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**Background**

In October 2014, the Office of Safe and Healthy Students funded 12 states and 71 districts to implement a Multi-Tiered Behavioral Framework (MTBF). The National Technical Assistance Center on PBIS has received funding to provide technical assistance to states and districts across sites.

To assess the ongoing technical assistance needs and implementation status across School Climate Transformation Grant (SCTG) recipients, the National Technical Assistance Center on PBIS conducted implementation surveys three times per year (Nov, March, May) during the first year of the project, two times per year (Nov, March) during the second year, and once per year (March) for the duration of the project. All SEA and LEAs were sent a link to an online survey and asked to complete this information electronically.

*The purpose of this report is to summarize these data from October 1, 2014 through March 30, 2019 and describe how the TA center is using this information to guide the ongoing organization of TA supports across sites.* The results reported in this evaluation summary represent work in at least 130 districts and 1868 schools.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Elementary School | Middle Schools | High Schools | Other | Not Reported | Districts |
| LEA | 444 | 205 | 150 | 65 | 619 | 69 |
| SEA | 136 | 95 | 92 | 62 | 0 | 61 |
| Total | 580 | 300 | 242 | 127 | 619 | 130 |

**Response Rate**

*Thank you* to all SEA and LEA teams who submitted survey data. We encourage SCTG recipients to continue discussions about TA needs with their TA providers.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | TA Worksheet  | Nov 2014 Survey  | March 2015 Survey | May 2015 Survey | Nov 2015 Survey | March 2016 Survey | March 2017 Survey | March 2018 Survey | March 2019 Survey |
| SEA   | 5/12 (42%)  | 9/12 (75%)  | 10/12 (83%) | 8/12 (67%) | 9/12 (75%) | 11/12 (92%) | 8/12 (67%) | 8/12 (67%) | 6/12 (50%) |
| LEA   | 19/71 (27%)  | 40/71 (56%)  | 49/71 (69%) | 54/7(76%) | 37/71 (52%) | 42/70(60%) | 57/70 (81%) | 47/70 (67%) | 48/69 (70%) |

**Results**

In the following charts, we compare the results of implementation surveys from Nov 2014 to March 2019 in the areas of implementation steps taken and evaluation plan components. Additionally, we provide a summary of practices included in SEA and LEA implementation plans. Each wave of surveys may have had different respondents; therefore, variability in reported implementation steps, evaluation plan elements, and implementation plan components may be due to a different number and combination of projects reporting at each time point.

\* Other includes: Prosocial, Acceptance and Commitment Training, ISF

* Other includes: CHAMPS, Mindfulness, Disproportionality in discipline, Differentiated family engagement, Alternative to suspension, Ripple effect, Second Step, TCIS, Positive Action Reconnecting Youth, CAST, Suicide prevention, The Leader In Me

**Implementation Outcomes:** Annual Government Performance and Results Act Measures for LEA’s

\* Number of sites included in GPRA data synthesis because data were reported as intended.

**Technical Assistance (TA) Summary**

**TA Activities**

In order to monitor the amount, type, and the quality of the TA provided to SCTG sites we tracked TA events. A TA event was defined as TA support offered in person or electronically (web/email/phone) to one or more LEAs or SEAs which approximates 30 minutes or more OR contains significant content information as determined by the TA provider. Using that definition, the Center engaged in more than 1550 unique TA events in the first 3 years of the grants and provided direct support to 100% of funded LEAs and SEAs. The most frequent types of TA provided were on-site meetings and individual telephone or video calls. The purpose of TA events changed slightly over time. Initially TA providers focused on leadership team development and building training and coaching capacity. As sites began to establish leadership teams and expertise, TA providers increased their focus on building content expertise and evaluation capacity.

**Webinars**

In addition to site-based TA, the National TA Center on PBIS provided 30 webinars, and OSHS provided 1 webinar available to all SCTG recipients. In addition, the TA center has hosted 4 community of practice calls for SEA sites. Materials and videos of all webinars are available at <http://www.pbis.org/sctg/sctg-events>.

