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What is evaluation?
“Key Aspects of Improvement”

“Many initiatives fail for lack of study and reflection on what is actually being done and what the results are from having done it. Observing, describing, and documenting are key aspects to a program improvement cycle, and particularly critical during the pilot phase when key functions of interventions are emerging.”

The Child Wellbeing Project, Improvement Cycle Tool
Before we begin a project or initiative…

• We need to know what we hope to accomplish
• AND we need to know how we hope to determine if we have accomplished it
• (for grant funded activities, refer to the grant application package)
Research vs. Evaluation

Blome (2009) – Office of Program Analysis and Evaluation, National Institute of General Medical Sciences

Research
• Produces generalizable knowledge
• Scientific inquiry based on intellectual curiosity

Evaluation
• Judges merit or worth
• Policy & program interests of stakeholders paramount
• Provides information for decision-making on specific program

At the heart of program evaluation is the idea that outcomes, or changes, are valuable and desired. Some outcomes are more valuable than others. Evaluators conduct program evaluation to find out if these valued changes are, in fact, achieved by the program or initiative. Brad Rose (2018)
Effective Evaluation System

An effective evaluation has a clearly defined purpose that tells a story that helps to...

- document program, initiative, or intervention
  - context, input, fidelity, and impact evidence
- improve and support continuation
  - stages of innovation and continuous improvement evidence
- direct policies and practices
  - efficient and effective reporting and dissemination of evidence

B. Algozinne
Core Features

1. Who is the evaluation for? (stakeholders, funders, policy makers)
2. Who is involved? (project or program participants)
3. What questions are trying to answer through evaluation?
4. What are planning to do? (project or program activities)
5. How did you do what you said you would? (complete activities on time, within budget)
6. What was the impact? (outcomes, change, accomplishments, perceptions)
Program Evaluation Simplified

Design/Plan
[Redesign/Re-Plan]

Implement Intentionally and Document Fidelity

Assess Continuously and Document Intended and Unintended Outcomes

Adapted from B. Algozinne
Various Components of Evaluation

Feedback Loops
• Based on formative and summative measures
• Compared with external standards set by stakeholders/consumers and also internal standard set by project

- Project or program
  - REACH
    - Extending number of schools implementing
  - CAPACITY
    - Develop organizational structures and staff competencies
  - FIDELITY
    - Implementation of effective practices
  - IMPACT
    - Successful student outcomes, perception of implementers and receivers

Describe Context
Describe Activities
Key questions to address in evaluation
Are we doing what we said we would do?

- Define the planned activities for the project.
- Report on completed activities.
  - Were the activities conducted according to schedule? (Timeliness)
  - Were the activities completed within budget? (Prudence)
  - Were the activities completed as stated? (Quality)
Is what we are doing making a difference?

- Short Term Outcome:
  - Change learning (knowledge/skill acquisition)
- Intermediate Term Outcome:
  - Change behavior (educator practices-fidelity)
- Long Term Outcome:
  - Change Impact (student outcomes)
Can we improve our work?

- Can we do it better?
  - More efficient, faster, effective, less cost
- Can we make it last?
- Can we scale? (extend the reach)
- Can we embed this learning into other work?
Evaluation depends on the maturity of the model

- **Model Demonstration:** Does it work in a specific setting with a specific population?
- **Replications:** Can it be reproduced in different settings with different populations?
- **Embed within existing work:** Provide access as current practice
- **Scale-Up:** Increase "reach" of practice to critical mass of implementation
- **Modifying System for Standard Practice**

