



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 and 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 and can be accessed by visiting the [DBHDS Behavioral Services website](#).

Contents: This document contains the following: 1) information on weighted scoring and a basic outline of the Scoring Instructions Guide (pages 1-2); 2) the Scoring Instructions Guide with scoring logic for each content area and definitions for each element (pages 2-15); 3) the review, scoring, training, interscorer reliability, feedback, and revision processes (pages 15-17); 4) information on future updates to the BSPARI (page 17); and 5) other resources and literature on quality assurance in FBA and BSP (page. 18).

Weighted scoring and outline of Scoring Instructions Guide: There are 13 total BSP content areas included on the BSPARI. Please note, some elements on the BSPARI are not included in the scoring logic or are only included in scoring based on presence of specific information in the plan (e.g., some elements of Safety & Crisis Guidelines are required only if restrictive procedures are included in the plan itself). A weighted scoring system is utilized to determine adherence of each minimum BSP content area and related minimum elements to the Practice Guidelines, and a behavior support plan (with FBA, graphs, and training documentation) is deemed to be adequate in its adherence if it scores at least 34 out of 40 points. DBHDS believes that all elements of the updated regulations for therapeutic behavioral consultation 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 18, 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 offers the scoring instructions criteria for each element; and 3) the third column provides scoring logic and possible permutations for the content area. 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”, “if known”, or may only be included in the scoring logic based on presence of other information in the plan (e.g., restrictive procedure such as restraint). The areas noted in the Practice Guidelines as “if applicable” or “if known” are important for clinicians 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. It also may not be possible for DBHDS reviewers to determine if the clinician 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, it may not be possible for a DBHDS reviewer to determine if the authoring clinician had knowledge of the history of previous behavioral services and their impact on behavior.

Scoring Instructions Guide

Content area: Demographics

Content area & minimum required elements from [regulations](#) and/or [Practice Guidelines](#). Scoring instructions criteria for element (Note: unless otherwise indicated, an x constitutes absence of what is listed as criteria for a check).

- **Individual’s name:** check = Individual's first name (or preferred name) and last name are included
- **D.O.B. (or age):** check = Individual's D.O.B. and/or age are included
- **Gender identification:** check = Gender identification is noted via pronouns or specifically stated.
- **Medical/behavioral health diagnostic information:** check = One or more medical/behavioral health diagnosis is included.
- **Current living situation & location where BSP is being implemented:** check = The individual's home is named, described, or address provided. If the BSP is being implemented in a place that is not the individual's home, documentation includes a name, description, or address of that location or locations.
- **Medicaid ID:** check = The individual's Medicaid ID number is included
- **Medications (if known):** check = Medications are included in and/or information is provided regarding where this information can be found (e.g., MAR).
- **Legal status:** check = Information is provided regarding who has the legal responsibility to make the individual's decisions. This may be the person receiving services or another individual such as a guardian.

- **Date of initial plan and revisions (and nature of revisions):** check = The first date of the behavior support plan or assessment is listed; if applicable, dates of revisions are listed, and information is provided in the BSP about the revision(s). Revision information may also be garnered from graphical displays.
- **Authoring clinician's name/credentials/contact information:** check = The name of the clinician overseeing the plan is listed, their credential(s) is listed, and contact information (e.g., phone, fax, email, physical address, and/or website with contact information) is provided.

Weighted scoring logic for Demographics content area:

- **1 point** = Minimally includes individual's name, medical/behavioral health diagnostic information, legal status, date of initial plan & revisions (and nature of revisions), & authoring clinician's name/credentials/contact info
- **0 points** = is missing any of the following: individual's name, medical/behavioral health diagnostic information, legal status, date of initial plan & revisions (and nature of revisions), & authoring clinician's name/credentials/contact info

Note: Demographic information may be located in other documentation and not on the BSP itself (e.g., in the Waiver Management System (WaMS), Part Five: Plan for Supports, etc.)

Content area: History and Rationale

Content area & minimum required elements from regulations and/or Practice Guidelines. Scoring instructions criteria for element (Note: unless otherwise indicated, an x constitutes absence of what is listed as criteria for a check).

