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Abstract

Staff persons working within supported living environments for individuals with intellectual and developmental disabilities are in a position to provide important services to those individuals. However, inherent in these settings is often a lack of direct supervision, which can result in staff persons becoming lax in their implementation of job responsibilities. That potential for less than ideal job performance on the part of staff persons can result in decreased quality of life for the individuals served. Simple feedback measures for staff persons in such settings may assist in creating an atmosphere that encourages staff awareness of job duties and motivates staff persons to perform to established standards. This study used a multiple baseline across types of documentation and a withdrawal design to examine the effects of posted group feedback on staff completion of three forms of routine documentation used in supported living settings, as well as the effect of the placement of such postings. A rubric of documentation expectations was posted following baseline for all documentation forms, and created some minimal but not meaningful improvement. Improvement in completion for the first form of documentation that occurred during posted feedback intervention failed to replicate when introduced for a
second form of documentation. Movement of the posting location for the second form of documentation to a more discrete yet routinely accessed location coincided with a decrease in performance for all three staff persons. Incorporation of individual feedback memos for that same form of documentation, though, in addition to a posted rubric and posted group feedback, corresponded with improved completion rates for all three staff persons. A withdrawal of feedback interventions indicated possible maintenance.
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Chapter 1

Introduction

Staff persons working in supported living settings are paid to provide necessary services to individuals with intellectual and/or developmental disabilities who live in their own homes or apartments in the community. These services range from a once weekly shift to assist a high functioning individual in completing shopping and laundry tasks, to 24 hour daily monitoring and assistance including bathing, transferring, feeding, medication assistance, behavior support, and many other person specific tasks. In the latter example, as many as four different staff persons may be rotating throughout one day in an individual’s home, though a supervisor of those staff persons may visit the home only once each couple of weeks. This lack of direct supervision creates an atmosphere that allows for what would be considered a least restrictive environment for the individual (Council for Exceptional Children, 1976; National Association for Retarded Citizens, 1977) though at the same time it can create a less than ideal level of work performance and follow through from staff persons. Of course, work performance that is not up to standards in such a work environment ends up adversely affecting the individuals being served.

Staff performance has been shown to react based on the level of direct
and conspicuous observation by supervisors (Brackett, Reid, & Green, 2007). Brackett and colleagues researched the effects of conspicuous versus inconspicuous observation on staff behavior and work performance. A multiple baseline across staff persons showed a very clear and immediate improvement in staff’s performance of trained work tasks when conspicuous observations were in place, with immediate reversal to baseline rates when inconspicuous observations occurred. However, when a second intervention of self-recording was put in place and used in conjunction with inconspicuous observation, staff performance again improved substantially. This shows that staff performance can be affected by a knowledge of supervisory involvement, even when not direct, particularly when the staff persons are provided with some kind of tool to allow them to know what aspects of their work are being monitored.

Researchers have done much work to determine the most effective interventions to improve individual performance in work settings, as well as a variety of other settings including educational, sports, and public arenas such as roadways and elevators (Rogue & Roberts, 1989; Van Houten, Nau, & Merrigan, 1981). Feedback is one tactic that is often used, which can come in a variety of forms including verbal feedback (Austin, Weatherly, & Gravina, 2005), which could be applied in a casual or structured manner, either to a group, or individually. Written feedback (Babcock, Sulzer-Azaroff, Sanderson, & Scibak, 1992) is another popular form, which may be implemented using memos or letters to groups or to individuals. Finally, posted feedback (Nordstrom et al.,
Public posting of performance feedback has been shown to be an effective intervention in supervised workplaces, either alone or when used in conjunction with goal setting and/or reinforcement (Nordstrom et al., 1991). Nordstrom and colleagues completed a review of studies specifically using public posting of performance feedback in work settings. They evaluated 21 studies conducted from 1970 through 1988, grouping those into three categories: 1) Public posting alone (11 studies), 2) Public posting with goal setting (2 studies), and 3) Public posting with both goal setting and reinforcement (8 studies). Findings included that public posting alone seemed to create some positive impact, with a question of whether that impact was meaningful. Public posting with goal setting created some difficulty in discerning the effects of the goal setting from the public posting, noting that “a de facto combination of goals and feedback is likely to occur whenever data are publicly posted” (p. 110). The third category, which included studies using the three components of posting, goal setting, and reinforcement, was found to be superior to the previous two alternatives.