*Invest heavily in resources to produce results*

Utilize typical/existing resources
Logic Model
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Receiving Unit</th>
<th>Process/Activity</th>
<th>Output</th>
<th>Short Term Objective: Change Learning</th>
<th>Intermediate Term Objective: Change Behavior</th>
<th>Long Term Objective: Change Conditions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| ISD Team       | ISD implementation support team members are provided with training and coaching in effective, evidence-based practices to support teachers and grade level team members in the implementation of an integrated reading and behavior MTSS model | • ISD leadership team members selected  
• ISD level team members are trained  
• ISD  
• level team members are trained | ISD implementation support team members have the knowledge and skills to provide the conditions and supports necessary for district implementation support teams to implement effective, evidence-based reading and behavior support practices | • Coordinate training for school staff based on student need and evidence-based practices  
• Coordinate coaching for school staff based on student need and evidence-based practices  
• Communicate common vision to staff  
• Planning to provide tools for implementation, developing processes for efficient implementation | • District teams engage in Plan Do Study Act (PDSA) cycles related to reading and behavior outcomes and establish funding priorities based on student performance, have a system for involving stakeholders in gathering information dissemination of results to constituents: staff, parents, district, community to promote visibility and political support  
• Capacity is established at the ISD level for training, coaching, evaluation, and reading/behavioral expertise. |
| LEA Team       | LEA team members are provided training and coaching in effective, evidence-based practices to implement an integrated academic and behavior MTSS model | • LEA team members selected  
• LEA team members trained  
• LEA team members coached | LEA team members have the knowledge and skills to provide the conditions and supports necessary for school leadership teams to implement effective, evidence-based reading and behavior support practices | • LEA Team analyzes fidelity/outcome data  
• Team develops LEA plan to support staff in implementation efforts  
• Team develops common vision  
• Application of implementation drivers  
• Engage in barrier busting | • LEA teams engage in Plan Do Study Act (PDSA) cycles related to academic and behavior outcomes and establish funding priorities based on student performance  
• Involve stakeholders in gathering information dissemination of results to constituents: staff, parents, district, community to promote visibility and political support |
# Logic Model: Indirect Receivers of MIBLSI

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Receiving Unit</th>
<th>Process/Activity</th>
<th>Output</th>
<th>Short Term Objective: Change Learning</th>
<th>Intermediate Term Objective: Change Behavior</th>
<th>Long Term Objective: Change Conditions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Grade Level Team** | Grade level team members are provided with training and coaching in effective, evidence-based practices in an integrated MTSS model | • Grade level team trained  
• Grade level team coached | Grade level team members have the knowledge and skills to provide effective, evidence-based academic and behavior support practices across the grade level | • Analyze assessment results at the grade/student level, provide instructional planning, implementation and evaluation for academic instruction and behavior management | • Teachers are successful in delivering effective, evidence-based reading and behavior instruction across grade level  
• Plan for differentiated instruction for students at each tier level  
• Differentiated instruction plan implemented with fidelity |
| **Classroom Teacher** | Teachers are provided with training and coaching in effective, evidence-based practices in an integrated academic and behavior MTSS | • Teachers are trained  
• Teachers are coached | Teachers have the knowledge and skills to provide effective, evidence-based reading and behavior support practices | • Teachers are engaged in effective MTSS teaching strategies  
• Minimal interference with instruction  
• Monitoring of student progress  
• Plan for differentiated instruction | • Students successful in academics and behavior within classroom  
• Plan for differentiated instruction for students at each tier level  
• Differentiated instruction plan implemented with fidelity |
| **Student** | Instructional time is allocated w/resources provided for effective MTSS | • Students are exposed to effective, MTSS strategies | Students have skills to read well AND behave in socially appropriate manner | • Students apply reading and social skills correctly in appropriate contexts | • Students are more successful in school leading to improved standardized scores, graduation rates |
Core Features of SCTG Evaluation Plans

GPRA
SCTG Evaluation Expectations

• **REQUIRED**: Performance Indicators from the RFP
  – LEA and SEA

• **SELECTED**: Evaluation questions and targets that grantees have written into the application proposals.

• **ADDED**: Supplemental evaluation questions added since receiving funding.
Local Education Agencies (LEAs)
Absolute Priority for LEA SCTG

Priority 1: Projects designed to develop, enhance, or expand systems of support for, and technical assistance to, schools implementing a multi-tiered system of support for improving school climate, which may include a multi-tiered behavioral framework, by using evidence-based efforts that are designed to foster safety; promote supportive academic, disciplinary, and physical environments; and/or encourage and maintain respectful, trusting, and caring relationships throughout the school community.
Required Performance Indicators: LEA 2019

a) The number of training and/or technical assistance events to support implementation with fidelity provided annually by LEAs to schools implementing a multi-tiered system of support.

b) Number and percentage of schools annually that report an improved school climate based on the results of the EDSCLS or similar tool.

c) Number and percentage of schools annually that are implementing a multi-tiered system of support framework with fidelity.

d) Number and percentage of schools annually that are implementing opioid abuse prevention and mitigation strategies.

