

# Test High School's MO SW-PBS 2014-2015 Year End Data Review and Data-Based Decision-Making Form

## 1. Is our school implementing Tier 1, universal supports with fidelity?

**A**

	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4
<b>Team Minutes</b>	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
<b>Big 5 Data Reports</b>	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes

	Primary Statements	Precision Statements
<b>Consistently Created</b>	Yes	No
<b>Used for Data-Based Decision-Making</b>	Yes	No

Matrix - Yes  
 Tier 1 Action Plans - Yes  
 Universal Support Checklist -  
 Lessons -  
 Lesson Schedule -

**B**

Current Data Indicators for our School	Criteria & Digging Deeper
--	---------------------------

**Self Assessment Survey (SAS)<sup>#</sup>**  
 Data Indicates:

	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015
# Staff Completing	30	33	0

  

**% In Place**

	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015
Schoolwide	43.9	63.2	N/A
Non-Classroom	37.4	61.5	N/A
Classroom	39.3	53.7	N/A
Individual	14.6	31.5	N/A

**Criteria:**

- 80% or above = implementing with fidelity
- 50-79% = at risk
- 49% or below = high risk

**Which Subscales are at criteria for implementing with fidelity and which are at-risk or high risk?**

**Which items contribute to the higher or lower ratings?**

**Have rating changed over time? Why / Why not?**

**C**

**SAS Schoolwide Items\***

1. A small number of positively & clearly stated student expectations or rules are defined.
2. Expected student behaviors are taught directly.
3. Expected Student behaviors are rewarded regularly.
11. Data on problem behavior patterns are collected and summarized within an on-going system.
12. Patterns of student problem behavior are reported to teams and faculty for active decision-making on a regular basis (monthly).

**% In Place**

Schoolwide #	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015
1	59.3	87.9	0
2	37.0	66.7	0
3	48.1	63.6	0
11	65.4	83.3	0
12	38.5	62.1	0

**SAS Classroom Items\***

1. Expected student behavior & routines in classrooms are stated positively & clearly defined.
2. Problem behaviors are defined clearly.
3. Expected behaviors & routines in classrooms are taught directly.
4. Expected student behaviors are acknowledged regularly (positively reinforced) (>4 positives to 1 negative).
8. Instruction & Curriculum materials are matched to student ability (math, reading, language).
9. Students experience high rates of academic success (>75% correct).
10. Teachers have regular opportunities for access to assistance & recommendations (observation, instruction & coaching).

**% In Place**

Classroom #	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015
1	88.9	81.3	0
2	51.9	61.3	0
3	74.1	77.4	0
4	38.5	48.4	0
8	4.3	32.1	0
9	19.2	29.0	0
10	12.5	53.3	0

\* Mathews, S., McIntosh, K., Frank, J.L., & May, S.L. (2013). Critical features predicting sustained implementation of school-wide positive behavioral interventions and supports. *Journal of Positive Behavior Interventions*, 20, 1-11

D

<p><b>Schoolwide Evaluation Tool (SET)<sup>#</sup></b> Data Indicates:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 80% teaching</li> <li>• 89% overall</li> </ul>	<p><b>Criteria:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 80% or above = implementing with fidelity</li> <li>• 50-79% = at risk</li> <li>• 49% or below = high risk</li> </ul> <p><b>How do the perceptions of fidelity of Tier 1 implementation compare across whole staff perception (SAS) and external review (SET)?</b></p>
--	--

<p><b>Benchmarks of Quality (BoQ)<sup>#</sup></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• N/A% overall</li> </ul>	<p><b>Criteria:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• MO SW-PBS encourages 80% for fidelity</li> <li>• 50-79% = at risk</li> <li>• 49% or below = high risk</li> </ul> <p><b>How do the perceptions of fidelity of Tier 1 implementation compare across whole staff perception (SAS) and Tier 1 team only review (BoQ)?</b></p>
--	--

**2. Is our school environment perceived as being safe?**

E

<p><b>School Safety Survey (SSS)<sup>#</sup></b> Data Indicates:</p> <p>Risk Ratio: N/A% Risk Factors of Concern</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. _____</li> <li>2. _____</li> <li>3. _____</li> </ol> <p>Protection Ratio: N/A% Protection Factors for Celebration</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. _____</li> <li>2. _____</li> <li>3. _____</li> </ol>	<p><b>Guiding Questions</b></p> <p>What are the factors over which we have no influence?</p> <p>What are the factors over which we have some influence?</p> <p>What are the factors over which we have significant influence?</p> <p>Which factor(s) will we monitor will/can we address through sustained/improved SW-PBS implementation?</p> <p>Which factor(s) will we monitor this coming year?</p> <p>Once we have multi year data how will we look for trends and respond to our data?</p>
---	--

