrence of daily youth community meetings,
  - d. Development of Positive Youth and Staff Outcomes inclusive of on-going Documentation,
  - e. Integration of direction toward a positive culture throughout DJJ and staff evaluation and promotion process.
  - f. Completeness and accuracy of reported data.
  - g. Replication of *appropriate, (timely)* youth representation and participation in staff meetings for organizational learning.
  - h. Efficacy of staff training program regarding youth related issues.
  - i. Enhancement of celebratory and recognition programs at each site of staff and youth for positive results.
2. Assign Team or Current Bureau to Quality Review, or
3. Develop Quality PbS Learning Organization Team
4. Research specific improvements in Outcome results in the aggregate for DJJ, by facility type and individual sites inclusive of raw numbers and rates.
5. Conduct longitudinal and incremental study of data results since DJJ began participation in PbS to demonstrate evolution of department culture change and improvement.

## Education

1. Require education component to follow PbS standards for testing and reporting.

### Related PbS standards Caption:

“Youths admitted during the assessment period receive math tests to determine grade level within the first school day after their admission to the facility.”

“Youths receive readings tests to determine grade level within the first





school day after their admission to the facility.”

“Percent of youths confined for over six months whose math scores increased between admission and discharge. (C)”

“Percent of youths confined for over six months whose reading scores increased between admission and discharge. (C)”

2. **Establish expectation for Educational component to attend staff team meetings at all locations.**