- **Current and/or relevant historical info about this person and their life:** check = Current and/or historical information about the person and their life is provided
- **The reason, rationale for BSP/necessity for intervention:** check = The reason, rationale, necessity for behavioral intervention is listed
- **Dangerous behavior:** topographies, intensities, risks and/or negative outcomes: check = The topography, intensity, risks associated with/and or negative outcomes is provided for at least one challenging behavior in the plan
- **Risk and benefits related to prescribed behavioral programming:** check = A risk benefit statement, risk benefit analysis, and/or signed attestation that risks/benefits have been reviewed with the person who is consenting to the plan is listed
- **Known history of previous services and impact on behavior:** check = Information on previous service(s) relevant to behavior is included, along with impact on behavior or outcome of service(s). If not provided, "unknown" or other similar indication is provided about this history

- **Trauma history:** check = Includes description(s) of an event, series of events, or set of circumstances experienced by the individual that is physically or emotionally harmful or life threatening. Or, trauma history/considerations are noted as "unknown", "not applicable" or other similar indication is provided that indicates this information is not available or relevant to this person.

Weighted scoring logic for History and Rationale content area:

- **2 points** = 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, intensities, risks, and/or negative outcomes); and includes the risks and benefits related to prescribed behavioral programming
- **1 point** = 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)
- **0 points** = Is missing any one of these elements: history or person and their life, rationale for BSP, and/or dangerous behavior(s) (e.g., topographies, intensities, risks, and/or negative outcomes)

Content area: Person-Centered Information

Content area & minimum required elements from regulations and/or Practice Guidelines. Scoring instructions criteria for element (Note: unless otherwise indicated, an x constitutes absence of what is listed as criteria for a check).

- **Individual's communication modality:** check = Includes information about how the person communicates with others
- **Routines/current schedule:** check = Includes information on the person's schedule and/or routines
- **Individual and guardian's participation:** check = Includes information about how the individual (and guardian, if guardian is required to consent to plan), participated in assessment and/or plan development
- **What activities are enjoyed and sought by the individual:** check = Includes information about stimuli that are known to be or hypothesized to be preferred/enjoyed by the individual (e.g., stimuli that may function as reinforcement). May not necessarily include the specific methods used (e.g., preference assessment) to determine these stimuli.
- **Preference assessment information/results:** check = Includes information about both the type and results of preference assessment(s) conducted to determine what may function as reinforcement for the individual
- **Individual's strengths and positive contributions:** check = Includes information about what the person is good at, and/or behaviors the person engages in that are valued by others.
- **Particular aversions/dislikes:** check = Includes information about what the person does not like or may not like/find to be aversive, unpleasant, noxious

- **Who in the individual's life is especially preferred:** check = Notes who in the person's life is preferred by the person and/or who the person enjoys being with. If this is not applicable to the person, notes that the person does not have preferred people in their life
- **Other cultural/heritage considerations:** check = Includes information about race, socioeconomic class, religion, sexual orientation, ethnicity, nationality, and geographic context (beyond the address of where services are occurring). Or, cultural/heritage considerations are noted as "unknown", "not applicable" or other similar indication is provided that indicates this information is not available or relevant to this person.

Weighted scoring logic for Person-Centered Information content area:

- **3 points** = All minimum elements are addressed, with what activities are enjoyed and sought by the individual and preference assessment being interchangeable at this time
- **2 points** = 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 & guardian's participation
- **1 point** = Minimally includes each of the following: communication modality, preference assessment and/or what activities are enjoyed and sought by the individual, and routines/schedule
- **0 points** = 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

Content area: Functional Behavior Assessment (FBA)

Content area & minimum required elements from regulations and/or Practice Guidelines. Scoring instructions criteria for element (Note: unless otherwise indicated, an x constitutes absence of what is listed as criteria for a check).

- **The FBA methods include descriptive assessment and/or functional analysis (FA):** check = Descriptive assessment and/or functional analysis methods were used in the FBA, conducted, or overseen by a qualified clinician
- **The FBA methods used are described:** check = The method(s) for FBA are listed
- **FBA conducted in location where services are occurring:** check = The location of where the FBA was conducted is the same for at least 1 setting for where services are occurring
- **Setting events/motivating operations:** check = Setting event(s)/motivating operation(s) are generally listed or listed specifically for at least 1 behavior targeted for decrease. May be noted specifically as "setting events" or the omnibus term "motivating operations" (or EO's/AO's) or may be counted as present if unconditioned motivating operations are listed as antecedents.
- **Antecedents:** check = The antecedents to challenging behavior are generally listed, or specifically listed for at least 1 behavior targeted for decrease