As early as 1970 researchers were considering the effectiveness of public posting in the workplace. Panyan and colleagues (1970) posted weekly individual staff completion rates of patient skills training sessions in a state
institution for individuals with mental retardation. In that study, feedback reports were first reviewed with staff persons by a unit psychologist, and then posted in a conspicuous location on each participating hall. A multiple baseline across wards showed abrupt and ongoing improvements in staff performance following the individual posting intervention.

A multiple baseline was also used to show the effects of public posting of group performance across groups of staff persons at a student operated university bar (Anderson, Crowell, Hantula, and Siroky, 1988). Following baseline the researchers first implemented a task clarification consisting of a checklist of expectations for staff persons to follow, which alone yielded some increase in performance. Posted feedback then provided additional improvement, with some possible generalization noted for two groups that did not receive the posting intervention.

Jones and colleagues (1986) used public posting of group graphed performance data in combination with training for psychiatric emergency room staff’s completion of required forms in a timely fashion. A multiple baseline across forms showed meaningful improvements following public posting intervention, which maintained for some time thereafter.

One study used posting to reduce rather than increase staff behavior. Oliphant and Oliphant (2001) looked at the use of posting in order to reduce employee theft in a drug store. Posting consisted of both a monetary loss amount as well as the number of items missing, and each were updated weekly.
during intervention. The postings, which were displayed in the staff break room, did include some positive reinforcement when improvement was noted, with wording included such as “wonderful” or prompted encouragement statements when improvement did not occur, such as “Can we lower this?” Results did show a significant reduction in theft and monetary loss, though the AB design precluded a clear demonstration of experimental control.

Ward and Carnes (2002) took public posting out of the workplace and into the sports arena. Their study considered the effects of posted feedback on individual athlete-set goals, including specific football skills exhibited during both practice and games. The postings were placed on a locker room wall next to the door that all players used to access the field from the locker room. A multiple baseline design across three specific skills was used to show that introduction of daily posted feedback resulted in an immediate increase in individual players’ accurate use of skills during practice, which then carried over into improved game performance.

In educational settings, public posting has been used both to affect teacher performance, as well as student performance. Skinner and colleagues (2000) looked at the effects of posted feedback in conjunction with group positive reinforcement on increasing “tootling” in students. Tootling was defined as students’ reporting on peers’ prosocial behavior. Students were first trained on how to observe and report on peers’ positive behaviors. Then a withdrawal design was used to show that intervention with posting (a poster board ladder
placed at the front of the classroom with daily adjustments to the group total made with students present) and positive reinforcement (an extra recess) was clearly effective in increasing student tootling.

Public posting of teacher performance also has been examined. Gross and Ekstrand (1983) looked at the use of posted feedback of teachers' rates of praise administered to students in an attempt to eliminate the need for direct classroom observers. Posting in this study was placed on the classroom wall, with a verbal explanation of the meaning of the data provided to the classroom staff persons. Observations were made using random audio tape recordings. Introduction of intervention (posted daily feedback in graph format) resulted in a near doubling of rates of praise from baseline, with maintenance shown after fading of feedback.

Studies of public posting on driver behavior have also been published. Pasto and Baker (2001) conducted a study to determine the effects of public posting via a sign at the entrance of a parking lot, in simultaneous combination with flyer feedback placed on parked cars, on seatbelt use in front seat passengers. Results indicate that seatbelt use did increase with intervention, with some maintenance at follow-up, despite a decreasing trend.

Not all public posting studies have shown clear improvement from intervention, however. Roque and Roberts (1989) conducted a study in the public traffic arena in an attempt to replicate earlier studies that had shown that publicly posted feedback regarding traffic speed had effectively reduced average
traffic speeds for travelers on a stretch of urban roadway. The feedback sign in this study was placed on the right shoulder of the roadway, was highly visible from about 122 meters, and was located shortly before a roadway speed limit sign. In the replication study, a reversal design was used with a comparison of effects of posted feedback alone (percentage of vehicles exceeding the speed limit) and posted inaccurate feedback (inflated percentage of vehicles exceeding the speed limit), with results showing no reduction in speed either from the accurate feedback, or the inaccurate feedback, when compared to baseline.

