

**Restorative Practice Behavior Model Within Secure
Juvenile Detention Facility: King County Juvenile
Detention Center**

Leighla Webb

University of Washington

**Submitted in partial requirement for a Master of Arts in
Policy Studies**

Advisor: Wadiya Udell, Ph.D.

Second Reader: Keith Nitta, Ph.D.

Executive Summary:

A policy shift in King County, Washington to ban the use of solitary confinement has required restructuring of the way in which King County Juvenile Detention Center responds to unsafe, problem behaviors. The new restorative behavior management system introduced harm reduction practices to teach new positive behaviors, while also utilizing sanctions to reinforce accountability. This study utilizes behavior response data from King County Juvenile Detention Center, as part as their behavior management procedures. Data for this study included youth who have received more than one behavioral infraction (behavior response) (N)=106. Youth's initial and subsequent behavioral infractions within thirty days post behavior intervention (i.e., sanction, restorative or combination of both) were analyzed to examine a change in subsequent problem behavior post behavior intervention. The study found subsequent problem behaviors increased after behavior intervention for the lowest level behavioral infractions and reduced severity of high level behavioral infractions. Additionally, this study assessed which behavior interventions (i.e., sanctions, restorative, or combination of sanctions and restorative) were most effective in reducing the severity of subsequent behaviors. No differences were found between the behavior intervention practices in reducing youth's subsequent behaviors. Future studies should examine a longer period of time to examine if repeated exposure to behavior interventions reduce severity of problem behaviors by examining more than initial behaviors and subsequent behaviors.

Introduction: Purpose of Study

The justice system is restrictive by design, focusing on control and surveillance for the safety of the community. Secured juvenile detention facilities are faced with unique challenges of managing disruptive and unsafe behaviors, while also maintaining safety and security for both adults and youth. Such settings are given an opportunity to rehabilitate youth with problem behaviors, providing behavioral and emotional support to meet the needs of each youth prior to their release back into the community.

In Washington State, there are two ways youth are adjudicated, as a juvenile or as an adult. In the former cases, youth are under eighteen years of age and are held in a juvenile detention facility until they have been adjudicated for a charge. The juvenile is then transferred to a long-term facility, or prison to serve the remainder of their sentence. In cases where a juvenile is given a life sentence, youth are held as juveniles until twenty-one years of age, where they can then be transferred to an adult facility. The second way in which youth can be adjudicated in Washington State is by way of prosecutors petitioning the court to transfer the youth to adult court, thereby providing the adult court with jurisdiction. In 1994, the Youth Violence Reduction Act was passed by Washington State Legislature enacting an automatic decline or “auto decline,” of jurisdiction to the adult court for youth 16 and 17 years old charged with violent felonies. The subsequent result of this policy placed youth in adult detention facilities, which lacked developmentally appropriate behavior management systems to address youth with problem behaviors.

Historically, both adult and juvenile facilities in Washington State have taken a behavioral approach to managing problem behaviors that combine punitive and award-based strategies. Most behavioral models can be classified as a form of operant conditioning, which

involves rewarding acceptable or desired behavior and punishing undesirable behavior through situational feedback to promote learning and performance (Kazdin, 2001). An individual, through operant conditioning, begins to make association between a particular behavior and the reward or punishment. When punishment is present, the behavior is suppressed until punishment is no longer present (Skinner, 1938). As a result, punitive behavior models have largely been unsuccessful in making lasting change in reducing adjudicated youth problem behaviors and may lead to an increase in recidivism (Lipsey, 2009). Instead of ceasing engagement in problematic behaviors, youth attempt to avoid the punishment by not getting caught (Altschuler, 2008). In addition to punitive behaviors being ineffective, the use of solitary confinement or seclusion, in particular, as a means of behavior management for youth has been criticized both nationally and locally. Solitary confinement has been found to have lasting negative effects on youth. Research on adolescent brain development indicate continued growth until early twenties of the prefrontal cortex, which is responsible for decision making and regulating impulses. During such periods of growth, brains are malleable based on experience, and are therefore vulnerable to toxic experiences, such as solitary confinement. The American Academy of Child and Adolescent Psychiatry (2012) has raised concerns about the well-documented long-term mental health issues such as, depression, anxiety, and psychosis that arise even in short periods of isolation for youth (Grassian 2006, Mitchell, Varley 1990, Vasiliades 2005, Sedlak, McPherson 2010).