- **Consequences:** check = The maintaining consequence(s) to challenging behavior are generally listed, or specifically listed for at least 1 behavior targeted for decrease
- **Data results and/or graphical displays:** check = A graph or raw data are provided from at least one method from the FBA, and/or baseline data are provided
- **FBA is current (since most recent shared planning meeting or statement of recent validity of function):** check = The FBA is no more than 1 year older than the date of the ISP, or there is a statement that indicates validity of the FBA that is more than 1 year old
- **Non-operant conditions that influence behavior:** check = Includes information about genetic abnormalities, medical conditions, and/or psychiatric or neurological dysfunctions specifically as contributors to challenging behavior (e.g., Prader-Willi, polydipsia, epilepsy). Additionally, respondents explicitly labeled as related to challenging behavior are included. Or, non-operant conditions are noted as "unknown", "not applicable" or other similar indication is provided that indicates this information is not available or relevant to this person.

Weighted scoring logic for Function Behavior Assessment content area:

- **8 points** = Uses descriptive or functional analysis (FA) methods, and all additional required 7 elements present
- **7 points** = Uses descriptive or FA methods, and 6 out of 7 additional required elements present
- **6 points** = Uses descriptive or FA methods, and 5 out of 7 additional required elements present
- **5 points** = Uses descriptive or FA methods and 4 out of 7 additional required elements present
- **4 points** = Uses descriptive or FA methods and 3 out of 7 additional required elements present
- **3 points** = Uses descriptive or FA methods and 2 out of 7 additional required elements present
- **2 points** = Uses descriptive or FA methods and 1 out of 7 additional required elements present
- **1 point** = Only indirect assessment methods used, and contains at least 1 of the other required elements
- **0 points** = FBA content section absent, or FBA does not consist of any accepted FBA tools/methods

Content area: Hypothesized Functions

Content area & minimum required elements from regulations and/or Practice Guidelines. Scoring instructions criteria for element (Note: unless otherwise indicated, an x constitutes absence of what is listed as criteria for a check).

- **Hypothesized functions listed:** check = For all behaviors targeted for decrease in the BSP, hypothesized function(s) listed
- **Functions match to accepted operant functions:** check = For all behaviors with a hypothesized function, the hypothesized functions are accepted operant functions

Weighted scoring logic for Hypothesized Functions content area:

- **2 points** = All minimum elements addressed for all behaviors
- **1 point** = 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)
- **0 points** = 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

Content area: Behaviors Targeted for Decrease

Content area & minimum required elements from regulations and/or Practice Guidelines. Scoring instructions criteria for element (Note: unless otherwise indicated, an x constitutes absence of what is listed as criteria for a check).

- **Lists each behavior targeted for decrease:** check = Provides a name for each behavior targeted for decrease (e.g., Aggression, Property Destruction).
X = There are no names listed for behaviors targeted for decrease, or there are no behaviors targeted for decrease in the BSP.
- **Operational definition:** check = For each behavior targeted for decrease, an operational definition is included.
- **Method of measurement:** check = For each behavior targeted for decrease, a method of measurement is included. If not explicitly listed in the section of the BSP with behaviors for decrease, the method of measurement is included on the graph(s) for each behavior targeted for decrease.
- **Inclusion in definition of examples and/or non-examples:** check = At least one behavioral definition for behaviors targeted for decrease includes an example and/or a non-example

Weighted scoring logic for Behaviors Targeted for Decrease content area:

- **3 points** = 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
- **2 points** = 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
- **1 point** = 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).

- **0 points** = 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.

Content area: Behaviors Targeted for Increase

Content area & minimum required elements from regulations and/or Practice Guidelines. Scoring instructions criteria for element (Note: unless otherwise indicated, an x constitutes absence of what is listed as criteria for a check).

- **Lists each behavior targeted for increase:** check = Provides a name for each behavior targeted for increase (e.g., Mands for attention, Request break).
- **Operational definition:** check = For each behavior targeted for increase, an operational definition is included.
- **Method of measurement:** check = For each behavior targeted for increase, a method of measurement is included. If not explicitly listed in the section of the BSP with behaviors for increase, the method of measurement is included on the graph(s) for each behavior targeted for increase.
- **Inclusion in definition of examples and/or non-examples:** check = At least one behavioral definition for behaviors targeted for increase includes an example and/or a non-example

Weighted scoring logic for Behaviors Targeted for Increase content area:

- **3 points** = 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
- **2 points** = 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
- **1 point** = 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 any behavioral definitions.
- **0 points** = 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.