The table below summarizes the number of webinar attendees and the number of downloads for each webinar video. The webinar ratings by SEA and LEA attendees are summarized in the graphs below. The final table includes suggestions for future webinar topics.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Webinar Topic** | **Number of Attendees** | **Number of Video Views/Material Downloads** |
| Performance Reporting (1/22/15) | 128 | 321/858 |
| Designing Evaluation Plans (2/26/15) | 105 | 270/821 |
| Developing State and District Leadership Teams (3/19/15) | 80 | 318/1065 |
| Implementation Action Planning (4/23/15) | 85 | 134/1773 |
| Developing Training and Coaching Capacity (5/28/15) | 70 | 273/1147 |
| Setting up Implementation Success (9/17/15) |  | 164/611 |
| Positive Classroom Behavior Support (10/16/15) |  | 580/1338 |
| Selecting and Implementing Evidence Based Practices (11/19/15) |  | 276/729 |
| Resources for Enhancing Equity in School Discipline (1/21/16) |  | 448/687 |
| MTSS-B in High School: Evidence, Fidelity, and Engaging Staff (2/18/16) |  | 343/626 |
| Building District Capacity for Multi-Tiered Behavioral Frameworks (3/17/16) |  | 306/445 |
| Tier II Overview: Readiness, Data Decisions, & Practices (4/21/16) |  | 357/553 |
| Systematic Screening for Emotional/ Behavioral Challenges in Tiered Systems (5/19/16) |  | 364/872 |
| Systems to Support Teachers' Implementation of PBIS in the Classroom (9/22/16) | 31 | 141/259 |
| Building and Measuring Regional and District Capacity to Implement MTSS (11/17/16) | 16 | 52/101 |
| Interconnected Systems Framework (12/8/16) | 30 | 148/254 |
| Integrating Trauma Informed Support in MTSS (1/26/17) | 63 | 143/271 |
| Restorative Practices in PBIS (2/16/17) | 62 | 57/359 |
| Tier 2 and Tier 3 Support Systems (3/16/17) | 43 | 311/650 |
| Equity and MTSS (4/27/17) | 38 | 416/577 |
| Leadership Capacity for MTSS (5/25/17) | 21 | 278/420 |
| Family and Community Engagement (6/15/17) | 27 | 378/2,728 |
| Best Practices in the Classroom: Building Capacity at the District Level to Support your Teachers (10/19/17) | 37 | 187PPT: 382Handout 1: 754Handout 2: 171 |
| Adding Check in/Check out to MTSS (11/16/17) | 15 | 195no material posted |
| Sustaining SWPBIS: 4 Research-based Tips for School Teams (12/7/17) | 34 | 111/296 |
| Aligning and Integrating SEL and PBIS (1/18/18) | 53 | 200/437 |
| Using Data (and data systems) to address Discipline Disproportionality (2/15/18) | 25 | 311/650 |
| Social Skills Instruction at Tier 2 (3/15/18) |  | 422/744 |
| Improving the Effectiveness of Tier 2 Interventions (4/19/18) |  | 215/845 |
| What Building Teams Should Ask of Their Districts (5/17/18) |  | 446/773 |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| SEA Community of Practice Topic | Attendees | Number of Video Views |
| District Action Planning | ECS didn’t facilitate | n\a |
| Aligning Multiple initiatives (6/10/16) | 15 | 254 |
| High school challenges (7/29/16) | 12 | 223 |
| Integrating AWARE, SCT, and PBIS at the district and state levels (9/23/16) | 18 | 140 |
| Rural challenges | 18 | 82 |

In the following table, we summarize the suggestions provided by LEA and SEA participants.

|  |
| --- |
| **Suggestions for Future Webinars or TA Products** |
| **SEA** | **LEA** |
| * Key practice elements necessary for successful implementation of MTBF in schools with measures and activities including capacity building activities for those who do not know how to do this.
* Sustainability
* District capacity building
* Integration of academics, behavior, social emotional supports
* Materials or PD for coaching practices
* Advanced tiers
* Examples of how the SEA can take and use the state capacity assessment
 | * Tier 2- especially in urban settings
* High school implementation
* Building internal coaching capacity
* Fine tuning SWIS
* Addressing intensive behavioral needs
* Interconnected Systems Framework, Mental Health supports
* Marketing and Sustainability
* Suicide prevention
* Trauma informed practices
* Restorative Practices
* Career Readiness
* Mindfulness
* De-escalation strategies
* Culturally responsive PBIS
* Administrative responses to discipline
* Aligning and integrating initiatives
* Specific evidence based Tier 2 and Tier 3 practices
* Tier 3 Data systems
* Classroom Coaching
 |

**Website**

                In addition to the webinar materials, the National TA Center on PBIS has provided a number of other documents and resources to all SCTG sites via <http://www.pbis.org/sctg>.