e) Number and percentage of schools that report an annual decrease in suspensions and expulsions related to possession or use of alcohol.

f) Number and percentage of schools that report an annual decrease in suspensions and expulsions related to possession or use of other drugs.
| Date    | Training Topic                  | Duration | District                        | Schools                                                        | Number of Participants |
|---------|---------------------------------|----------|---------------------------------|                                                               |                    |
| 1/27/17 | School Wide PBIS Day 1- Elementary | 1 day    | Charlton Public Schools         | • Carlton Early Elementary • Carlton Upper Elementary         | 22                  |
| 2/10/17 | School Wide PBIS Day 1- Secondary | 1 day    | Alton Community Schools         | • Westview High School • Robertson High School                 | 14                  |
| 2/12/17 | School Wide PBIS Day 1- Elementary | 1 day    | Williamsburg Consolidated Schools | • Pinewood Elementary • Hickory Elementary • Maple Hill Elementary • Sand Lake Elementary | 31                  |
| TOTALS  |                                 | 3 days   | 3 Districts                     | 8 Schools 6 Elementary 2 Secondary                              | 67 Participants     |
## Number of Schools Implementing MTBF Example

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Number of Schools in Participating District(s)</th>
<th>Number of Schools Implementing</th>
<th>Percent of Schools Implementing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Elementary</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Cumulative Implementing Schools Chart Example

Elementary  Middle  High

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Number of Schools

- New
- Existing
We can create positive climates

Elementary School B

School Climate Survey

SWPBIS Fidelity Inventory: Tier 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Fidelity Criteria Percentage Implemented</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2/2/2016</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4/19/2016</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/18/2016</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/21/2017</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5/5/2017</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/5/2017</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mean Scores

- 3/6/2016: 3.19 (N=122)
- 11/30/2016: 3.34 (N=199)
- 11/22/2017: 3.35 (N=127)
TFI- Technical Adequacy (McIntosh, Massar et al. 2015)

Content Validity (Tier 1 .95; Tier II .93; Tier III .91)
Usability (12 of 14 ≥ 80%) (15 min per Tier)
Inter-rater Agreement (.95; .96; .89)
Test-retest reliability (.98; .99; .99)
Factor Analysis
## 1.1 Team Composition

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feature</th>
<th>Data Sources</th>
<th>Scoring Criteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **1.1 Team Composition**: Team Composition: Tier I team includes a Tier I systems coordinator, a school administrator, a family member, and individuals able to provide (a) applied behavioral expertise, (b) coaching expertise, (c) knowledge of student academic and behavior patterns, (d) knowledge about the operations of the school across grade levels and programs, and for high schools, (e) student representation. | • School organizational chart  
• Tier I team meeting minutes | 0 = Tier I team does not exist or does not include coordinator, school administrator, or individuals with applied behavioral expertise  
1 = Tier I team exists, but does not include all identified roles or attendance of these members is below 80%  
2 = Tier I team exists with coordinator, administrator, and all identified roles represented, AND attendance of all roles is at or above 80% |

**Main Idea:** Teams need people with multiple skills and perspectives to implement PBIS well.
Total Score (TFI)

School-Wide PBIS (SWPBIS) Tiered Fidelity Inventory Demonstration School

Percentage Implemented

- 5/5/2017: 40%
- 5/5/2018: 80%
Sub-Scale Report

School-Wide PBIS (SWPBIS) Tiered Fidelity Inventory
Demonstration School

Percentage Implemented

5/5/2017  5/5/2018

Tier I
Tier II
Tier III
Sub-subscale report

School-Wide PBIS (SWPBIS) Tiered Fidelity Inventory
Demonstration School

Percentage Implemented

Tier I
- Teams
- Implementation
- Evaluation

Tier II
- Teams
- Interventions
- Evaluation

Tier III
- Teams
- Resources
- Support Plan
- Evaluation

5/5/2017
5/5/2018
## School-Wide PBIS (SWPBIS) Tiered Fidelity Inventory

### Demonstration School Challenged
Zenith, Winnemac

#### School Year: 2011-12
**Date Completed:** 5/5/2012 - 5/5/2013

### Tier I: Universal SWPBIS Core Features

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teams</th>
<th>5/5/12</th>
<th>5/5/13</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1. Team Composition:</strong> Tier I team includes a Tier I systems coordinator, a school administrator, a family member, and individuals able to provide (1) applied behavioral expertise, (2) coaching expertise, (3) knowledge of student academic and behavior patterns, (4) knowledge about the operations of the school across grade levels and programs, and for high schools, (5) student representation.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2. Team Operating Procedures:</strong> Tier I team meets at least monthly and has (a) regular meeting format/agenda, (b) minutes, (c) defined meeting roles, and (d) a current action plan.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Feature Total:** 2 of 4 3 of 4

