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Executive Summary

Mayhew values form the foundation of the program
The Mayhew program helps disadvantaged New Hampshire boys who are struggling with social and behavioral difficulties by teaching, modeling, and practicing the Mayhew values of respect, responsibility, community, and challenge. The program has two residential summer sessions spanning several weeks each on Mayhew Island, followed by less intensive individual mentoring during the school year. Staff instill Mayhew values during the summer sessions and reinforce them via monthly meetings during the community phase.

Staff reported “A good bit” of fidelity to Mayhew values
The Center for Behavioral Health Innovation created a system for staff to self-assess their fidelity to the Mayhew model. The Mayhew model instills the four core Mayhew values (respect, responsibility, community, challenge) using three strategies (teaching, modeling, practice). Staff reported an average fidelity rating across all sessions of approximately 4 – “A good bit/well” – on a 5-point scale. On average, staff perceived themselves to be adherent to Mayhew values and strategies, although we observed significant differences between self-reported staff fidelity. In general, staff rated fidelity higher in the summer sessions than in the community phase. We observed little variation in ratings among the three strategies and four values. Staff completed fewer fidelity assessments during the final week of each session.

It was “A little challenging” to apply Mayhew values when working with the boys
Mayhew staff also tracked how challenging it was to apply Mayhew strategies and values with the individual boys with whom they worked. Staff reported an average challenge rating across all boys of about a 2 – “A little challenging” on a 5-point scale. Staff found it relatively easy to apply Mayhew strategies and values with most of the boys, most of the time (although exceptions were noted). Staff recorded many (optional) comments about their strengths, challenges, and ideas for how they could improve their work, reflecting a strong commitment to reflective practice – and the boys. Staff recorded fewer challenge ratings during the final week of each session.

Recommendations
Staff-reported fidelity ratings showed little variation among Mayhew’s three strategies and four values, revealing staff members’ difficulty distinguishing these concepts. Collapsing the modeling and teaching strategies will make the tool easier and quicker to use, while further highlighting the importance and distinctiveness of the practice strategy. Staff rated fidelity lowest during the community phase, in part due to an inherently diminished number of opportunities to enact Mayhew strategies and instill values. We recommend creating a more intentional and structured approach to community-phase meetings, while allowing for improvisation and flexibility. We have fewer data for the final week of each session on both the fidelity and challenge tracking tools because several staff members entered their data behind schedule. Timely data entry is important because staff members’ recollection becomes significantly less reliable as time passes—compromising the data’s integrity. Additional administrative oversight may be necessary for timely data collection. Finally, staff appreciated having the time to reflect on their work when filling out the self-assessment, but the built-in data dashboard added more value for supervisors/administrators than staff. Feedback from the boys on staff fidelity/performance might have more information-value for staff.
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The Mayhew Program

Mayhew’s mission is to help at-risk New Hampshire boys succeed
Mayhew is an independent nonprofit program for boys which combines a residential summer program and school year mentoring. “Mayhew challenges and helps at-risk New Hampshire boys to believe in themselves, work well with others, and find their best” (Mayhew, 2017). The six-year program, which is funded by the United Way, is tuition free. It supports and challenges the 193 boys that it currently serves, as it has done for thousands of other New Hampshire boys since 1969.

Mayhew prioritizes disadvantaged boys
Mayhew enrolls boys from predominantly low-income, single parent families. They are referred to Mayhew due to social and behavioral issues by agents of the school or community, such as principals, teachers, social workers, counselors, and occasionally by family members. Seventy-two percent of the 193 boys Mayhew currently serves are from families at or below the Federal Poverty Guidelines and 91% are at or below 150% of the guidelines (J. Nute, personal communication, 2015). The typical Mayhew family has an annual income of $23,850, 43% lower than the federal poverty level for a family of four.

Mayhew teaches, models, and practices its four core values to promote success
The Mayhew philosophy has four core values: responsibility, respect, community, and challenge. Mayhew staff instill these values in the boys using three strategies: teaching, modeling, and practice. Staff encourage the boys to do their best, try everything that is asked of them, and work with others. The program extends across two intensive residential summer sessions to instill Mayhew values, and a community phase which helps preserve these values as the boys return home.
The Mayhew Fidelity System

The Center for Behavioral Health Innovation (BHI) served as External Evaluators

The Center for Behavioral Health Innovation (BHI) at Antioch University New England works shoulder-to-shoulder with community partners to evaluate and improve behavioral health practice and outcomes for underserved populations. The Mayhew Program engaged BHI to develop a system for monitoring staff fidelity to the Mayhew model.