Unlike punitive behavior models, which have been found to be both ineffective and harmful for youth, positive behavior models have shown to enhance alternative thinking, problem solving, and self-regulation. Such skills have been found to persist after youth are released into the community (Nellis & Hooks Wayman, 2009). Positive behavior models, such as multi-tiered levels of support (MTSS), incentivized behavior, token economies, or reward

behavior models are all attempting to encourage positive behaviors by positive reinforcement. A popular positive behavior model based on operant conditioning and used by detention centers is a token economy system. Token economies target behaviors by reinforcement with tokens (or stars, points, etc.) which are exchanged for rewards. There is a long history of token economy systems being utilized as motivational tools in educational and rehabilitative settings, in addition to prison settings (e.g. Liebling, 2008; Jolivet, 2016; Jolivet et al., 2013; 2016; Kumm & Jolivet, 2017; Sanders et al., 2019; Sprague et al., 2020), psychiatric institutions (Kazdin, 1978, 182) and probation programs (U.S. Department of Justice, 2000).

In more recent years, detention facilities have incorporated restorative models to regulate behavior. Restorative practices in juvenile justice settings focus on rehabilitation, promote social-emotional growth, support positive behaviors and work to reduce harm by building accountability (Wilson et al. 2017). This alternate approach to punishment centers healing and repairing damage between offender, the victim and to the community. These practices aim to repair harm, decrease the offender's risk of recommitting problem behaviors, improve victims' willingness to forgive their offender and increase experience with the justice system (Wilson et al. 2007, Wong et al. 2016).

King County Juvenile Detention Center

King County Juvenile Detention Center (KCJDC) houses adjudicated youth up to 18 years of age, with an average population hovering around 40 securely housed youth daily in 2019 (King County Adult and Juvenile Detention: Detention and Alternatives Report, 2019). A series of events in the fall of 2017, resulted in an opportunity for policy change and restructuring of the way in which King County manages behavior of youth in secured detention. King County Ordinance 18637, which bans the use of solitary confinement for youth awaiting adjudication by

King County, was approved by King County Council in December 21, 2017 (Dembowski, Kohl-Welles, and Gosset, 2017). The ordinance prohibits King County Juvenile Detention Center to use cell confinement as a means of behavior management or for punitive purposes. While awaiting the approval of Ordinance 18637, King County Executive, Dow Constantine signed an Executive Order, accomplishing what Ordinance 18637 had failed to include; ordering all “auto-decline” youth (youth being adjudicated in adult court) in all King County adult facilities to be rehoused to King County Juvenile Detention Center (Constantine, 2017). As a result of policy change in the fall of 2017, the population of youth housed in secure detention in King County has changed.

In 2017, KCJDC only housed youth adjudicated in juvenile court with an average length of stay of 11.04 days (King County Detention Alternatives Report, 2018). KCJDC in 2018 continued to house youth adjudicated in juvenile court with an average length of stay of 12.44 days (King County Detention Alternatives Report, 2018). However, due to the King County Executive Order, KCJDC also housed long-term secure youth adjudicated with adult charges in Superior Court, as all youth under 18 in adult detention facilities were required to be held in juvenile facilities (Constantine, 2017). As a result, in 2018, the demographics of youth at KCJD shifted to include those adjudicated for more serious charges who have an average length of stay of 179.31 days (King County Detention Alternatives Report, 2018). The shift in youth demographics resulted in a need to change KCJDC behavior management system to maintain safety and security to meet the needs of the new youth population. A more robust behavioral incentive program became necessary to encourage positive behaviors for long-term housed youth, as well as more restorative behavior practices to manage problem behaviors. The present study intends to assess the impact of the new behavioral response system, specifically sanctions

and restorative or combination of sanctions and restorative practices, on youth problem behaviors. The study utilizes data from standard procedures regarding KCJDC behavior response practices.