Energy consumption has also been addressed through public posting. Van Houten and colleagues (1981) conducted a study to assess the effects of public posting on energy use in elevators in comparison to a door delay to decrease the convenience of the elevator. A multiple baseline across elevators showed no clear reduction in elevator use during the posting of the amount of electricity used by the elevator in the past week displayed directly on the elevator door, or during the same type of posting when an additional poster was added to the elevator door requesting that people use the stairs. The delayed door intervention however, which slowed the operation of the elevator doors, when combined with signs on the elevator door stating that the elevator had been slowed in order to conserve energy, showed immediate and significant reduction in energy consumption across elevators, which continued as the delay time was faded.

The majority of the above mentioned studies show clear evidence that
public posting can be effective and valuable in a variety of areas. Interestingly, the two studies mentioned which failed to show a clear effect of public posting were ones in which direct supervision of the individuals’ behaviors was not available or typical (traffic speed and elevator use). More research is necessary, then, to determine if public posting is effective when direct supervision of staff activities is not the norm. In addition, although most available studies gave indication of where postings were placed, none of them gave reason for the choice of placement, nor did they compare the effectiveness of varied locations in order to make that choice. The question then becomes whether it is necessary for the posting to be in a public location, viewable without effort by passersby, or can the posted feedback be effective when placed in a location viewable only by the group of individuals whose performance is reflected on the posting. This experiment was conducted in order to extend previous research by examining the following experimental questions: (a) What is the effect of posted group aggregate feedback on staff completion of routine documentation in a supported living setting? (b) What is the effect of posted feedback in a conspicuous (bulletin board) location versus a less conspicuous (staff binder) location on staff completion of routine documentation in a supported living setting? and (c) What is the effect of posted group aggregate feedback in combination with individual memo feedback on staff completion of routine documentation in a supported living setting?
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Methods

Participants and Setting

The participants were three adults who work as direct care assistants in a supported living home for adults with MR/DD who exhibit challenging behaviors. All participants (a) had worked as supported living caregivers for at least one month; (b) were familiar with documentation forms and procedures currently used at the site, including the Behavior Support Plan (BSP) documentation sheets, the Individual Services Plan (ISP) documentation sheets, and the shift log; (c) worked between one and five permanent shifts per week at the research site; and (d) consented to participation in the study.

The study was conducted at a supported living site operated by a supported living provider agency in a Central Ohio location. The site had a bulletin board in place for posting of staff related materials for the duration of the study. The bulletin board was located in an area of the home that was frequented by all staff persons multiple times per shift, but not accessible to view by a visitor standing at the front door. The site also had a staff documentation binder that was kept shelved when not in use, but which was easily accessible to all staff persons, and which each staff person was required to access a minimum
of one time per shift.

Materials

Materials used during intervention included a poster for display of a rubric of documentation expectations, and a poster for graphic display of the staff’s performance. Additionally, paper and envelopes were used for the individual feedback memos.

Dependent Variables

The dependent variable of interest in this study was the percentage of completeness of documentation. Level of completeness was recorded for each participant on each of three types of documentation (Individual Service Plan, Behavior Support Plan, and shift log). Level of completeness was based upon five aspects of each document. A complete BSP document for one shift included:

1) the number of times a target behavior occurred recorded next to each target behavior, or circling of either Y (yes) or N (no) where applicable;
2) the number of times each intervention was implemented for each target behavior, or circling of either Y or N where applicable;
3) the number of times each replacement behavior was witnessed, or circling of either Y or N where applicable;
4) the number of times reinforcement was given, or circling of either Y or N for each reinforcement possibility where applicable;
5) presence of staff initials.

A complete ISP document for one shift included:

1) check marks or initials by each daily goal related to meal preparation and nutrition;
2) check marks or initials by each daily goal related to hygiene;
3) check
marks or initials by each daily goal related to housekeeping; 4) check marks or initials by each daily goal related to behavior plan implementation; and 5) presence of staff initials. A complete shift log entry included 1) date (including month, day, and year); 2) shift worked or specific hours worked; 3) a minimum of at least two sentences describing client activities during the shift, or a statement indicating that the client was not present or was asleep during the entire shift; 4) a minimum of at least two sentences describing any target behaviors exhibited during the shift, or at least one sentence stating that there were no target behaviors witnessed; and 5) staff initials and/or signature.

Data Collection

Data were collected once per week from the sites via the permanent product of the three completed documentation forms. Appendix B shows the checklist that was used by observers for each form to record whether each section was completed fully. The level of completeness was then expressed as a percentage which was calculated for each document by dividing the number of target areas and multiplying by 100. In addition, weekly percent completeness was calculated by aggregating the data from all participants for each documentation form.