The main SCTG webpage has received 55,501 views and 49,991 visits.  The following table lists available resources and the number of downloads for each.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Document Name** | **Number of Downloads** |
| Safe and healthy students pre-conference meeting: Measuring and improving attendance and reducing chronic absenteeism | 518 |
| Safe and healthy students pre-conference meeting: How do we Implement, evaluate, and sustain the SCTG work? | 246 |
| Safe and healthy students pre-conference meeting: Positive and practice classroom management  | 660 |
| Safe and healthy students pre-conference meeting: SEA SCTG review of systems implementation best practice & organizational implementation capacity development 2018 & beyond | 198 |
| Safe and healthy students pre-conference meeting: Sustainability of the SCTG work | 161 |
| Safe and healthy students pre-conference meeting: Aligning initiatives in a MTSS framework | 633 |
| 2014-2018 School Climate Transformation Grant Implementation Survey Summary | 546 |
| Safe and healthy students pre-conference meeting: Scaling and sustaining | 421 |
| Safe and healthy students pre-conference meeting: Implementing MTSS with impact | 2105 |
| Safe and healthy students pre-conference meeting: LEA presentation | 2914 |
| Safe and healthy students pre-conference meeting: opening remarks | 244 |
| [2014-2017 School Climate Transformation Grant Implementation Survey Summary](http://www.pbis.org/Common/Cms/files/pbisresources/SCTG%20Implemenatation%20Survey%20Winter%202017%5B1%5D.pdf) | 410 |
| [Sustainability Self-Assessment for Tier 1MTSS for school, LEA, and SEA teams](http://www.pbis.org/Common/Cms/files/pbisresources/SCTG%20Tier%201%20Sustainability%20Self-Assessment.doc) | 3762 |
| [Tier 2 Readiness Guide](http://www.pbis.org/Common/Cms/files/pbisresources/Tier2_ReadinessGuide.docx) | 10493 |
| [2014-2016 School Climate Transformation Grant Implementation Survey Summary](https://www.pbis.org/Common/Cms/files/pbisresources/SCTG%20Implemenatation%20Survey%20Winter%202016.pdf) | 393 |
| Six Month TA Status Report | 234 |
| Computer Applications for Monitoring Student Outcomes: Behavior | 1041 |
| Measuring Performance within School Climate Transformation Grants | 1378 |
| SCTG-Multi-tiered Behavior Framework Overview and TA Support | 1137 |
| SCTG Technical Assistance Worksheet | 841 |
| SCTG TA PBIS overview: Coordination and Capacity-Building Technical Assistance for Multi-tiered Behavioral Frameworks | 888 |
| SCTG and Technical Assistance: Frequently Asked Questions | 880 |
| Use of SCTG Funds for Incentives and Communication Products | 592 |
| SCTG Baseline Data Summary | 663 |

**Project Director’s Meeting**

The National TA Center on PBIS has co-facilitated an annual project directors meeting as a pre-conference day aligned with the National PBIS Leadership Forum held in Chicago each fall. Topics have included multi-tiered behavioral frameworks, integration and alignment, equity, and implementing advanced tiers.

In the table below, suggested topics for future pre-conference days are summarized.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **SEA** | **LEA** |
| * Engaging stakeholders
* Managing more intensive behavioral needs
* Integration of MTSS for academics, behavior, and social emotional supports
* Advanced tiers
* Grant opportunities
 | * Tier 2 integration of academic and behavioral supports
* Sustainability
* Strengthening Tier 3
* Universal screening in high schools
* District level teaming and responsibilities
* Marketing and Sustainability
* Trauma Informed Practices
* Building SEL into core curriculum
* Tier 2 and 3 interventions
* Specific workshop on aligning initiatives- step by step- not just another district telling their story
* School climate measures and roll in ESSA
* Administrative response to discipline
* Leveraging funding
* Cultural competence and PBIS
* Coaching and Classroom Management
* Deep dive into 1 or 2 topics rather than 15-20 min sessions all day. Deep dive would include practical information and power points, coaching strategies, etc. that could be used when we return. Additionally, 30 min session with our project manager to ask specific questions
 |

In the following charts we summarize responding sites evaluation of the TA received from the Center.