Focus of Evaluation or Analysis

The subsequent change in youth with more severe charges and longer lengths of stay required a change in behavioral management system to meet the needs of current population of youth at KCJDC. The new behavior response system reworked existing behavior management systems to include more restorative practices and eliminating room confinement as a means of behavior management. KCJDC's new approach to behavior management aims to build resilience and support healing, with the goals of encouraging positive behaviors, decreasing unsafe behaviors and teaching new behaviors while also maintaining safety and security for both youth and adults.

Although this study focuses on methods of reducing problem behaviors, it is important to note that KCJDC's new behavior management system utilizes a mixture of incentives, sanctions, and restorative practices to hold youth accountable for both their positive and problem behaviors. In an effort to incentivize prosocial behaviors KCJDC uses a token economy system where youth earn the opportunity to spend on commissary and acquire various privileges to encourage positive behaviors. To address problem behaviors, youth who engage in unsafe or disruptive behaviors, are assigned a behavioral infraction which provides sanctions on their progression to the next level or even demoted from incentive level (see Table 1). When behavior infractions occur, detention officers refer to the Accountability Grid (see Table 2); a tiered level behavior response tool, to understand the appropriate response to youth's problem behaviors. The

accountability grid has a mix of sanctions, and restorative practices outlined to manage youth's problem behaviors.

A key change for managing behaviors; levels 1 through 4 (see Table 2 for list of behaviors) is the use of restoration hall replacing the practice of room confinement. Restoration hall is a housing unit staffed with a detention officer where the youth spend their free time programming and in some cases move into, it is not considered part of the general population. A youth with a level 1 behavioral infraction are not physically moved to restoration hall, but rather practice restorative harm reduction in their unit (see Table 2). A level 2 behavioral infraction is the first exposure to restoration hall, exposing the youth for unprogrammable hours (i.e. free time) for one day and spend all programming hours with their unit. If placed in restoration hall on a level 3 behavioral infraction, the youth are exposed to restoration hall for 2 days spending only their free time or nonprogramming hours in restoration hall, leaving the remainder of programming time with their living unit. In cases where a level 4 behavioral infraction is given, youth move in to restoration hall for 3 days where they are provided all of their programming, free time, and sleeping until they are released back in to their living unit. While in restoration hall, detention officers work with youth on understanding their problem behavior by identifying triggers, feelings, concerns, and their actions which accounted for their removal to restoration hall. One goal is to ensure youth understand what harm was created, who was affected and how they were affected while also providing alternative solutions for next time. Another goal of restoration hall is to make amends by showing accountability for their actions. Such restorative practices include; problem solve with staff/peer, apology plan, letter of accountability, behavior chain analysis, circle/group participation, skill building class, gang intervention training, personal development, life skills training, and long-term intervention plan.

KCJDC officers are in charge of managing and documenting youth's behaviors. In the case where a behavioral infraction needs to be utilized, detention officers fill the infraction out on paper and it's later entered into digital data tracking system. The form allows officers to use their discretion and provide autonomy when deciding which sanctions, or restorative practices should be implemented in the hopes to build more collaborative rapport with the youth.

Brief Overview of Evaluation/Analysis Procedures

This study is a secondary data analysis of KCJDC incident report data which is recorded as required by their behavior management procedures. The focus of this study is to understand the way in which KCJDC responds to problem behaviors, and what behavior intervention practices are utilized. The timeframe of data included in analysis is the onset of the new behavior response management system May 6th, 2019 through February 15th, 2020, prior to the move into the new Judge Patricia H. Clark Children and Family Justice Center to ensure a change in environment was not a factor. Data utilized for this study included youth who have received more than one behavioral infraction (behavior response) (N)=106. For these 106 youth, their initial behavioral infraction and their subsequent behavioral infraction within thirty days post behavior intervention (i.e., sanction, restorative or combination of both) were analyzed. The thirty-day time between initial behavioral infraction and subsequent behavioral infraction was utilized to ensure a gap in change in environment (release to community) was not a factor, ensuring youth maintained in KCJDC. As is often the case in detention settings, disruptive behaviors may escalate within a short period of time. In cases where youth received multiple infractions in one day, the higher-level infraction for that day was selected as their first behavior infraction. A data set for each initial behavioral infraction, levels 1 through level 4, were created and analysis was ran separately.