**3. Are all of our students experiencing improved behavioral and academic outcomes?**

F

<p><b>Office Managed Problem Behaviors &gt; School Enters (AKA &gt; Office Discipline Referrals &gt; ODRs)</b></p> <p><b>End of Year ODR Triangle Data:</b></p> <p>70.0% 0-1 ODRs</p> <p>16.6% 2-5 ODRs</p> <p>13.4% 6+ ODRs</p> <p>2071 total ODRs for the year</p> <p align="center">total school days</p> <table border="1" style="width: 100%;"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>Average Minutes Lost Per ODR</th> <th>Number of minutes lost</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Administrative</td> <td>20*</td> <td>41420</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Instructional</td> <td>25**</td> <td>51775</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>		Average Minutes Lost Per ODR	Number of minutes lost	Administrative	20*	41420	Instructional	25**	51775	<p>How does our triangle data align with national averages?</p> <p>Other Summary Questions (Big 5)</p> <p>Where are most problem behaviors occurring?</p> <p>What is our most frequent problem behavior?</p> <p>What time of day are most of our problem behaviors occurring?</p> <p>What question do we have as a result of these answers?</p> <p>If you were to "thin slice" ODR or Minor data by specific sub categories (e.g. students with IEPs, by race/ethnicity, gender, and free/reduced lunch status) would the data look the same?</p>
	Average Minutes Lost Per ODR	Number of minutes lost								
Administrative	20*	41420								
Instructional	25**	51775								

G

H

\* Scott, T.M. & Barrett, S.B. (2004). Using staff and student time engaged in disciplinary procedures to evaluate the impact of schoolwide PBS. *Journal of Positive Behavior Interventions*, 6(1), p. 21-37

\*\* Barrett, S. & Scott, T.M. (2006). Evaluating as time saved as index of cost effectiveness in PBIS schools. Eugene, OR: OSEP Technical Assistance Center on Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports. Retrieved from [http://pbis.org/pbis\\_newsletter/volume\\_3/issue4.aspx](http://pbis.org/pbis_newsletter/volume_3/issue4.aspx)

<b>Student Assistance Referrals</b>				
	<i>School Assistance Team</i>	<i>Special Education</i>		<i>Other</i>
Grade	# Referred	# Referred	# Eligible	# Referred
Pre-K	0	0	0	0
K	0	0	0	0
1	0	0	0	0
2	0	0	0	0
3	0	0	0	0
4	0	0	0	0
5	0	0	0	0
6	0	0	0	0
7	0	0	0	0
8	0	0	0	0
9	93	12	10	0
10	76	8	8	0
11	23	0	0	0
12	14	0	0	0

<b>Office Referrals by Grade Level</b>		
<i>Office Managed Behaviors - No Staff Managed Behaviors</i>		
Grade	IEP	Non-IEP
Pre-K	0	0
K	0	0
1	0	0
2	0	0
3	0	0
4	0	0
5	0	0
6	0	0
7	0	0
8	0	0
9	112	791
10	31	602
11	17	298
12	3	217

Are all students benefiting from the implementation of SW-PBS in our building? Why or why not? What other data can inform this dialog?

Are there differences across grade levels? If so, why?

I

J

K

**Attendance > School Enters**

93% % average daily attendance for ALL students

81% % average daily attendance for students with disabilities

Consider the ADA of students with the most referrals to the ADA for all students. How do they compare?

L

**Academic Benchmarks > School Enters**  
 e.g., Missouri Assessment Plan, End of Course, End of Unit, AIMS Web, grade level or departmental formative assessments, etc.)

What are the behavioral skills of students in each of these sub categories? (e.g. frequently displaying appropriate behavioral skills, frequently displays teacher/staff managed problem behaviors, frequently displays office managed behaviors. frequently misbehaves to avoid academic tasks. etc.)

**English Language Arts for ALL Students**

12% % Advanced ELA

28% % Proficient ELA

32% % Basic ELA

28% % Below Basic ELA

**English Language Arts**

Advanced ELA

Proficient ELA

Basic ELA

Below Basic ELA

**MATH for ALL students**

6% % Advanced Math

17% % Proficient Math

22% % Basic Math

45% % Below Basic Math

**MATH**

Advanced Math

Proficient Math

Basic Math

Below Basic Math

What are the academic outcomes for students with disabilities?