In order to establish interobserver agreement (IOA), a second reviewer calculated individual scores per shift for at least 30% of all shifts worked for each participant during each phase of the experiment. Exact IOA agreement was calculated by dividing the number of agreements by the number of agreements
plus disagreements and multiplying by 100%. An agreement was defined as both observers determining that a specific targeted area of a documentation form was either complete or incomplete. A disagreement was defined as one observer finding a specific targeted area of documentation to be complete, while a second observer found that the same targeted area was incomplete. Overall interobserver agreement for the study was 96%, with IOA for staff #1 at 96%, staff #2 at 96%, and staff #3 at 95%. Across forms of documentation, the IOA for ISP was 97%, BSP was 97%, and shift log was 93%.

**Experimental Conditions**

**Baseline.** During baseline, participants completed documentation on each of the three formats based on previous training by supported living supervisors or a behavior support specialist. Participants continued to receive routine or specific supervision from Supported Living supervisory staff persons as needed related to any aspects of their jobs, which potentially included addressing documentation issues. Participants were asked to notify the experimenter should this have occurred.

The treatment phase consisted of four conditions, A) rubric; B) rubric plus group posting on bulletin board; C) rubric plus group posting on documentation binder; and D) rubric plus group posting on documentation binder plus individual feedback memos.

**Rubric.** A rubric of documentation expectations was posted on the bulletin board located in a public area that was accessible to all individuals within
the group home but not visible to visitors at the front door. The rubric consisted of a bulleted list for each form of documentation, on a 21.6 cm x 27.9 cm sheet of paper. The expectations listed included documentation rules related to completion that would later be assessed by observers to determine percentage of completeness for this study. The rubric was introduced in order to ensure that all staff persons had clear and consistent information about how documentation was expected to be completed. A copy of the rubric is included in Appendix A.

**Rubric plus group posting on bulletin board.** The rubric remained in place, and a group feedback posting was placed on the bulletin board located in a public area that was accessible to all individuals within the group home but not visible to visitors at the front door. The posting consisted of the type of documentation being assessed, the group performance level expressed as a percentage, and a bar graph depicting progress, all in bold print on a 21.6 cm x 27.9 cm sheet of paper. A sample posting is included in Appendix C.

**Rubric plus group posting on staff binder.** The rubric remained in place and the posting, which followed the same format as the posting in the previous condition, was placed on the front cover of the binder in which the staff documentation forms were kept. This posting location was visible only when staff persons accessed the binder, which they were required to do at least once per shift.

**Rubric plus group posting on staff binder plus individual feedback.** The rubric and group postings remained in place, and an individual feedback
memo was provided to each staff person each week. Appendix D shows a sample feedback memo, which includes a comparison of the group percentage of completeness to that individual’s percentage of completeness each week. The individual memos consisted of both the group’s current percentage of completion, along with the individual’s current percentage of completion for that week, all in bold print on a 21.6 cm x 27.9 cm sheet of paper. The memo was folded and sealed within a standard sized business envelope with the individuals names printed clearly on the outside of the envelopes. Envelopes were left on the staff desk where documentation was completed by each staff person at least once per shift.

**Experimental Design**

The original design was a multiple baseline across documentation of shift log, ISP, and BSP to assess the effects of (a) posting of rubric of documentation expectations alone; and (b) posting of rubric along with the group posting intervention on a bulletin board, on staff completion of required documentation forms. Subsequent interventions were applied to the second baseline (ISP) when documentation did not improve in that area. When an increase was achieved, the respective interventions were withdrawn for both shift log and ISP. BSP remained untreated as a result of ceiling effects.

**Social Validity**

Social validity was assessed via a questionnaire administered to all participants and their supervisors. The questionnaire was a rating scale that
assessed areas including the degree to which participants and their supervisors felt that the study was useful in (a) creating increased awareness of how to complete documentation; (b) improving their performance on documentation; (c) creating an atmosphere of working together toward a common goal; and (d) improving the lives of the consumers they serve. Additionally, the questionnaire assessed the supervisor’s likelihood that posting would be used in this or other settings in the future.
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Results

Figure 3.1 shows the mean percentage completion for each of the three documentation forms across weeks. Performance data for each of the individual staff persons are shown in Figures 3.2, 3.3, and 3.4.