Descriptive analyses were conducted on all datasets levels 1 through 4 on all study variables, including the initial behavior, subsequent behavior and the behavior intervention categories. Both the initial and subsequent behaviors were operationalized on a scale of 1 through 4 (see Table 2). Behavior intervention categories include sanctions, restorative practice, or a combination of sanctions and restorative practices. Sanctions are defined as loss of incentive day, loss of extended bedtime, and MP3 probation. Restorative practices are defined as problem solve with staff, problem solve with peer, apology letter, and exposure to restoration hall. Combination is defined as a mix of sanctions and restorative practice.

Two-way mixed ANOVA analyses were performed to understand if subsequent behavioral infractions reduced in severity post behavior intervention and to examine whether a particular behavior intervention (i.e., sanctions, restorative or combination) was more effective than another in reducing the severity of youth's subsequent behavior.

Results

Level 1 behaviors and severity of subsequent behaviors

There were 27 youth with level 1 initial behavioral infractions. Of the 27 youth, the majority of youth had an increase in the severity of their subsequent infraction, as the mean post behavior intervention was 2.23. Whereas eight youth remained at level 1 after receiving a behavior intervention, 11 increased to level 2, two increased to level 3, and six increased to level 4. The within-subjects test showed that the difference between initial behavior and subsequent behavior following a behavior intervention was statistically significant, $F(1,24)=37.5$, $p<.001$. Youth whose first infraction was at level 1 had an increase in the severity of problem behaviors after receiving behavior intervention.

Level 1 initial behavior intervention practices

Twenty-seven youth had an initial behavioral infraction at level 1 with a subsequent infraction. Of those 27, 10 received a sanction, 8 received restorative practice, and 9 received a combination of sanction and restorative practice. Multivariate tests to assess differences in subsequent behavior by way of behavior intervention found no statistical difference between behavior interventions, $F(2,24)= 3.006$, $p=.068$. In other words, there were no differences between sanction, restorative practice, and combination practices on the severity of level 1 youth's subsequent problem behaviors.

Level 2 behaviors and severity of subsequent behaviors

There were 36 youth with level 2 initial behavioral infractions. Of the 36 youth, there was little difference in level of severity of subsequent behavioral infraction, as the mean post behavior intervention was 2.23. There were ten youth who decreased to a level 1 post behavior intervention, ten youth who remained at level 2, nine youth increase to level 3, and seven youth increased to level 4. The within-subjects test showed that this difference between initial behavior and subsequent behavior following behavior intervention was not statistically significant, $F(1,33)=2.4$, $p=.130$. Youth whose initial behavioral infraction was a level 2 did not have a statistically significant change in severity of problem behaviors after receiving behavior intervention.

Level 2 initial behavior intervention practices

Thirty-six youth had an initial behavioral infraction at level 2 with a subsequent infraction. Of those 36 youth, 10 received sanctions, 8 received restorative, and 9 received a combination of sanctions and restorative practices. Multivariate tests to assess differences in subsequent behavior by way of behavior intervention found no statistical difference between behavior

interventions, $F(1,33)=.133$, $p=.876$. Meaning, there is no differences between sanction, restorative, and combination practices on the severity of level 2 youth's subsequent problem behaviors.

Level 3 behaviors and severity of subsequent behaviors

There were 18 youth with level 3 initial behavioral infractions. Of the 18, a majority of the youth had a decrease in the severity of their subsequent behavioral infraction, as the mean post behavior intervention decrease to 2.3. Whereas, six decreased to level 1, seven decreased to level 2, four remained at level 3, and one increased to level 4 behavioral infraction. The within-subjects test showed that this difference between initial behavior and subsequent behavior following behavior intervention was statistically significant $F(1,15)=4.256$, $p=.057$. Youth whose initial behavioral infraction was a level 3 decreased in severity of problem behaviors after receiving behavior intervention.