Content area: Antecedent Interventions

Content area & minimum required elements from regulations and/or Practice Guidelines. Scoring instructions criteria for element (Note: unless otherwise indicated, an x constitutes absence of what is listed as criteria for a check).

- **Tactics promote environment in which functionally equivalent replacement behavior (and/or desirable behavior) acquisition will occur:** check = Includes information about how to set up the environment to promote at least 1 functionally equivalent replacement

behavior (or desirable behavior) that is targeted for acquisition in the plan. May itemize how to set up the environment to foster functionally equivalent replacement behavior (and/or desirable behavior) for each behavior targeted for increase, or may have general information not specifically tied to each behavior targeted for increase

- **Tactics that address setting events and/or MO's: check** = The plan provides information about how to abate challenging behavior for at least one setting event/MO as outlined in the FBA. Or, if this information was not listed in the FBA, the plan includes information about how to abate challenging behavior based on the hypothesized function(s) listed in the FBA for at least one behavioral function.
- **Tactics/de-escalation strategies that address immediate antecedents and/or precursors: check** = The plan provides at least one tactic/strategy that addresses at least one immediate antecedent (or precursor) as listed from the FBA
- **Strategies that describe stimuli that should or should not be present: check** = The plan provides information about stimuli that should be present or should not be present as an antecedent modification to reduce the likelihood that challenging behavior will occur, or to increase the likelihood that desirable behavior will occur

Weighted scoring logic for Antecedent Interventions content area:

- **4 points** = All minimum elements addressed
- **3 points** = Includes 3 of 4 minimum elements
- **2 points** = Includes 2 of 4 minimum elements
- **1 point** = Includes 1 of 4 minimum elements
- **0 points** = Section not addressed or missing all 4 elements

Content area: Consequence Interventions

Content area & minimum required elements from regulations and/or Practice Guidelines. Scoring instructions criteria for element (Note: unless otherwise indicated, an x constitutes absence of what is listed as criteria for a check).

- **Tactics incorporate a function-based treatment approach for challenging behavior: check** = As derived from the FBA, a function-based treatment is incorporated for at least 1 challenging behavior
- **Tactics use the least-restrictive approach for challenging behavior: check** = No restrictions, restraint, exclusionary time out, or programmed punishment are in the plan. If these are present, rationale is provided that outlines the necessity of such approaches
- **Tactics minimize reinforcement for challenging behavior(s): check** = Reinforcers for challenging behavior as outlined in the FBA are not provided contingent on challenging behavior. If the reinforcer is provided, it is clear why it is provided (e.g., reinforcement of precursor behavior)

- **Inclusion of preferences/reinforcers, schedule of reinforcement, and/or expectations for learning environment/materials/teaching conditions to increase desired behavior:** check = Schedule of reinforcement is included for at least 1 desirable behavior, or preferences/reinforcers are programmed in to promote desired behavior, or information about setting up learning environment/materials/teaching conditions to increase desired behavior is included

Weighted scoring logic for Antecedent Interventions content area:

- **4 points** = All minimum elements addressed
- **3 points** = Includes 3 of 4 minimum elements
- **2 points** = Includes 2 of 4 minimum elements
- **1 point** = Includes 1 of 4 minimum elements
- **0 points** = Section not addressed or missing all 4 elements

Content area: Safety & Crisis Guidelines

Content area & minimum required elements from regulations and/or Practice Guidelines. Scoring instructions criteria for element (Note: unless otherwise indicated, an x constitutes absence of what is listed as criteria for a check).

- **Safety gear outlined:** check = Safety gear is noted in the plan, which may include but is not limited to protective gear, equipment used in vehicles or in the community to ensure safety of person and others, and/or phones/GPS locators. Or, the plan notes that this is not applicable or other similar wording that indicates that there is no equipment that supporters need to ensure safety of the person and others. The reviewer does not make a judgement on the necessity of safety gear in scoring. X = There is no safety gear included in the plan, or there is no wording in the plan that indicates safety gear is not applicable. The reviewer does not make a judgement on the necessity of safety gear in scoring.
- **Crisis protocol or where to obtain the protocol:** check = Includes information about an individualized crisis/safety protocol for this person (or where to obtain the protocol). Or, includes specific crisis protocol/training program that supporters are trained in. Or, indicates that this is not applicable or other similar wording that indicates that there is no crisis protocol specific to this person or not specific crisis protocol/training program that supporters are trained in. The reviewer does not make a judgement on the necessity of crisis protocol in scoring. X = There is no information in the plan about individualized crisis/safety protocol for this person, no information about a crisis protocol/training program supporters are trained in, or no indication that this is not applicable to this person. The reviewer does not make a judgement on the necessity of crisis protocol in scoring.
- **Describes supports needed to ensure safety of person and others:** check = Includes information about how to ensure safety of person and others when challenging behavior occurs for at least one challenging behavior. If an individualized crisis/safety protocol is included for this person (or information about where to obtain the protocol is provided), score a check. Or, indicates that this is not applicable to