During baseline, group performance was variable for all three documentation areas, ranging from 45% to 88%, and with a mean of 73%. For the shift log, the mean percentage of completion was 78% (77%, 76%, and 82% for staff #1, #2, and #3 respectively). For the ISP, mean percentage of completion was 72% (76%, 64%, and 76% for staff #1, #2, and #3 respectively). The BSP documentation had a mean percentage of completion of 69% (83%, 43%, and 84% for staff #1, #2, and #3 respectively).

Little improvement was seen when a rubric was provided to display the items that were being scored for completion. Performance was similar to baseline with a mean of 84%. This mean is inflated due to the BSP maintaining at the rubric intervention stage throughout the remaining duration of the study due to ceiling effects from week 18 on. For the shift log, the mean percentage of completion was 80% (87%, 68%, and 87% for staff #1, #2, and #3 respectively). The ISP mean percentage was 73% (79%, 67%, and 73% for staff #1, #2, and #3 respectively).
respectively). Finally, for the BSP documentation the mean percentage of completion was 89% (90%, 75%, and 90% for staff #1, #2, and #3 respectively). It should be noted that staff #2 had only 3 data points for the BSP from week 13 through the end of the study. Because this staff person typically worked during a shift when another staff person was also scheduled, this staff person appeared to discontinue completion of this form of documentation, allowing the other staff person on shift to complete it.

Bulletin board posting of group feedback was initiated for the shift log documentation at week 13, and for the ISP at week 16. The rubric remained in place during this time. Improvements during this intervention were noted for the shift log, but not for the ISP. Mean percentage of completion for these two forms of documentation was 92%. For the shift log, staff persons completed a mean percentage of 94% of documentation, a significant improvement from previous phases seen across staff persons (97%, 85%, and 97% for staff #1, #2, and #3 respectively). For the ISP documentation however, the mean percentage of completion remained relatively unchanged at 74% (81%, 68%, and 74% for staff #1, #2, and #3 respectively). Posted feedback was not implemented for the BSP due to ceiling effects.

When bulletin board posting did not create an effect for the ISP documentation, the location of the posting was moved to the front of the staff documentation binder for the ISP feedback only. Again, the rubric continued to be in place during this intervention. At this point a reduction in completion of ISP
documentation was seen across staff persons, with a mean percentage of completion of 69%. Individual percentages during this phase were at 76%, 35%, and 67% for staff #1, #2, and #3 respectively.

After falling rates on ISP completion during binder posting, an additional feedback measure was added which provided a weekly memo to each staff person comparing group weekly percentages to that individual staff person’s weekly performance percentages for the ISP documentation. The memo was used in combination with the rubric and binder posting interventions. This continued for the ISP for three weeks, during which time the three staff persons showed improved performance on the ISP documentation. The mean percentage of completion for the ISP in this phase was 89%, in improvement of 20% from the previous phase. Individual percentages of completion were 93%, 79%, and 96% for staff #1, #2, and #3 respectively.

In the final week of the study, the shift log and ISP were returned to rubric only intervention, while the BSP remained at rubric. Upon the withdrawal of all forms of feedback, mean percentage of completion across forms of documentation in this final week of the study was 92%, an indication of maintenance from levels at the previous intervention phases, and an overall improvement from baseline of 19%. For the shift log, the mean percentage of completion was 92% (92%, 93%, and 90% for staff #1, #2, and #3 respectively). For the ISP, the mean percentage of completion was 87% (92%, 80%, and 90% for staff #1, #2, and #3 respectively). The BSP ended its final week at rubric
intervention with a mean percentage of completion of 98% (96% and 100% for staff #1 and #3 respectively). No data points were available for staff #2 during the final week of the study.