Level 3 initial behavior intervention practices

Eighteen youth had an initial behavioral infraction at level 3 with a subsequent infraction. Of those 18 youth, 1 received sanctions, 8 received restorative, and 9 received a combination of sanctions and restorative. Multivariate tests to assess differences in subsequent behaviors by way of behavior intervention practices found no statistical difference between behavior interventions, $F(2,15)=.655$, $p=.534$. Therefore, there are no differences between sanctions, restorative and combination practices on the severity of level 3 youth's subsequent problem behaviors.

Level 4 behaviors and severity of subsequent behaviors

There were 25 youth with level 4 initial behavioral infractions with subsequent behaviors. Of the 25 youth, a majority had a decrease in severity of subsequent behavior infraction, as the mean post behavior intervention was 2.6. There were five youth who declined to a level 1 post behavior intervention, nine decreased to level 2, five decrease to level 3, and six remained at level 4. The within-subject test showed that this difference between initial behavior and subsequent behavior following behavior intervention was statistically significant, $F(1,23)=34.069, p<.001$. Youth whose initial behavioral infraction was a level 4 reduced severity of problem behaviors after receiving behavior intervention.

Level 4 initial behavior intervention practices

Twenty-five youth had an initial behavioral infraction at level 4 with a subsequent infraction. Of those 25, 0 received sanctions only, 18 received restorative, and 7 received a combination of sanctions and restorative. Multivariate tests to assess differences in subsequent behaviors by way of behavior intervention practices found no statistical difference between behavior interventions, $F(1,23)= 1.184, p=.288$. In other words, there is no differences between sanctions, restorative practices and combination practices on the severity of level 4 youth's subsequent problem behaviors.

Conclusions

The new restorative behavior management system was found to reduce the level of severity of subsequent problem behaviors for levels 3 and 4 only. For level 2 behaviors there was no difference, and for level 1 behaviors an adverse effect was found with subsequent behaviors increasing in severity. It's unclear why only levels 3 and 4 subsequent behavior reduced in severity, and why level 2 had no change. Given that youth at level 1 were at the lowest level or

behavioral infraction, and that we only included youth who had subsequent infractions, we failed to capture youth who may have decreased in subsequent problem behaviors. Therefore, level youth could only have either no change or an increase in problem behaviors.

Results assessing which behavior intervention practices (i.e., sanctions, restorative or combination) reduced the severity of youth's subsequent behavior found no behavior intervention was more effective in reducing subsequent behaviors for levels 1 through 4. The reduction of severity of levels 3 and 4 subsequent behaviors indicates that it does not matter which behavior intervention is given as long as one is provided. It is unclear why there's no difference between behavior interventions, however data indicated there is no uniformity to the way in which officers provide behavioral infractions. For example, level 1 behaviors had exposure to restorative interventions, including restoration hall, which are not required of level 1 behavioral infractions. Not adhering to the behavior management procedures could be counter-productive to the goals of the program by giving youth with more serious behavior interventions than not necessary.

Limitations

A limitation of this study was examining a limited timeframe of the first nine months of the new behavior management system, where officers were still learning the new system and the procedures in which to respond to problem behavior appropriately. Additionally, the thirty-day window between initial behavioral infraction and subsequent behavioral infraction could have excluded youth from this study who's subsequent behavioral infractions were more than thirty days. Utilizing a thirty-day window between initial behavioral infractions and subsequent behavioral infraction also provided a small sample size. Furthermore, limiting the data to only youth who had subsequent behavioral infractions resulted in excluding youth with only one

behavior intervention. Although this may have addressed the possibility of a lack of subsequent behavioral infractions being the result of youth being released, it prevented the examination of youth in detention who ceased to engage in problem behaviors post behavior intervention. It is possible for youth with only one behavior intervention that they ceased problem behaviors and behavioral infractions after exposure to one behavior intervention.