**1. Is our school implementing Tier 2 and/or Tier 3 (i.e., targeted or secondary and/or Tier individualized supports) with fidelity?**

Tier 2 Action Plan - No  
 Tier 3 Action Plan - No

M

**Current Data Indicators for our School**

**Criteria & Digging Deeper**

**Teams Participating in Tier 2 or 3 Training**  
**Benchmarks of Advanced Tiers (BAT)<sup>#</sup>**

**% Implemented**

**Criteria:**

- 80% or above = implementing with fidelity
- 50-79% = at risk
- 49% or below = high risk

		2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015
Tier 1 Implementation		N/A	83.3	N/A
Tier 2 & Tier 3 Foundations	Commitment	N/A	66.7	N/A
	Student Identification	N/A	62.5	N/A
	Monitoring & Evaluation	N/A	25.0	N/A
Tier 2	Target Intervention Support Systems	N/A	50.0	N/A
	Main Strategy Implementation	N/A	50.0	N/A
	Main Strategy Monitor & Evaluation	N/A	62.5	N/A
Tier 3	Int. Support Systems	N/A	58.3	N/A
	Assess & Plan Dev	N/A	55.0	N/A
	Monitoring & Evaluation	N/A	83.3	N/A

**Which Subscales are at criteria for implementing with fidelity and which are at-risk or high risk?**

**Which items contribute to the higher or lower ratings?**

**Have ratings changed over time? Why / Why not?**

N

## 2. Are students receiving these supports experiencing improved behavioral and academic outcomes?

**Tier 2 Additional Data**  
 What is our system to collect information on the Adapted FACTS Part A in order to determine the function of behavior?

Within the *Advanced Tiers Spreadsheet*?  
 How is our team using the student information page to inform function-based decision-making?

**Student Outcome Reporting**

How is our team monitoring fidelity of Tier 2 intervention (as defined/described in the Intervention Essential Features document) implementation?

		2013-2014	2014-2015
Check & Connect	Number of Students who Participated	9	0
	Number of Students who Graduated	6	0
	Number of Students who participated in Tier 2 intervention(s) but required more intensive support	0	0
CICO Academic	Number of Students who Participated	0	0
	Number of Students who Graduated	0	0
	Number of Students who participated in Tier 2 intervention(s) but required more intensive support	0	0
CICO Behavior	Number of Students who Participated	5	0
	Number of Students who Graduated	5	0
	Number of Students who participated in Tier 2 intervention(s) but required more intensive support	0	0
SS Intervention Groups	Number of Students who Participated	0	0
	Number of Students who Graduated	0	0
	Number of Students who participated in Tier 2 intervention(s) but required more intensive support	0	0

What is our system for monitoring fidelity of implementation if a student has a questionable or poor outcome?

Is the student behavior graph data discussed above in a format ready to be shared (e.g. no student names, collated if multiple students are receiving services, and presented in a table or graphed) with stakeholders: staff, board, SW-PBS Regional and/or Tier 2/3 Consultants? Explain

O

**Tier 3 Additional Data**

Functional Behavior Assessment (FBA) / Behavior Intervention Plan (BIP) Evaluation Rubric

Does our team consistently use the FBA/BIP Evaluation Rubric to evaluate the quality of each student's FBA/BIP?

P

Do we revise a student's FBA/BIP for any activities rated "Partially in Place" or "Not in Place"?

<b>Student Outcome Reporting</b>		<b>2013-2014</b>	<b>2014-2015</b>
FBA/BIP	Number of Students who Participated	0	0
	Number of Students who Graduated	0	0

**Note: This information is not submitted to Tier 2-3 consultants. Please use this for your team to document and then use as a guide during dialog/discussion regarding your Tier 2-3 systems, data & practice. The number in (parenthesis) indicates the number of items included in the sub scale.**

<b>Subscale</b>	<b>Overall Status</b>	<b>Notes</b>
1. Collect information (3)		
2. Develop Summary Statement (6)		
3. Confirm Sumamry Statement (2)		
4. Develop Competing Behavior Pathway Summary (3)		
5. Identify Stategies for BIP (7)		
6. Develop Implementation Plan (3)		
7. Develop Evaluation & Monitoring Plan (3)		

**New Action Plan Steps based on data-based decision-making with Year End Data: (Teams Complete)**

	<b>New Steps to Achieve Fidelity</b>	<b>New or Ongoing Steps to Sustain Fidelity</b>	<b>Steps to Ensure Team Rotation and New Staff Orientation</b>
Tier 1			
Tier 2			
Tier 3			