Social Validity

Each of the three staff persons, as well as their direct supervisor, completed a social validity questionnaire. All of the staff and the supervisor either moderately or strongly agreed with the following statements: (a) I feel that the feedback regarding documentation performance that was posted at my work site made me more aware of how well I (or my staff) completed required documentation; and (b) I feel that my (or my staffs’) performance on required documentation improved with the posted feedback at my work site. Two of the three staff and the supervisor indicated moderate or strong agreement with the following statements, while one indicated a neutral response: (a) I feel that having feedback posted as group rather than individual performance percentages was helpful in creating an atmosphere of working together with my co-workers toward a common goal; (b) I feel that having feedback posted at my work site has resulted in improvements to the lives of the consumer(s) we serve; and (c) I would like to see continued feedback posted at my site to help me (or my staff) do the best job possible. Regarding the placement on the binder versus the placement on the wall, two staff and the supervisor indicated strong or moderate disagreement with the idea that they preferred the binder location, while one staff remained neutral on the topic. The supervisor also answered a question
regarding intentions to use the feedback in the future, indicating a strong agreement that posting would be used in the future at that or other sites.
Figure 3.1: Mean effects of feedback intervention on documentation completion for group
Figure 3.2: Effects of feedback interventions on documentation completion for staff #1
Figure 3.3: Effects of feedback interventions on documentation completion for staff #2
Figure 3.4: Effects of feedback interventions on documentation completion for staff #3
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Discussion

In this study, posting of a rubric of documentation expectations showed minimal and not necessarily meaningful improvement in staff completion of three forms of documentation in a supported living setting. Posted group feedback appeared to have an effect for one form of documentation, the shift log, though the fact that it did not have the same effect upon the ISP form of documentation indicates that the change for the first form of documentation could have been the result of other factors such as the passing of time, or a response to other variables that are discussed below. Changing the placement from bulletin board to the front of the staff documentation binder resulted in no improvement for the ISP documentation, and actually coincided in a decreasing trend for all three staff persons, potentially indicating that a bulletin board placement may be more effective than a more discrete placement on the front of a frequently accessed binder. Finally, introduction of individual feedback via memo showed sustained improvement for the ISP form of documentation. No interventions beyond the posted rubric were implemented for the BSP form of documentation, though increases were noted throughout the rubric intervention, indicating the possibility of generalization across forms of documentation. When all feedback
interventions were withdrawn from the shift log and ISP documentation forms in the final week of the study, there appeared to be maintenance across staff persons, while staff performance on completion of the BSP also maintained with no intervention change. This maintenance indicates that posting and memo feedback may be effective in creating some ongoing change in staff performance on documentation completion without frequent or continued use.

These findings suggest that supervisors of staff persons in supported living settings, who may not make contact with their employees on more than a monthly basis, and even less frequently for overnight and weekend staff persons, may possibly be able to influence staff completion of some tasks through the use of a package of measures including a posted rubric of expectations, posted performance feedback in a conspicuous location, and individual feedback memos.

Several implications arise from this study. First of all, implementation of the interventions of posted rubric, posted group feedback, and individual memo feedback are fairly simple and easy to implement, with much less time and energy required when compared with direct supervision. Supervisors in supported living settings, who are typically required to review staff documentation from each site at least monthly, must often spend a good deal of time tracking down multiple staff persons each month to complete or correct unfinished or imperfect paperwork. Creating a simple measure in order to provide feedback to the group of staff persons at a site, with occasional individual feedback, may be
an effective way to alleviate some of the backtracking work, while creating an environment where staff persons feel more motivated to complete their jobs in an accurate and timely manner. Future research should focus on the frequency of feedback provided both to the group and to the individual staff persons to determine if intermittent feedback, which is more likely to occur in such a setting, would be as effective as routine feedback, and what frequency of feedback is most effective.

Second, awareness that location of the postings does appear to matter will result in less time wasted with postings in locations that may be overlooked. It seems likely that a more conspicuous posting on the wall may create more social pressure to perform at the desired level than one posted in a location that is less salient. It may also be too easy for staff persons to pull out a binder and flip to their desired location without taking note of postings or memos. This idea may also be applicable to other informational memos that supervisors intend for staff to see when placed in documentation binders. Such information and/or feedback may have increased readership on a wall or bulletin board location that is more clearly visible and therefore accessible. Supervisors must be cognizant, however, of maintaining a least restrictive environment for the individuals, and therefore not overburdening walls and bulletin boards with business related postings which can detract from the individual’s home environment, and result in a more office-like setting. Future research is needed to determine if other areas for posting beyond those investigated in this study may be more effective in
producing change in staff performance.

Finally, and perhaps most importantly, it can be speculated that when staff’s performance on completion of job duties such as documentation improves, the individual’s being served by those staff persons will experience improved quality of life. For instance, as completion of documentation of ISP elements improves, staff persons likely become more aware of each individual’s service plan, which may translate into improved focus on meeting the goals established for that individual. In the same way, improved documentation in a shift log provides all staff persons, as well as supervisors working with an individual with more communication regarding the individual’s activities and needs, which again is likely to translate into improved services. Future research should look into what measurable effects improved documentation in a supported living setting could have upon individuals served.