this person or other similar wording that indicates there is no support needed to ensure the safety of the person and others.

X = There is no information in the plan about supports needed to ensure safety of person and others. If "crisis protocol or where to obtain the protocol" is scored as X, this is also scored as X. The reviewer does not make a judgement on the supports needed to ensure safety of person or others.

- **If restraint or time out is included, notes debriefing procedures:** check = If restraint or time out is included as defined in 12VAC35-115-110, notes debriefing procedures. X = Restraint or time out is included as defined in 12VAC35-115-110 and there is no information about debriefing afterward. N/A = There is no restraint or time out as defined in 12VAC35-115-110 included in the BSP.
- **If restraint or time out is included, notes criteria for release or refers to provider policy and procedures:** check = If restraint or time out is included as defined in 12VAC35-115-110, provides information about criteria for release or refers to provider's policies and procedures. X = Restraint or time out is included as defined in 12VAC35-115-110 and there is no information about criteria for release or reference to provider's policies and procedures. N/A = There is no restraint or time out as defined in 12VAC35-115-110 included in the BSP.

Weighted scoring logic for Safety & Crisis Guidelines content area:

- **1 point** = Describes supports needed to ensure safety of person and others. If restraint and/or time out are included, includes restraint/time out criteria (or refers to provider policies and procedures) and debriefing procedures.
- **0 points** = No information is included anywhere in the plan about how to ensure the safety of the person and others, and/or restraint and/or time out are included in the plan but debriefing procedures and/or criteria for release (or reference of provider policy and procedures) are missing.

Content area: Plan for Training

Content area & minimum required elements from regulations and/or Practice Guidelines. Scoring instructions criteria for element (Note: unless otherwise indicated, an x constitutes absence of what is listed as criteria for a check).

- **Outlines a plan for training staff, family, or other supporters that notes clinician obtaining and reviewing data:** check = A training plan for supporters is included. Information is also provided about the clinician obtaining data for review.
- **Plan incorporates a BST approach:** check = Plan specifically notes behavior skills training approach to training, or includes information about training approach that includes the four core tenets of BST (instruction, modeling, rehearsal, feedback)
- **Training record (or plan for training based on authorization type) is available in WaMS related to recent review period:** check = If the plan is in "annual" status, there is evidence that training has been completed (e.g. session note, training sign in/out log, dates of training and topic, etc.). If the plan is in secondary status, a check is provided if a plan for training is also scored as a check

Weighted scoring logic for Plan for Training content area:

- **3 points** = All minimum elements addressed
- **2 points** = Has 2 out of 3 elements, one of which must be use of BST type approach to training
- **1 point** = Has at least 1 element present, but lacks a BST type approach to training
- **0 points** = 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)

Note: If the authorization type is a secondary authorization and training has not yet occurred, score this section as if training record is present

Content area: Appropriate Signatures

Content area & minimum required elements from regulations and/or Practice Guidelines. Scoring instructions criteria for element (Note: unless otherwise indicated, an x constitutes absence of what is listed as criteria for a check).

- **Plan is signed by individual or legal guardian:** check = Plan is signed by the person that has the legal authority to consent to the plan
- **Signature for consent includes date:** check = The signature for consent is dated
- **Contact information for guardian or individual is present:** check = The contact information for the person who has the legal authority consent to the plan is included (e.g., phone number, email, physical address)
- **If a restrictive component is included, updated consent is included and coincides with when restriction began:** check = A restriction is present as outlined in 12VAC35-115-100 and 12VAC35-115-110 and the signed consent is dated within 45 days, prior or after, the date of the restriction commencing. If a restriction is present and date of restriction commencing is not included, signed consent is dated within 45 days, prior or after, the date of the current BSP. X = A restriction is present as outlined in 12VAC35-115-100 and 12VAC35-115-110 and there is no signed consent. Or, a restriction is present, but the signed consent is more than 45 days, prior or after, the date of the restriction commencing. N/A = No restrictions present as outlined in 12VAC35-115-100 and 12VAC35-115-110

Weighted scoring logic for Plan for Training content area:

- **1 point** = Minimally, the plan is signed and dated by the person that has the legal authority to consent to the plan.
- **0 points** = Section missing entirely, or BSP is not signed and dated by person that has legal authority to consent to the plan. Zero points will be provided if a restrictive procedure is included but the signature and date by the individual (or their decision maker) does not coincide within 45 days prior or after the date of the current BSP.