In the table below, we summarize the elements of TA that were most helpful.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **SEA** | **LEA** |
| * How to improve support to schools
* Webinars and state leadership gatherings
* Providing the most up to date resources
* Flexible to our needs
 | * Pre-conference day
* Onsite training, problem solving. And collaboration
* Direct questions are always answered with helpful and relevant information and resources; The ability to attend conferences and events has allowed us to select topics of relevance and receive both the theory and practice components; the Classroom Strategies and ICF guides have been important reference points.
* Early on RTI-B
* Onsite coaching from Midwest PBIS
* Effectiveness and fidelity topics
* International Conference
* All
* Aligning Initiatives
* Resources for implementation based on 10 critical elements
* Practice advice
* PBIS forum
* Foundational Trainings
* Conferences
* Webinars
* Phone calls and observations
* Email support
* I can always find resources when I need them. I appreciate the reliability of the information provided
* Tier 1 universal
* PBIS website
* Tiered fidelity inventory
* PBIS in the classroom
* Mental health
* Conference calls and webinars designed specifically for our district
* APBS Journal of PBIS
* Ready-made documents and access to personnel
* Aggregating disproportionality and chronic absenteeism
 |

In the table below, we summarize suggestions for improving TA.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **SEA** | **LEA** |
| * Implementation strategies and engaging stakeholders
* Regular check-ins with PBIS TA provider
* Opportunities to dig into specific tool training and discussion around use
* More opportunities to access research and training centered on opioids
 | * None
* Make at least one site visit every year or every other year
* An opportunity for a regional PLC for districts to share best practices, strategies- this would be similar to the work done at the National Meeting but more frequent.
* Implementation practices used by similar sized districts
* More individualized coaching
* Increase staff
* Routine check-ins
* Update website
* Training and support directly to school site
* Academics and behavior aligning MTSS
* Phone conferences
* Information site that could be used as a resource to all staff
* Alternate location of national conference
 |

**Conclusion**

 We conclude with a few general lessons learned from the past five years working with State Education Agency (SEA) and Local Education Agency (LEA) School Climate Transformation Grantees. SEAs and LEAs are more likely to use SCTG resources to promote effective change when the systems change efforts include the following elements.

1. **Focus on Outcomes**

SEAs and LEAs that focus on improving student outcomes increase the precision with which they plan, implement, monitor, and adjust project activities to enhance student success. By focusing on results, rather than activities (e.g., training events), SEAs and LEAs increase the likelihood of enhancing their school climate.

1. **Clearly Define the Work**

Clearly defining the work, including individual roles and responsibilities, helps with establishing commitment and an understanding of importance of high implementation fidelity. A SEA or LEA with a legislative or policy mandate can more effectively establish positive school climate and improve social, emotional, behavioral, and academic outcomes for students. An essential element of a policy mandate is for every LEA in the state to define an annual goal around establishing a positive, school-wide social climate.

1. **Establish a Leadership Team**

States and districts are more successful when they establish a leadership team to select, implement, and evaluate implementation of evidence-based practices within a multi-tiered behavioral framework (MTBF).

* + ***Composition***. The leadership team should include a group of individuals who have (a) organizational authority – they can make decisions, (b) budget authority – management and alignment of budgets, (c) content knowledge – core features and logic model associated with MTBF practices and systems, and (d) alignment and integration opportunities – work with others who have similar outcome priorities.
	+ ***Coordinator***. The leadership team needs a person with significant FTE (>.50) dedicated to coordinating and implementing the decisions of the team. This person needs to be knowledgeable about the SEA or LEA office, fluent with the content of MTBF implemented practices and systems, and effective at dissemination and communication with leaders and coordinators of related initiatives and priorities. Ideally, this person is selected from existing personnel and already has MTBF-related expertise, experience, and responsibilities.
	+ ***Meeting schedule***. The leadership team needs to meet at least monthly if they are to manage large-scale implementation efforts.

SEAs or LEAs that propose a “leadership position,” but not a team, are less likely to produce functional effects and sustainable implementation across time and personnel. A leadership team without the relevant knowledge or authority is less likely to produce change. In addition, leadership teams that meet quarterly or less are more focused on “being informed” than on “producing change” and maximizing student benefit.

A grantee focused on MTSS implementation should be able to identify in their proposal the persons who will be on their leadership team and the person who will serve as coordinator. If they propose to search for such a position, it too often indicates that they are not prepared. Similarly, investing in existing personnel and positions, rather than adding temporary grant-funded coordination and leadership, is associated with greater sustained capacity building within the organization and, especially, when grant funding ceases.