Recommendations

Future studies should be conducted once officers have become trained and practiced in the new behavior management system and procedures. An important consideration would be to include intake and release dates in the study so that youth who have more than thirty days between initial behavioral infraction and subsequent behavioral infraction, and youth with no behavioral infractions, can be included in the study. Furthermore, a study with a longer period of time could allow for an understanding if repeated exposure to behavior interventions reduced severity of problem behaviors. Additionally, a longer period of time could also provide a larger sample size for a deeper understanding of the behavior management system.

In the case of the new behavior management system, it is recommended to update the behavior intervention tracking to include all interventions outlined in Table 2. Currently the behavior management system tracking is missing many of the restorative practices provided in restoration hall, which if tracked could provide an understanding of which restorative interventions are successful in reducing severity of problem behaviors. Additionally, given the adverse effect of restorative practices on level 1 behaviors, failure to reduce severity of level 2 behaviors and no difference between behavioral interventions for all levels, it is recommended that staff are provided with more trainings in restorative practices. Additionally, it is recommended further examining facility-wide behavioral management systems to alleviate some

of the responsibility for the officers and include mental health and teacher staff. Facility-wide behavior management systems have been effective in improving staff and youth buy-in (Boden, Ennis, Allen, Williams, Dana, 2020) and impact facility culture and climate (Jolivette et al, 2018). This would provide autonomy to all staff to participate in encouraging and rewarding positive behaviors and managing problem behaviors.

Appendices

Table 1: Incentive Levels

Incentive Level	Progression Days	Bedtime	Privileges	Demotion
Sapphire	0 – 10	8:00	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Library •Recreation Activities •Sunday Shopping •Composition Book •Access to MP3 Player 	<p>Egregious Incidents: (Staff assault, security breach, pre-planned assaults, major escape attempt, etc.)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Drop to Sapphire, Day 0 <p>Serious Incidents: (Previously 4 or 6 shift Program Modifications)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Sapphire – drop to Day 0 •Diamond – drop to Sapphire, Day 0 •Silver – drop to Diamond, Day 11 •Gold – drop to Diamond, Day 11 w/ the option to apply to return to Gold Status upon becoming Silver <p>2nd fight within 30 days:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Drop to Sapphire, Day 0
Diamond	11 – 25	9:00	<p>All of the above plus:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Extended Bedtime •Discounted MP3 Player Rental Cost 	
Silver	26 - 76	10:00	<p>All of the above plus:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Game On Attendance •Extra Library Visit •Honor Level Achievement Ceremony •Discounted Sunday Shopping 	
Gold	77	10:00	<p>All of the above plus:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Additional Recreation Activities •Assigned gym shoes (don't have to share) •Large Bath Towel, Wash Cloth, Laundry Bag •Bi-weekly Take Out Meal 	

Table 2: Accountability Grid

Restoration Status	Infraction (level depends on severity)	Response	Loss of Free Time	Programming (Unit/Restoration Hall)
Level 1 (Previously 1-2 Shift Infractions)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Body Alteration ▪ Call Button Misuse ▪ School Removal ▪ Disruptive Behavior ▪ Minor Contraband ▪ Meal Misuse ▪ Minor Physical Altercation ▪ School Refusal 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Time Out (less than 30 mins) ▪ Not earning incentive day ▪ Loss of extended bedtime¹ ▪ Repeated violations (more than 3) will move to Level 2 Consequences 	Restorative Practice in Living Hall	Unit JDO may assign in unit activity to reflect on behavior and repair harm. Here are some ideas: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Apology Plan ▪ Problem Solving Plan ▪ Letter of Accountability
Level 2 (Previously 1-2 Shift Infractions)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Extortion ▪ Destruction of Property ▪ Security Checks ▪ Verbal Altercation ▪ School Removal w/criteria ▪ Meal Misuse ▪ Minor physical altercation 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ In Unit Accountability Sanction ▪ Time Out (less than 30 mins) ▪ Cooldown for up to 2 hours ▪ Not earning incentive day ▪ Sent to restoration hall for next programming period; returning for 8:00 bedtime 	1 Programming Day	Unit JDO may assign in unit activity to reflect on behavior and repair harm. Here are some ideas: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Apology Plan ▪ Problem Solving Plan ▪ Letter of Accountability ▪ Behavior Chain Analysis

¹ The usual bedtime is 8:00p.m.; as youth move up in levels, their bedtime can be extended to as late as 11:00p.m.