### Implementation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Implementation</th>
<th>5/5/12</th>
<th>5/5/13</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>3. Behavioral Expectations:</strong> School has five or fewer positively stated behavioral expectations and examples by setting/location for student and staff behaviors (i.e., school teaching matrix) defined and in place.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item</td>
<td>Current Score</td>
<td>Action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1. Team to propose teaching template and Fall teaching schedule at Feb 16 Faculty meeting.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Implementation Fidelity Summary Example

Average Fidelity Subscale

Winter 2017

Winter 2018

Score

Elementary | Middle | High | Elementary | Middle | High

Tier I Fidelity | Tier II Fidelity | Tier III Fidelity
Report Summary: TFI High, Low, Mean
18 SCTG Schools

Tier I

Tier II

Tier III
Suspension/ Expulsions Disaggregated

• Suspensions and Expulsions for substance abuse (drugs, alcohol).
• Consider comparing total Suspension/Expulsion rates with Suspension/ Expulsion rates for substance abuse.
District/ School Discipline Data

• Office Discipline Referrals.
  – Ensure operational definitions
  – Clarify standard for “Staff Managed” versus “Office Managed”
  – Clarify “minor” and “major”
• See:
  • Operationally defined; Staff receive training; Separation of minor from major; Designation of behaviors referred to the office versus managed in class.
• Data Sources
  – **District School Information System** (e.g. Synergy, PowerSchool, AERIES, Skyward)
  – **School-based Data Decision Systems**: Review 360, Educator’s Handbook, School-wide Information System (SWIS)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Major Problem Behavior</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bullying (Bullying)</td>
<td>The delivery of direct or technology-based messages that involve intimidation, teasing, taunting, threats, or name calling.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Defiance/Insubordination/Non-Compliance (Defiance)</td>
<td>Student engages in refusal to follow directions or talks back.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disrespect (Disrespect)</td>
<td>Student delivers socially rude or dismissive messages to adults or students.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disruption (Disruption)</td>
<td>Student engages in behavior causing an interruption in a class or activity. Disruption includes sustained loud talk, yelling, or screaming; noise with materials; horseplay or roughhousing; and/or sustained out-of-seat behavior.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dress Code Violation (Dress)</td>
<td>Student wears clothing that does not fit within the dress code guidelines practiced by the school/district.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fighting (Fight)</td>
<td>Student is involved in mutual participation in an incident involving physical violence.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forgery/Theft/Plagiarism (Theft)</td>
<td>Student is involved by being in possession of, having passed on, or being responsible for removing someone else's property; or the student has signed a person’s name without that person’s permission, or claims someone else’s work as their own.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gang Affiliation Display (Gang Display)</td>
<td>Student uses gesture, dress, and/or speech to display affiliation with a gang.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harassment (Harass)</td>
<td>The delivery of disrespectful messages in any format related to gender, ethnicity, sex, race, religion, disability, physical features, or other protected class.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Available in “Resources” at [www.pbisapps.org](http://www.pbisapps.org)
## MAJORS ONLY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade Range</th>
<th>Number of Schools</th>
<th>Mean Enrollment per School</th>
<th>Mean ODRs/100 Students/School Day</th>
<th>Median ODRs/100 Students/School Day</th>
<th>25th Percentile ODRs/100 Students/School Day</th>
<th>75th Percentile ODRs/100 Students/School Day</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>K-6</td>
<td>3592</td>
<td>465</td>
<td>.34 (.47)</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-9</td>
<td>1002</td>
<td>650</td>
<td>.46 (.57)</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9-12</td>
<td>517</td>
<td>970</td>
<td>.46 (.72)</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PreK-8</td>
<td>351</td>
<td>449</td>
<td>.45 (.79)</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PreK-12</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>332</td>
<td>.96 (1.82)</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.85</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ODR = office discipline referral; (#) = standard deviation; Shaded column = most useful for decision making
Decrease in Major Office Discipline Referrals