1. **Align SCTG with Key Initiatives**

Given the large demands on SEAs and LEAs, capacity and resources are limited to take on many additional initiatives. Aligned systems are more likely to be implemented with fidelity and sustained over time when implementers can see clear connections between the SCTG and other mandates and requirements. Alignment builds on initiatives by leveraging funding, training, and evaluation to improve sustained implementation of efficient and effective practices.

SEAs and LEAS that are more effective (a) adopt only programs and practices that have empirical documentation of effectiveness, (b) minimize the adoption of practices and programs that overlap with respect to activities and outcomes, (c) ensure selected practices and programs align with priority outcomes, (d) establish SEA and LEA-level procedures for aligning practices and programs so local districts/schools have a coherent and efficient process, (e) simultaneously consider the extent to which practice implementation fidelity can be assessed, and (f) examine the degree to which implementation expertise exists and/or can be developed.

1. **Specify Data Systems**

Any SEA or LEA focusing on large-scale implementation of MTBF need to define the data systems used to (a) identify need, (b) monitor capacity improvement, (c) assess fidelity with which core practices and implemented, and (d) assess impact on students/families. Capacity improvement and implementation fidelity are particularly important at the SEA and LEA levels.

* + - * + ***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](https://www.pbis.org/blueprintguidestools/blueprint/implementation-blueprint) (available from the Center on PBIS by Spring 2019).
				+ ***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](https://www.pbis.org/blueprintguidestools/blueprint/implementation-blueprint) (available from the Center on PBIS by Summer 2019).
				+ ***Fidelity of Practice Implementation***. Any SEA or LEA implementing evidence-based practices in a MTBF on a large scale needs to stipulate a metric and process for assessing the fidelity with which core features of the program/practice are implemented to criterion. Schools should use fidelity measures 2 to 4 times per year to assess need, develop action plans, identify successes, and assess impact of fidelity on student outcomes. The [Tiered Fidelity Inventory (TFI)](https://www.pbisapps.org/Applications/Pages/Tiered-Fidelity-Inventory-%28TFI%29.aspx) is one option that efficiently identifies fidelity at Tier 1, Tier 2, and Tier 3. Any proposal that lacks a specified metric and process for fidelity measurement is less likely to produce functional outcomes.
				+ ***Student Outcomes***. Proposals that result in positive effects document the SEA and LEA expectation for district and school collection, summary, and reporting of student outcomes. An ongoing process should monitor at least (a) office discipline referrals, (b) suspension and expulsion patterns, (c) attendance, and (d) law enforcement encounters. These data should be easily disaggregated, with instant graphing, by (a) grade level, (b) disability, (c) ethnicity, and (d) socio-economic status.

Many SEAs and LEAs are becoming more sophisticated in their collection and summary of data, but they have yet to build formal decision-making procedures by which data are used at the school, district, region, and state. Recent research findings suggest that educators need support in using data for practical decision-making, problem-solving, and action planning. As such, efficient systems have a relatively small set of important questions and decisions around which data collection systems are developed and operated. In addition, these questions and decisions are examined on a regular basis to inform timely decision making, using efficient, predictable, and effective team-based problems solving structures and routines.

1. **Provide Differentiated District Supports**

Any effort to build large-scale or district-wide implementation of evidence-based practices within a MTBF needs to indicate how resources used to differentiate support across schools and educators in their district. Development of the implementation relationship between the LEA and individual schools (e.g., PBIS Implementation Blueprint) should consider implementation drivers (e.g., policy, training, evaluation, demonstrations, teaming) and capacity development self-assessment tools (e.g., District Systems Fidelity Inventory, Tiered Fidelity Inventory).

1. **Develop Training, Coaching, and Technical Expertise**

SEAs and LEAs are more likely to succeed in implementing evidence-based practices through a MTBF when they focus on both (a) how resources can provide training, coaching, and content expertise to local schools and (b) how these resources are used to establish capacity more locally and more cost effectively.

* ***Train Teams***. Training and professional development opportunities are delivered to teams (district or school) rather than individuals, and link training to on-site coaching that is delivered immediately after training.
* ***Invest in Content Expertise***. Technical expertise in behavioral theory and support is needed especially for successful implementation of Tier 2 and Tier 3 behavior supports.
* ***Develop Local Training and Coaching Expertise***. Sufficient training and coaching expertise is needed within the SEA and/or LEA to (a) ensure sustained implementation when external resources are no longer available and (b) enable scaling implementation as more LEAs and schools express interest.
1. **Engage in Meaningful Evaluation Activities**

Evaluation activities are critical for SEAs and LEAs to (a) summarize and communicate key findings with stakeholders, (b) hold themselves accountable to implementing with fidelity, improving outcomes, and building local capacity; and (c) guide decisions about enhancements or adjustments to project activities to maximize outcomes. Effective evaluations include the following components.