<p>Level 3 (Previously 4 Shift Infractions)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Breach of Security or Peace ▪ Gang Related Behavior ▪ Harassment/Inappropriate Language, Conduct ▪ Threats ▪ Manufacturing Contraband 	<p>Spend free time programming in Restoration Hall²; with potential to moving there on a case by case basis</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ First offense: Youth will lose one level – If no other infractions within 30 days, this offense will not be considered in future sanctions. ▪ Second offense: If the infraction occurs within 30 days of the first infraction, the youth in honor level will be demoted to Diamond and the non-honor level youth will be demoted to day 4 of the Sapphire Level ▪ Sent to restoration hall for next programming period; ▪ Return to assigned living hall for 8:00 bedtime 	<p>2 Programming Days</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ School and Gym with assigned living hall ➤ Needs Based Structured Activities <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Circle/Group Participation ▪ Skill building class ▪ Apology plan <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Behavior contract ○ Behavior chain analysis ○ Letter of apology ▪ Gang intervention training ▪ Personal development ▪ Life skills training
<p>Level 4 (Previously 5-6 Shift Infractions)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Arson ▪ Assault ▪ Assisting Suicide Attempts ▪ Destruction of Property ▪ Escape or Attempted Escape ▪ Flooding or Flooding Attempt ▪ Gang Related Assault ▪ Major Breach of Peace ▪ Major Contraband ▪ Possession of Drugs and/or Intoxicants ▪ Threats ▪ Use of Force 	<p>Move to Restoration Hall</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ First offense: Youth will lose one level – If no other infractions within 30 days, this offense will not be considered in future sanctions. ▪ Second offense: If the infraction occurs within 30 days of the first infraction, the youth in honor level will be demoted to Diamond and the non-honor level youth will be demoted to day 4 of the Sapphire Level 	<p>3 Programming Days</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ In Unit Transition School and Gym Time with RH ➤ Long-term intervention plan ➤ Risk Needs Responsivity Assessment ➤ Needs Based Programming <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Individual Sessions of Motivational Interviewing • Behavior Chain Analysis • Letter of Apology • Gang Intervention Training (if indicated) • Circle/Group Participation

² Restoration Hall is an alternative to room confinement as a program modification and will be located in a non-occupied housing unit with a JDO as needed.