Several limitations existed in this study. First of all, there were many variables that could not be accounted for. One such variable is the possibility that trainings or supervisory actions may have occurred without notice given to the experimenter, and which may have affected staff performance. This could account for sudden unexplained improvements in documentation that do not coincide with any study interventions.

Another variable that could not be controlled was that an individual being served in the home may have at times been absent from the home for the entire shift of one staff person, resulting in that staff person overlooking completion of
documentation for that individual. Although documentation at those times should have been completed with at least a “not present” notation, the tendency for staff persons to neglect all completion of paperwork in such situations may have led to extremely low performance rates, potentially skewing the data of the study. Such occurrences indicate that the presence of the individual being served may serve as a discriminative stimulus for the staff behavior of documentation completion. In the same way, an individual’s display of a targeted behavior may serve as a discriminative stimulus for completion of behavior documentation.

In addition, during some visits to the home to collect data, it appeared that some staff persons may have reacted to the study with defense or upset. This was evident by one staff person removing and shredding the postings on two occasions. It appears that for this staff person, the posting may have become aversive in nature. That staff person was apparently attempting to escape from the posted stimulus that was perceived as punishing, and at the same time to possibly punish the experimenter for imposing the postings. This is an example of a Skinnerian concept addressed by Delprato known as countercontrol in which one “oppose(s) controlling attempts by moving out of range, attacking, or passively resisting” (192). It is unclear how much of a role countercontrol played in the overall outcomes of the study, although it seems likely that it could also be related to the lack of BSP data points for staff #2, which dropped off concurrently with implementation of the first posting intervention.

Other staff responses observed by the experimenter include a note
placed on a posting asking for an explanation of why it was there and what specifically it meant. This could be construed to imply that the posting was effective in raising interest and concern for completion of job duties, as could questions posed by staff persons at the site during posting visits such as “What do we need to do to do better?” Future research could examine how feedback is delivered to a supported living site, and how varying methods of delivery could effect staff cooperation and motivated involvement. For instance, a study could focus on whether delivery of feedback during high activity times is more or less effective than feedback delivered during an overnight shift. Or, a future study may look at the wording and layout of postings to determine whether a more detailed and personal explanation of feedback may be more or less effective than direct and basic information, such as the percentages and graphs used in this study.

Despite such signs that the staff persons did show a desire to improve their performance, another limitation to the posted group feedback may be that the group aggregate score posted may not have given the individual staff persons enough information about their own performance to be able to make significant improvements, despite desire to do so. This may be evident by the sharp increase in performance once staff persons did receive individualized feedback about their own completion of documentation duties, indicating that group feedback should be accompanied by at least intermittent individual feedback to create the greatest impact. Again, the frequency of posted or
individual feedback could be an element of future research, as could individual versus group aggregate feedback.
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APPENDIX A

RUBRIC OF DOCUMENTATION EXPECTATIONS
HOW TO COMPLETE YOUR DOCUMENTATION

BSP

1. All data must be completed before the end of your shift. Do not go back and fill in data at a later date.

2. Answer every question on the behavior plan data sheet by completing each box in the column for the date and shift that you are working. If someone else is working at the same time you are, it is still your responsibility to ensure the data is completed.

3. When working 3rd shift, complete your data on the date your shift started.

4. If you work two shifts in a row, it is your responsibility to complete both shift columns.

5. For Y / N boxes, circle the appropriate letter (Y = Yes, N = No).

6. For blank boxes, write a number to answer the frequency question. If there was no occurrence, you must write a zero (0), rather than leaving the box blank. Do not use lines, dashes, etc.

7. Initial the box at the bottom of the column where indicated. More than one set of initials may be used when more than one staff is working during the same shift.

8. Complete the food intake log by writing the time the meal or snack was eaten, and the type and amount of each food item. Write N/A if a food type, meal, or snack is not consumed, rather than leaving a line blank.

ISP

1. All data must be completed before the end of your shift. Do not go back and fill in data at a later date.

2. Complete the ISP data sheet by filling in boxes in the column for the date you are working. If someone else is working at the same time you are, it is still your responsibility to ensure the data is complete.