What is fidelity?

Fidelity has to do with intervention integrity – the degree to which a practice is implemented in a way that is faithful to its model (i.e., core principles and strategies). Fidelity involves adherence (doing what is prescribed by the model) and competence (the quality, skills, and contextual responsiveness with which the model is implemented). Practitioners tend to unwittingly “drift” from the intervention model in the absence of fidelity assessment. Assessing fidelity also helps us make sense of the outcomes of an intervention or project. For instance, if project outcomes are poor, but fidelity was strong, we would tend to suspect that other factors were prime contributors to the disappointing results (Schoenwald et al., 2011).

How we measured Mayhew fidelity

Mayhew staff self-assessed their use of each of the three key strategies (teaching, modeling, practice) to instill each of the four core Mayhew values (responsibility, respect, community, challenge) over time. Staff rated their adherence to these values and strategies on a 5-point scale (1=Not at all/Very poorly, 5=A lot/Very well). We also invited staff to comment on what they did well and how they could improve in the future, with each administration. Staff completed the fidelity self-assessment approximately weekly during each summer session and once per every two weeks during the community phase.

We also measured the perceived difficulty of implementing (i.e., “Challenge”) the Mayhew model with fidelity for each boy. We measured challenge scores to help staff and supervisors monitor their work with each boy more objectively, frequently, and systematically to inform supervision and mid-course corrections. Mayhew staff rated how challenging it was to apply Mayhew’s strategies and values with each boy on their caseload on a 5-point scale (1=Not at all challenging, 5=Extremely challenging). Staff were again invited to comment on what they did well and how they could improve in the future, with each administration. Staff provided Challenge ratings approximately weekly during each summer session and once per every two weeks during the community phase.

How we promoted self-reflection and improvement in real time

Staff recorded their fidelity and challenge ratings in an Excel workbook (see appendix A for a sample excel worksheet). The Excel workbook for the summer session had an integrated data dashboard. Staff could click a button after entering new data to update the data dashboard in real time (see appendix C for an example). Research indicates that in the presence of valid feedback, practitioners readily self-correct and improve their own performance in real time (Lambert, Harmon, Slade, Whipple, & Hawkins, 2005; Lambert & Shimokawa, 2011).
Fidelity improved during the first summer session
Staff adhered more closely to Mayhew values as the first summer session progressed, as shown in the top-left graph of the fidelity dashboard. Some staff reported greater fidelity than others (top-right graph). Other than modeling, which tended to be the highest-rated strategy, we observed little variation in ratings by strategy or value (bottom-left).

Fidelity to Mayhew values - First summer session
Improved Fidelity Since Last Rating? 1 = Not at all || 5 = A lot

Adherence to Mayhew values improves during the first summer session

Some variation between staff in fidelity

Minimal variation in Fidelity between Mayhew Values

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimension</th>
<th>Modeling</th>
<th>Practicing</th>
<th>Teaching</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Challenge</td>
<td>4.22</td>
<td>4.12</td>
<td>4.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community</td>
<td>4.22</td>
<td>4.20</td>
<td>4.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respect</td>
<td>4.48</td>
<td>4.14</td>
<td>4.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsibilities</td>
<td>4.32</td>
<td>4.07</td>
<td>4.04</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

How Can I Do Better?

- Ask for more respect when talking - interrupted often
- By not assuming
- By not being responsible for the others gear and not having to check in with other calling out disrespect more when I see it
- Check in w/ group more often
- Do more things that are challenging for me if opportunity arises...
- Encourage more group work - ways to help community
- Encourage them to take on more skill challenges
- Enforce some rules more often/consistently
- Getting on top of meds
- Give tasks/ jobs that involve more than one person
- More focus on how to stay organized
- Not intervene with the links and telling them what to do with their gear
- Not talk to the guys about their own gear as much and give them more tasks to be
- Positively encourage the benefits of taking on a challenge
- Practice respect w/ all gear, personal stuff included
- Try to engage the staff to be moreiesening with each other
Challenge ratings decreased as the first summer session progressed

Staff-reported challenge ratings decreased slightly, but steadily throughout the first summer session. The average challenge rating for this session fell between 2 “A little challenging” and 3 “Moderately challenging.” However, this average was inflated by a few staff-boy dyads which were rated on average as 4 “Very challenging” or 5 “Extremely challenging” (bottom-right). We observed a fair amount of variation between staff challenge ratings (bottom-left).
Fidelity remained high, challenge increased in the second session