Note: contact information for guardian or individual may be included in other documentation outside of the BSP (e.g., in ISP, WaMS, Part Five: Plan for Supports, etc.)

Content area: Appropriate Signatures

Content area & minimum required elements from regulations and/or Practice Guidelines. Scoring instructions criteria for element (Note: unless otherwise indicated, an x constitutes absence of what is listed as criteria for a check).

- **Visual display (e.g., graphs) for each behavior targeted in the BSP, to include behaviors for decrease and increase:** Double check = Every behavior targeted for decrease and increase is present on a graph. Must include behaviors for increase and decrease, even if only behaviors for decrease are formally targeted.
single check = Only some behaviors are present on a graph. E.g., only some of the behaviors targeted for decrease are included.
X = There are no graphs present
- **Summary statement present for each graph:** Double check = For the graphs that are present, there is a summary statement that provides information about progress for each behavior displayed.
single check = For the graphs that are present, there is a summary statement for some but not all behaviors. Or, for the graphs that are present, some of the summary statements provide information about progress and others do not.
X = There is no summary statement for any of the graphs that are present, or what is provided as a summary statement does not provide any information about progress.
- **Graphs have indicators that demonstrate decision making and/or analysis is occurring (based on behavior trends and/or revision dates):** Double check = For the graphs that are present, visual indicators (e.g., change line, arrow, etc.) are present on each graph. Or, if there have not been any changes to the plan or other updates in documentation that should be captured on the graphs, and if the trends/levels indicate desired responding for all graphs, select double check
single check = For the graphs that are present, visual indicators (e.g., change line, arrow, etc.) are present on some but not all graphs. Or, 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/levels indicate desired responding for some but not all graphs, select check
X = There are no visual indicators on graphs and changes may be warranted based on reviewer's visual analysis of trends/levels/variability, or if changes/updates were made and are not captured on any of the graphs. Or, there are no graphs
- **Graphs represent entire necessary review period (if any data absent, indication as to reason why is included):** check = For the graphs that are present, all data is included. Or, some data are missing from the graphs that are present, but there is an adequate reason provided in the documentation (e.g., person hospitalized)
X = For the graphs that are present, there are gaps in data/missing data and there not a reason or an inadequate reason provided as to why (e.g., behavior analyst lost the data is an inadequate reason). Or, there are no graphs.
- **Graphs demonstrate that data review is occurring monthly if restraint or time out is included:** check = If restraint or time out is included as outlined in 12VAC35-115-110, graphs contain at least monthly data. Or, if any data are missing, an adequate reason is

provided in the documentation.

X = Restraint or time out is included as outlined in 12VAC35-115-110 and graphs are missing data for one or more months, without an adequate reason as to why provided in the documentation.

N/A = There is no restraint or time out included as outlined in 12VAC35-115-110

Weighted scoring logic for Plan for Training content area:

- **5 points** = All elements addressed for each target behavior (decrease & 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)
- **4 points** = 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. 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 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 explanation as to why. OR, score as a 1 if all

graphs are present, but all 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).

- **0 points** = 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 not occurring at least monthly as required, an automatic 0 score is applied regardless of the presence or absence of other elements.

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 decide 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 clinician during the feedback process.

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 clinician 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.

Reviews, Training, Interscorer Reliability, and Feedback

Reviews and automated scoring

Each DBHDS reviewer is a Board Certified Behavior Analyst® and is licensed to practice behavior analysis in accordance with the laws of the Commonwealth of Virginia. We suggest that reviewers outside of DBHDS that use the tool are qualified/credentialed/licensed in accordance with applicable state laws or regulations. The DBHDS team that created the BSPARI has 30 years of combined experience in the assessment and treatment of challenging behavior. Annually, DBHDS reviewers obtain a randomized sample of behavior support plans and associated documentation across providers of therapeutic behavioral consultation. The sample is determined by a statistician at DBHDS and ensures a 90% confidence level to identify behavior programs to review across providers of therapeutic behavioral consultation, derived from the previous years’ service authorization data. The reviewers will then utilize the BSPARI in review of behavior support plans and associated documentation that is provided in WaMS by the clinician (e.g., Part Five: 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.