Consider “Major” office discipline referrals per 100 students as the comparative metric.
– Separate by grade level (Elementary, Middle, High)
– Separate by cohort (Year One adoption, Year Two adoption)

Major ODRs per 100 students for School “X” across years 1, 2 and 3

National SWIS Median for Elementary
ODR Rates per SCTG School at a specific time
(compared with SWIS national median)

ODRs per 100 students per school day

[Bar chart showing ODR rates for Elementary, Middle, and High schools across different years. The chart compares the ODR rates with the SWIS national median.]
ODR Rates at Times 1, 2 and 3 for SCTG Schools by Grade Cluster
(compared with SWIS national median)

Elementary  n = 8

Middle   n = 6

High School  n = 5
State Education Agencies (SEAs)
Absolute Priority for State SCTG

Grants awarded to SEAs to develop, enhance, or expand statewide systems of support for, and provide technical assistance to, LEAs implementing a multitiered behavioral framework to improve school climate and behavioral outcomes for all students.
Under the Government Performance and Results Act (GPRA), the following performance indicators have been established to evaluate the overall effectiveness of the School Climate Transformation Grant Program—State Educational Agency Grants:

- The number of training and technical assistance events provided by the SEA School Climate Transformation Grant Program to assist LEAs in implementing a multitiered behavioral framework.
- The number and percentage of schools in LEAs provided training or technical assistance by the SEA School Climate Transformation Grant Program that implement a multitiered behavioral framework.
- The number and percentage of LEAs provided training or technical assistance by the SEA School Climate Transformation Grant Program that implement a multitiered behavioral framework with fidelity.
Performance Indicators

• The number of **training and technical assistance events** provided by the SEA School Climate Transformation Grant Program to assist LEAs in implementing a multi-tiered behavioral framework.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metric</th>
<th>Possible Measure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number and length of training, and TA events</td>
<td>Training and TA Logs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived value and quality of training and TA events</td>
<td>Training and TA Evaluations</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Develop system to record training events
Performance Indicators

• The number and percentage of schools in LEAs provided training or technical assistance by the SEA School Climate Transformation Grant Program that implement a multi-tiered behavioral framework.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metric</th>
<th>Possible Measure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of schools implementing MTBF within LEAs receiving TA support.</td>
<td>Demographic Logs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Graph of current implementers support through project

All Partners

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>ISDs</th>
<th>Districts</th>
<th>Schools</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>214</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Graph of cumulative implementers support through project over time

**MIBLSI Participating Districts**

Time Series Graph: Includes Only Partners First Time Participation

**MIBLSI Participating Schools**

Time Series Graph: Includes Only Partners First Time Participation

- Number of Districts
- Number of Schools
- Total Per Year
- Cumulative
Performance Indicators

• The number and percentage of LEAs provided training or technical assistance by the SEA School Climate Transformation Grant Program that implement a multi-tiered behavioral framework with fidelity.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metric</th>
<th>Possible Measure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of LEAs (Leadership Teams) receiving TA</td>
<td>Training and TA Logs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The fidelity of MTBF implementation in schools receiving support (Tier I, Tier II, Tier III)</td>
<td>Tiered Fidelity Inventory</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Defining the District Capacity Assessment (DCA)

- Bi-annual self-assessment: typically assessed in August/September and February
- Items align with the five implementation foundations:
  - Usable innovations
  - Stages of implementation
  - Implementation teams
  - Generic implementation infrastructure
  - Data analysis and problem solving
District Capacity Assessment (DCA)

- The primary purpose of the DCA is to assist school districts to implement effective innovations such as PBIS that benefit students.

- The capacity of a district to facilitate building-level implementation refers to the systems, activities, and resources that are necessary for schools to successfully adopt and sustain Effective Innovations.
Example School District:
District Capacity and PBIS School Tier 1 Fidelity

District Capacity Assessment Score
- 2014-15
- 2015-16
- 2016-17

Average Fidelity School Score
- 2017-18
- 2018-19

Fidelity Criteria
Capacity Assessment

**State Capacity.** SEAs are more likely to be successful if they agree to at least annually assess the capacity of the state using some formal metric. The State Capacity Assessment (SCA) is one option, and a new State Systems Fidelity Inventory (SSFI), based on the Implementation Blueprint

**District Capacity.** Any formal effort to implement educational change needs to define how to improve the capacity of local districts to conduct implementation of effective practices. A valid metric for assessing district capacity should be administered at least annually, and preferable at least twice a year. The District Capacity Assessment (DCA) is one option, and a new District Systems Fidelity Inventory (DSFI), based on the Implementation Blueprint
DISTRCT SYSTEMS FIDELITY INVENTORY (DSFI)

Interested in using the DSFI?