Fidelity remained high during the second summer session

Fidelity ratings in the second summer session remained high, but did not increase much (top-left, right half). As with the first session, there was a lot of variation between staff members’ self-reported fidelity ratings (top-right), but very little within Mayhew strategies and values (bottom-left).
Challenge ratings increased slightly during the second summer session
Staff perceived their work with the boys as increasingly challenging as the second summer session progressed. Notably, there were no staff-boy dyads rated as 4 “Very challenging” or 5 “Extremely challenging” (bottom-right graph). There was more than a full point of variation between average staff challenge ratings in some cases (bottom-left). No staff-boy dyads were rated on average as 4 “Very challenging” or 5 “Extremely challenging” in the second summer session (bottom-right).
Fidelity decreased, challenge remained low in the community phase

Fidelity decreased slightly during community phase
Fidelity ratings during the community phase were less stable than in the summer (top-left), in part because of the decreased number of staff. In general, fidelity ratings during the community phase trended slightly downward. Fidelity ratings varied a little within Mayhew values and strategies (bottom-left), but still less than expected.
Work in the community phase was “A little challenging”
Challenge ratings during the community phase remained quite low (top graph). We observed a good bit of variation in average challenge rating between staff, as seen in the bottom-left graph. No staff-boy dyads were rated on average 5 “Extremely challenging” and only one was rated 4 “Very challenging.” However, several staff-boy dyads were rated 3 “Moderately challenging” on average (bottom-right).
Mayhew maintained high fidelity, low challenge in 2016

Mayhew staff reported “A good bit” of fidelity across all three sessions
As shown in the top graph of the fidelity dashboard, Mayhew staff reported the highest levels of fidelity during the second summer session by a small margin. Staff reported an average fidelity rating across all sessions of approximately 4 “A good bit.” Fidelity in the community phase was slightly lower overall and more variable, largely due to having fewer staff. The difference in fidelity may be partially attributable to fewer supports (e.g., presence of other staff and boys) and natural opportunities to instill Mayhew values during the community, as compared to the summer phase. Some staff members struggled to enter their data on time, reflected in the small number of administrations at the very end of each phase. The bottom graph reflects the difference in fidelity between sessions and shows remarkably little variation in fidelity within Mayhew values and strategies. The lack of variation suggests that staff may not have differentiated between and among the various Mayhew strategies and values.

Self-reported Fidelity to Mayhew Values over 6 months of practice
Fidelity reached its peak in Session 2 before dipping in the Community Phase

Very little variation in fidelity between Mayhew Values or Critical Components
Critical Components: Modeling, Practicing, Teaching
Mayhew staff reported low challenge ratings across all three sessions

The average challenge rating across all sessions and cases hovered around 2 “A little challenging,” indicating that staff generally did not have much difficulty applying Mayhew values and strategies when working with their boys. Mayhew staff reported somewhat higher average challenge ratings during the first summer session than the second summer session or the community phase, as shown in the top graph of the challenge dashboard below. However, the average challenge rating for the first summer session is positively skewed by a higher frequency of 4 “Very challenging” and 5 “Extremely challenging” ratings than in other sessions (see bottom-left graph). Even though it was optional, staff often recorded their thoughts on how they could improve their work with the boys (see bottom-right graph). This suggests excellent staff engagement and commitment to reflective practice, the Mayhew model, and most importantly, the boys. Please note that many more entries were recorded than could fit in the dashboard.
Conclusions and Recommendations

Staff adhere to Mayhew values and strategies but need help differentiating these concepts
Fidelity ratings remained relatively high throughout both summer sessions and the community phase. Little variation was observed, however, among and between staff self-assessment of the various Mayhew values and strategies. This may indicate that staff cannot adequately differentiate the four values and three strategies. After discussing this finding with Mayhew leaders, we propose collapsing teaching and modeling into a single strategy to differentiate those strategies from practice, which is seen as both critical and distinct. Along with additional training and operational clarity around these values and strategies, staff may also benefit from having a “cheat sheet” with definitions and examples of each strategy and value to refer to when completing their self-assessments.

Some staff need additional administrative oversight to enter their data on time
Some staff were unable to enter their data on time, and instead logged this data during the last week of the session. Additional administrative oversight will help reduce this problem. Oversight could manifest as a regularly scheduled “data check-in” meeting or consistently monitoring data entry worksheets to ensure data is entered on time. Creating more time and space for entering data may be helpful for staff who are legitimately unable to enter their data within the given timeframe.