The BSPARI has automated 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

clinician should review the “Resources” tab. The “Resources” tab will highlight in red relevant resources which may be useful to the clinician. It is recommended that for any required areas that are highlighted in red on the “Resources” tab that the clinician access the resources to improve future iterations of the behavior support plan under review (and 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 clinician during the feedback process.

Training on the BSPARI and interscorer agreement:

Internally at DBHDS, any new reviewer is trained to a criterion of minimum 85% agreement with the lead author of the BSPARI on blind interscorer reviews across 5 consecutive BSPARI’s. Information on training on use of the BSPARI beyond what is presented in the Scoring Instructions can be obtained by contacting the lead author of the BSAPRI at nathan.habel@dbhds.virginia.gov. It is suggested that any reviewer using the BSPARI is certified as a BCBA® or BCBA-D® and has met the [consulting supervisor requirements](#) of the Behavior Analyst Certification Board®.

An interscorer review process is completed for 10% of all reviews conducted. Interscorer reviewers consist of blind reviews in which a second reviewer examines the same review documents (e.g., FBA, BSP, graphs, training information) as the primary reviewer and scores results on a blank BSPARI. Then, fidelity between the primary and secondary reviewer BSPARIs is determined via a total count interscorer as follows:

1. Total the number of agreements on scoring for all minimum elements and associated points provided for each BSP content area (and the overall total score)
2. Total the number of disagreements on scoring for all minimum elements and associated points provided for each BSP content area (and the overall total score). Add that to the total number of agreements from #1 above to arrive at total agreements + disagreements.
3. Divide total agreements from #1 by the total agreements and disagreements from #2. Convert this decimal to a percentage by multiplying it by 100.

There is a possibility of 83 total agreements or disagreements (69 elements evaluated, 14-point allocations).

Example: if 77 out of 83 areas were in agreement across DBHDS BSPARI reviewers, then the interscorer agreement would be as follows:

Number of agreements: 77

Number of disagreements: 6

Total number of agreements + total number of disagreements (77 + 6 = 83)

$77 / 83 = .927$ $.927 \times 100 = 93\%$ interscorer agreement

Feedback for plan authors, required resubmissions for plans not in adherence

The feedback process 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. After a BSP review and scoring, DBHDS will provide a copy of the scored BSPARI to the clinician using HIPAA compliant methods. If the score of the BSPARI is below 34 points, DBHDS requires that the clinician/provider meet with DBHDS reviewers via secure video conference to discuss the results and will provide resources and training suggestions for the clinician. DBHDS will require revision and resubmission of the behavior program if the BSPARI score is below 34 points. A date for resubmission will be agreed upon during the feedback session. Upon receipt of the revised behavior program, DBHDS will complete a full BSPARI review and will repeat the feedback process as described above. Only one revision cycle is required unless the nature of plan deficits impacts the health or safety of the person receiving services, or those that support them. Additionally, if the behavior program has a score of 34 points or above, but there are critical areas that are absent that impact health or safety, DBHDS will require revision and resubmission of the behavior program. 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 behavioral consultation services.

Future updates to the BSPARI

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 behavioral community. DBHDS will review the “Resources” tab 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>
- Habel, N., Bonaventura, S., & Deochand, N. (2024). The development of a behavior plan quality assurance instrument in a publicly funded system of care. *Behavior Analysis in Practice*. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s40617-024-00909-1>
- 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. <https://doi.org/10.1177/15345084070320020101>
- 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. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s40617-018-0255-7>
- 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. <https://www.milestones.org/files/legacy/2014/04/Random-Evaluation-of-a-Web-Based-Tool-5-8-14.pdf>
- 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. <https://doi.org/10.3109/13668250.2016.1254736>
- Williams, D.E. & Vollmer, T.R. (2015). Essential components of written behavior treatment plans. *Research in Developmental Disabilities*, 36, 323-327. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ridd.2014.10.003>
- Willis, T.J., Lavigna, G.W., & Donnellan, A.M. (2011). *Behavior Assessment Guide*. The Institute for Applied Behavior Analysis, Los Angeles, CA.