3. Place an “X” in each box for which a service was provided.

4. Be sure that you or one of your coworkers for that day have completed and placed an “X” next to all daily goals.

5. Be sure that all weekly or monthly goals have an “X” within the time span indicated.

6. If a daily goal is not met because of a client’s referral, write an “R”. Do not leave the box blank. Do not use lines, dashes, etc.

7. Initial the box for your shift at the bottom where indicated. More than one set of initials may be present when more than one staff is working during the same shift.

Shift Log

1. All shift log entries must be completed before the end of your shift. Do not go back and fill in the shift
log at a later date.

2. Complete an entry for each shift you work, no matter how long or short the shift is. There may be multiple entries for the same shift when more than one staff is working at the same time.

3. Begin each entry with the date, and the start and stop time of your shift.

4. Include reference to each client by name or initials, and use:
   a. *at least* 2 sentences to describe each individual’s activities during your shift, OR
   b. if the client is not present for the entire shift, one sentence should be present indicating that, OR
   c. if the client is sleeping for the entire shift, one sentence should be present indicating that.

5. For individuals with a behavior plan, include:
   a. *at least* two sentences describing any behavioral issues, including issues with not following diet, OR
   b. one sentence indicating that there were no behavioral issues for the entire shift.

6. Complete each entry with your name and/or signature.
### Data Collection

*Week # __________________  Dates __________________________  Staff # __________________________

**Instructions:** Place a plus (+) next to items that are fully complete, and a minus (-) next to items that are not fully complete, based on information provided next to each item below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target Behaviors (a number is written in each target behavior box for that shift)</th>
<th>Interventions (a number is written in each intervention box for that shift)</th>
<th>Replacements (a number is written, or a Y/N is circled in each replacement behavior box for that shift)</th>
<th>Reinforcements (a number is written, or a Y/N is circled in each reinforcement box for that shift)</th>
<th>Initials &amp; Signature (initials are present for that shift, and a signature is present for that page)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total Complete:** 5 x 100 =

---

### ISP Documentation

- **Meal Prep/Nutrition (checks or initials by each daily goal)**
- **Hygiene (checks or initials by each daily goal)**
- **Housekeeping (checks or initials by each daily goal)**
- **BSP Implementation (checks or initials by each daily goal)**
- **Initials & Signature (initials are present for that shift, and a signature is present for that page)**

**Total Complete:** 5 x 100 =

---

### Shift Log

- **Date** (presence of date including month, day, and year)
- **Shift Worked** (type of shift is included - 1st, 2nd, or 3rd)
- **Client Activities** (at least two sentences are present describing what the client did that day)
- **Behavior Summary** (at least two sentences are present describing any behavioral occurrences, OR, one sentence states there were no behaviors that shift)
- **Signature** (entry is signed)

**Total Complete:** 5 x 100 =

---

Observers printed name and signature: __________________________
APPENDIX C

SAMPLE POSTING
As a **GROUP** last week, 77% of the **ISP (HPC sheets)** documentation was complete.
APPENDIX D

SAMPLE INDIVIDUAL FEEDBACK
Hello,

As a group, all staff at this site completed 69% of the ISP (HPC) documentation.

YOUR Individual completion of the ISP data was at 79%.

Thanks!
APPENDIX E

SOCIAL VALIDITY QUESTIONNAIRE
Social Validity Questionnaire

Please complete the following by circling one rating for each question as follows:

1 = strongly disagree
2 = moderately disagree
3 = neutral, no opinion
4 = moderately agree
5 = strongly agree

1. I feel that the feedback regarding documentation performance that was posted at my work site made me more aware of how well I (or my staff) completed required documentation.

   1   2   3   4   5

2. I feel that my (or my staffs’) performance on required documentation improved with the posted feedback at my work site.

   1   2   3   4   5

3. I feel that having the feedback posted as group rather than individual performance percentages was helpful in creating an atmosphere of working together with my co-workers toward a common goal.

   1   2   3   4   5

4. I feel that having feedback posted at my work site has resulted in improvements to the lives of the consumer(s) we serve.

   1   2   3   4   5
5. I would like to see continued feedback posted at my site to help me (or my staff) do the best job possible.

1  2  3  4  5

6. As a supervisor, I plan to use posted feedback at this or other worksites in the future to assist my staff in improving their performance on documentation or other job duties.

1  2  3  4  5

7. I preferred the posting on the documentation binder more than the posting on the staff bulletin board.

1  2  3  4  5