* ***Identify Key Evaluation Questions***. Evaluation activities should be guided by specific questions. For SEA and LEA SCTGs, the evaluation questions must include the GPRA questions specified in the RFP. In addition, relevant questions may include:
	+ Are schools implementing practices and systems in the MTBF with **fidelity**?
	+ Among schools implementing with fidelity, are *all* educators and students experiencing desired **outcomes** (e.g., decreased ODRs, suspensions, expulsions, and law enforcement contacts; improved attendance, academic scores, and perceptions of school climate and safety)? Are these outcomes experienced equitably by all subgroups (i.e., when data are disaggregated by race and ethnicity, gender, disability status, and other relevant demographic characteristics)?
	+ To what extent is the SEA or LEA building **local capacity** to sustain these implementation fidelity and outcomes in the absence of external funding?
* ***Select Relevant Measures and Indicators***. For each evaluation question, identify relevant measures or indicators of fidelity, outcomes, and capacity.
* ***Select a System to Facilitate Decision-Making***. To facilitate collecting, entering, and reporting data, invest in a system that maximizes efficiency and flexibility for data entry and reporting. In particular, having effective visual displays (e.g., graphs, info-graphics) facilitates data-based decision-making and evaluation. [PBISApps](https://www.pbisapps.org/Pages/Default.aspx) in one system that facilitates entering, tracking, and reporting data related to fidelity (e.g., TFI, DSFI, and SSFI) and key student outcomes (e.g., ODRs, school climate).

* ***Analyze and Report Data to Address Each Evaluation Question***. For each evaluation question, (a) summarize relevant data, (b) ensure accuracy and clarity of the data summary, and (c) include relevant graphics to illustrate key findings. Specifically, consider the following guidelines in summarizing and interpreting findings.
	+ Summarize MTBF implementation **fidelity** of Tier 1, Tier 2, and Tier 3 practices and systems (e.g., the number of schools implementing with fidelity at each tier during each project year).
	+ Examine **outcomes** among schools and districts that are implementing with fidelity, in comparison with schools and districts that are not implementing with fidelity.
	+ Document efforts and assessments (e.g., DSFI, SSFI) that indicate the SEA or LEA is building **internal capacity** to enable sustained implementation fidelity and outcomes of MTBF when external, grant-funded supports end.
1. **Build Capacity in Implementation Cascade during Pilot Activities**

SEAs or LEAs considering implementation of a new program, practice, or approach should be encouraged to not just launch small “pilot” demonstrations with a few schools, but to specifically indicate how pilot efforts require LEA capacity and/or SEA capacity. Pilots should represent a slice of the entire state or district system (i.e., the implementation cascade from SEA to LEA to school to educators to students), while focusing on documentation of effective implementation fidelity and practical demonstration of student improvement.

1. **Invest in Local Implementation Capacity**

Acquisition of MTBF and sustainability are enhanced when the SEA and LEA work is leveraged and connected to existing infrastructure of supports. Local implementation capacity is dependent on the interconnected system of SEA, LEA, and schools in supporting school climate. Successful LEAs and SEAS develop and annually revisit a 5-year plan that gives priority to professional development, leadership, funding, personnel, and evaluation policies and procedures for enabling sustained implementation when grant funding ends.

* ***Build Systems to Support Implementation***. Any SEA or LEA proposing to implement evidence-based practices through a MTBF on a significant scale should address specific systems (e.g., training, coaching, data structures) that are used to establish sustained adoption of new practices. Initial implementation without emphasis on sustainability results in repeated investment per site and limited scale of implementation.
* ***Promote Scalability***. In addition to sustainability, a long-term implementation vision and action plan should indicate how expansion of implementation are supported. Of particular interest are organizational strategies that enable expanded practice adoption while (a) maintaining fidelity implementation in existing efforts, (b) extending implementation opportunities to new LEA and school sites, and (c) providing boosters for sites that waver in their implementation efforts.
* ***Consider Integration and Alignment***. An important consideration is how the SEA and LEA integrate their efforts into and with new initiatives, issues, programs, etc. that may become priorities or accompany change in leadership.