Staff like to reflect on their work; could profit from a streamlined version of the tool and feedback from the boys
Staff often commented on what they were doing well and how they could improve their work, even when it was not required. This demonstrates their dedication to the Mayhew program and the boys they serve. They also appreciated the opportunity created by the self-assessment tool to intentionally self-reflect on their performance. Based on the results and experience of Mayhew staff, we suspect that a streamlined version of the tool could provide the same self-reflective value, while being quicker and easier to use. Direct feedback from the boys would likely further enhance staff self-reflection and quality improvement.

Staff would benefit from more structure during the community phase
Fidelity was somewhat lower in the community phase than in the summer sessions. Community phase staff do not benefit from the same social supports (presence of other staff and boys and the community/norms that emerge “on Island”) and natural opportunities to teach, model, and practice the Mayhew values that summer session staff enjoy. It is inherently more difficult to adhere to the Mayhew model in the relatively short and infrequent encounters with individual/small groups of boys that are the hallmarks of the community phase. The Mayhew Program would profit from further development of intentional strategies and structures to augment the value and power of the community phase. Additional guidance and structure for community phase staff needs to be balance with room for improvisation and flexibility.
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Appendices

Appendix A: Fidelity Tracking Tool

Mayhew Values Fidelity Tool: Data Entry
Hover over the column headers for instructions on how to enter data in each field

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Administration</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Mayhew Value</th>
<th>Critical Component</th>
<th>How well did I do with this since the last time I filled this out?</th>
<th>How did I do this well?</th>
<th>How can I do better?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix B: Challenge Tracking Tool

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Administration</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Boy #</th>
<th>How challenging has it been for you to apply the Mayhew values in your work with this boy since the last time you filled this out?</th>
<th>Optional</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Optional:
- What's going well in my work with this boy?
- What could I be working on or doing better better with him?
**Appendix C: Staff-level fidelity dashboard**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mayhew Value</th>
<th>Component</th>
<th>History</th>
<th>Current vs Summer</th>
<th>How did I do this well?</th>
<th>How can I do this better?</th>
<th>Benchmark</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Challenge</td>
<td>Modeling</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Practicing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teaching</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community</td>
<td>Modeling</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Practicing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teaching</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respect</td>
<td>Modeling</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>I apologized to Jason after using a harsh tone with him when he requested to be goate</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Practicing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Make a stronger effort to work with Oliver on the rude tone he uses with Daniel</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teaching</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsibility</td>
<td>Modeling</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Practicing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teaching</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* This table should be read left to right, top to bottom. A flag indicates a low score on a particular component in the most recent administration for this staff person. The History column shows Mayhew value scores over time for this staff person. A blue dot highlights data from the latest administration for this staff person. The Current vs Summer column shows the scores of the latest administration for this staff person in light green compared to the average score for this staff person across the summer in dark green. The black line in this chart represents a benchmark – the average score for each Mayhew value across all staff (you can see the value of this benchmark in the last column). Comments that appear in columns F and G correspond to the latest administration for this staff person.
**Appendix D: Case-level dashboard**

### Challenge in the Cabin

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID</th>
<th>History</th>
<th>Current vs Summer</th>
<th>Comments</th>
<th>Benchmark</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td><img src="graph1" alt="Graph" /></td>
<td><img src="graph2" alt="Graph" /></td>
<td>I'm at a loss for how to engage with and work with this boy; I need help figuring out what to do differently the next few days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td><img src="graph3" alt="Graph" /></td>
<td><img src="graph4" alt="Graph" /></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td><img src="graph5" alt="Graph" /></td>
<td><img src="graph6" alt="Graph" /></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td><img src="graph7" alt="Graph" /></td>
<td><img src="graph8" alt="Graph" /></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td><img src="graph9" alt="Graph" /></td>
<td><img src="graph10" alt="Graph" /></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td><img src="graph11" alt="Graph" /></td>
<td><img src="graph12" alt="Graph" /></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td><img src="graph13" alt="Graph" /></td>
<td><img src="graph14" alt="Graph" /></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Cabin*  

* This table should be read left to right, top to bottom. A flag indicates a low score on a particular component in the most recent administration for this staff person. The History column shows Challenge scores over time. A blue dot * highlights data from the latest administration. The Current vs Summer column shows the scores of the latest administration in light green compared to the average challenge rating throughout the summer for this boy. The black line represents a benchmark, which is set in column G. Comments that appear in column E correspond to the latest administration.