It's accessible through the PBISAssessments field test site.

Visit PBIS.org and contact your PBIS State Coordinator.

They will connect with a member of the National TA Center for PBIS to obtain access.
**State Capacity.** SEAs are more likely to be successful if they agree to at least annually assess the capacity of the state using some formal metric. The State Capacity Assessment (SCA) is one option, and a new State Systems Fidelity Inventory (SSFI), based on the Implementation Blueprint.
Invest in Data Decision Support Systems
### SWPBIS Tiered Fidelity Inventory

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Tier 1</th>
<th>Tier 1: Teams</th>
<th>Tier 1: Implementation</th>
<th>Tier 1: Evaluation</th>
<th>Tier 2</th>
<th>Tier 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>District Average</strong></td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maple Elementary School</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reed Lake Middle School</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oaks Elementary School</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Red Pines Elementary School</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Bay Lake Middle School</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>74%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blue Heron Elementary School</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willow Elementary School</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Crucial Role of Evaluation

Proper evaluation ensures that MTSS implementation plans are grounded in good decision making. Without evaluation, every action taken by districts and schools would be just a guessing game. MTSS requires evaluation at every level of implementation on a continual basis, including:

- Installation and capacity-building efforts.
- Systems and team activities.
- School-wide practices and targeted student interventions.

Collecting the right data is critical, but simply having data is not enough to guide decision making. District and school staff must understand what the data mean as they analyze it. When teams look at data, they use that information to design improvements that will lead to success for all students.

Rationale for Required Assessments

Explore Further

Student Assessments

Fidelity Assessments

VIEW THE STUDENT ASSESSMENTS

Gather data to determine which students need additional supports and when school-wide supports need to be

VIEW THE FIDELITY ASSESSMENTS

Determine how many features of school-wide MTSS are in place in your school, and the quality of their

Screening Schedule

2019-2020 School Year

Early Warning Indicators (EWIs)

Fall
- Pull data after the first 20 days of school (typically 10/1/19 based on data from days 1-20).

Winter
- Pull data at the end of Trimester 1, Quarters 1 & 2, or Semester 1.

Spring
- Pull data at the end of Trimester 2 or Quarter 3. (Ensure plan for pulling data at End of Year.)

Student Risk Screening Scale (SRSS)

Fall
- 10/14/2019 to 10/25/2019

Winter
- 12/1/2019 to
Student Assessments

VIEW THE STUDENT ASSESSMENTS 

Gather data to determine which students need additional supports and when school-wide supports need to be adjusted.

Capacity Assessments

VIEW THE CAPACITY ASSESSMENTS 

Evaluate how well your ISD or local district can support schools implementing MTSS.

Fidelity Assessments

VIEW THE FIDELITY ASSESSMENTS 

Determine how many features of school-wide MTSS are in place in your school, and the quality of their implementation.

Reach Assessments

VIEW THE INDICATORS FOR ASSESSING REACH 

Determine the stage of implementation for your ISD, local district, or school so you can plan supports.

Data Analysis

VIEW INFORMATION FOR DATA ANALYSIS 

Learn about the guiding principles for data analysis and how MIBLSI supports data analysis.

MIBLSI Database

VIEW THE MIBLSI DATABASE INFORMATION 

Learn how to access MIDATA (the MIBLSI database) and its advantages.
Additional Resources
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Use of I-SWIS: Use of the Integrated Framework

In this Evaluation Brief, we describe I-SWIS, a tiered system for school-wide support plans. Our description includes application to guide implementation. They are short, the results, and provides a

National Technical Assistance Center on Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports (PBIS)

http://www.pbis.org/

January 1, 2010

https://www.pbis.org/resource-type/evaluation-briefs
Recordings here include keynotes and presentations about PBIS concepts. Check out the videos from the PBIS Technical Assistance Center, below!

https://www.pbis.org/video-examples/video