References

- Dembowski, Kohl-Welles, and Gosset. (2017). *King County Signature Report Ordinance 18637*, Pub. L. No. 2017- 047 3.3
- Dow Constantine. (Nov. 2, 2017). *Executive Order Housing of Declined Juveniles*. Executive Order, JJS-8-1-EO, King County.
- Grassian, Stuart. (2006) Psychiatric Effects of Solitary Confinement. *Journal of Law and Policy*. 325-383.
- Jolivet, K., Sprague, J., Swoszowski, N., McIntosh, K., Sanders, S. (2020). FW-PBIS Framework Implementation and Facility Climate Perspectives Through the Lens of Youth in Secure Juvenile Facilities: A Pilot Study. *Hammill Institute on Disabilities*. Vol. 41 (2), 99-110.
- Jolivet, K. (2016). Multi-tiered systems of support in residential juvenile facilities. *The National Technical Assistance Center for the Education of Neglected or Delinquent Children and Youth*. <https://neglected-delinquent.ed.gov/sites/default/files/NDTAC-IssueBrief-508.pdf>
- Jolivet, K., Sprague, J., Swoszowski, N., McIntosh, K., Sanders, S. (2020). Staff and youth buy-in ideas for initial and sustainable facility-wide positive behavior intervention and supports implementation within residential and juvenile facilities. *Hammill Institute on Disabilities*. Vol. 41 (2), 88-98.
- Jolivet, K., Kimball, K.A., Boden, L.J., Sprague, J. R. (2016). The utility of a multi-tiered behavioral system in juvenile corrections: The positive behavior interventions and supports (PBIS) framework. *Corrections Today*, 78, 42-47.
- Jolivet, K., Swoszowski, N. C., R. P. (2013). PBIS as prevention for high-risk youth in alternative education, residential, and juvenile justice settings. *Education and Treatment of Children*, 36, 1-2.
- “Juvenile Solitary Confinement as a Form of Child Abuse.” *The Journal of the American Academy of Psychiatry and the Law*, vol. 43, 2017, pp. 350–57. <http://jaapl.org/content/jaapl/45/3/350.full.pdf>
- Youth Violence Reduction Act*. RCW 9.94A, 1994.
- Kazdin, AE. (1978) *History of Behavior Modification: Experimental Foundations of Contemporary Research*. Baltimore, MD: University Park Press.
- Kazdin, A. E. (2001). *Behavior modification in applied settings*. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.
- King County Department of Adult & Juvenile Detention. (2018). *King County Statistical Reports*, 2018, www.kingcounty.gov/~media/courts/detention/documents/2018-12-kc-dar.ashx?la=en.
- Kumm, S. A., & Jolivet, K. (2017). *Facility-wide PBIS implementation as viewed by roundtable participants and from the field*. National Technical Assistance Center on Positive Behavior Interventions and Supports. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/326522433_Facilitywide_PBIS_Implementation_as_Viewed_by_Roundtable_Participants_and_From_the_Field
- Liebling, A. (2008) Incentives and earned privileges revisited: Fairness, discretion, and the quality of prison life. *Journal of Scandinavian Studies in Criminology and Crime Prevention* 9(1): 25–41.
- Lipsey, M., Wilson, D., & Cothorn, L. (2000). Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, *Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention* (2000). Retrieved From <https://www.ncjrs.gov/pdffiles1/ojjdp/181201.pdf>

- Mitchell, Jeff, M.D. & Varley, Christopher, M.D. (March 1990) Isolation and Restraint in Juvenile Correctional Facilities. *Journal of American Academy of Child Adolescent Psychiatry*, 29:2.
- Nellis, A., & Hooks Wayman, R. H. (2009, Fall). *Back on track: Theory, research, and promising approaches for youth reentry*. Washington, DC: Youth Reentry Task Force of the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Coalition.
- Sanders, S., Royer, D., Kumm, S., & Jolivette, K. (2019). *Facility-wide PBIS implementation: Possible barriers and potential solutions for six salient topics as viewed by roundtable participants and facilitators*. National Technical Assistance Center on Positive Behavior Interventions and Supports. [https:// www.pbis.org/resource/facility-wide-pbis-implementationpossible-barriers-and-potential-solutions-for-six-salient-topics-as-viewed-by-roundtable-participants-and-facilitators](https://www.pbis.org/resource/facility-wide-pbis-implementationpossible-barriers-and-potential-solutions-for-six-salient-topics-as-viewed-by-roundtable-participants-and-facilitators)
- Sedlak, Andrea, McPherson, Carla. (May 2010) Conditions of Confinement. *OJJDP*.
- Sprague, J., Jolivette, K., Boden, L. J., & Wang, E. (2020). Implementing Facility-Wide Positive Behavior Interventions and Supports in Secure Juvenile Correction Settings: Results of an Evaluation Study. *Remedial and Special Education*, 41(2), 70-79. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0741932519897135>
- Skinner, B. F. (1953). *Science of human behavior*. New York, NY: Macmillan
- Vasiliades, Elizabeth. (2005). Solitary Confinement and International Human Rights: Why the U.S. Prison System Fails Global Standards. *American University International Law Review* 21, no. 1: 71-99
- Wilson, R.J., McWhinnie, A., Picheca, J.E., Prinzo, M. & Cortoni, F. (2007) Circles of Support and Accountability: Engaging community volunteers in the management of high-risk sex offenders. *The Howard Journal*, 46(1), 1-15
- Wong, Jennifer & Bouchard, Jessica & Gravel, Jason & Bouchard, Martin & Morselli, Carlo. (2016). Can At-Risk Youth Be Diverted From Crime?: A Meta-Analysis of Restorative Diversion Programs. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*. 43.