**TIERED FIDELITY INVENTORY 2.10**

*Algozzine, Barnett, Eber, George, Horner, Lewis, Putnam, Swain-Bradway, McIntosh, & Sugai, 2014*

Tier I: Universal SWPBIS Features

*NOTE: This section may be completed individually or with other tiers as part of the full Tiered Fidelity Inventory*

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **FEATURES** | **POSSIBLE DATA SOURCES** | **SCORING CRITERIA** |
| Subscale: Teams |
| **1.1 Team Composition:**Tier I team includes a Tier 1 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 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 expertise1 = 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% |
| **1.2 Team Operating Procedures:** 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. | * Tier I team meeting agendas and minutes
* Tier I meeting roles descriptions
* Tier I action plan
 | 0 = Tier I team does not use regular meeting format/ agenda, minutes, defined roles, or a current action plan1= Tier I team has at least 2 but not all 4 features2 = Tier I team meets at least monthly and uses regular meeting format/agenda, minutes, defined roles, AND has a current action plan |
| Subscale: Implementation |
| **1.3 Behavioral Expectations:** 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. | * TFI Walkthrough Tool
* Staff handbook
* Student handbook
 | 0 = Behavioral expectations have not been identified, are not all positive, or are more than 5 in number1 = Behavioral expectations identified but may not include a matrix or be posted2 = Five or fewer behavioral expectations exist that are positive, posted, and identified for specific settings (i.e., matrix) AND at least 90% of staff can list at least 67% of the expectations |

Scoring Criteria: 0=Not implemented; 1=Partially implemented; 2=Fully implemented

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **FEATURES** | **POSSIBLE DATA SOURCES** | **SCORING CRITERIA** |
| 1.4 Teaching Expectations: Expected academic\* and social behaviors are taught directly to all students in classrooms and across other campus settings/locations. | * TFI Walkthrough Tool
* Professional development calendar
* Lesson plans
* Informal walkthroughs
 | 0 = Expected behaviors are not taught1 = Expected behaviors are taught informally or inconsistently2 = Formal system with written schedules is used to teach expected behaviors directly to students across classroom and campus settings AND at least 70% of students can list at least 67% of the expectations |
| \* MO SW-PBS trains and provides support for data-based decision making for social behavioral outcomes only. Although best practice would be to apply this logic to academic interventions and outcomes, teams are asked to reply on SW-PBS work only. |
| **1.5 Problem Behavior Definitions:** School has clear definitions for behaviors that interfere with academic and social success and a clear policy/ procedure (e.g., flowchart) for addressing office- managed versus staff-managed problems. | * Staff handbook
* Student handbook
* School policy
* Discipline flowchart
 | 0 = No clear definitions exist, and procedures to manage problems are not clearly documented1 = Definitions and procedures exist but are not clear and/or not organized by staff-versus office-managed problems2 = Definitions and procedures for managing problems are clearly defined, documented, trained, and shared with families |
| MO SW-PBS Response Continuum can serve as a possible source of data. |
| **1.6 Discipline Policies:** School policies and procedures describe and emphasize proactive, instructive, and/or restorative approaches to student behavior that are implemented consistently. | * Discipline policy
* Student handbook
* Code of conduct
* Informal administrator interview
 | 0 = Documents contain only reactive and punitive consequences1 = Documentation includes and emphasizes proactive approaches2 = Documentation includes and emphasizes proactive approaches AND administrator reports consistent use |

Scoring Criteria: 0=Not implemented; 1=Partially implemented; 2=Fully implemented

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **FEATURES** | **POSSIBLE DATA SOURCES** | **SCORING CRITERIA** |
| **1.7 Professional Development:** A written process is used for orienting all faculty/staff on 4 core Tier I SWPBIS practices:(a) teaching schoolwide expectations, (b) acknowledging appropriate behavior, (c) correcting errors, and (d) requesting assistance. | * Professional development calendar
* Staff handbook
 | 0 = No process for teaching staff is in place1 = Process is informal/unwritten, not part of professional development calendar, and/ or does not include all staff or all 4 core Tier I practices2 = Formal process for teaching all staff all aspects of Tier I system, including all 4core Tier I practices |
| **1.8 Classroom Procedures:** Tier I features (schoolwide expectations, routines, acknowledgements, in-class continuum of consequences) are implemented within classrooms and consistent with schoolwide systems. | * Staff handbook
* Informal walkthroughs
* Progress monitoring
* Individual classroom data
 | 0 = Classrooms are not formally implementing Tier I1 = Classrooms are informally implementing Tier I but no formal system exists2 = Classrooms are formally implementing all core Tier I features, consistent with schoolwide expectations |
| **1.9 Feedback and Acknowledgement:** A formal system (i.e., written set of procedures for specific behavior feedback that is [a] linked to schoolwide expectations and [b] used across settings and within classrooms) is in place and used by at least 90% of a sample of staff and received by at least 50% of a sample of students. | * TFI Walkthrough Tool
 | 0 = No formal system for acknowledging students1 = Formal system is in place but is used by at least 90% of staff and/or received by at least 50% of students2 = Formal system for acknowledging student behavior is used by at least 90% of staff AND received by at least 50% of students |
| **1.10 Faculty Involvement:** Faculty are shown school- wide data regularly and provide input on universal foundations (e.g., expectations, acknowledgements, definitions, consequences) at least every 12 months. | * PBIS Self-Assessment
* Survey (SAS)
* Informal surveys
* Staff meeting minutes
* Team meeting minutes
 | 0 = Faculty are not shown data at least yearly and do not provide input1 = Faculty have been shown data more than yearly OR have provided feedback on Tier I foundations within the past 12 months but not both2 = Faculty are shown data at least 4 times per year AND have provided feedback on Tier I practices within the past 12 months |

Scoring Criteria: 0=Not implemented; 1=Partially implemented; 2=Fully implemented

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **FEATURES** | **POSSIBLE DATA SOURCES** | **SCORING CRITERIA** |
| **1.11 Student/Family/Community Involvement:**Stakeholders (students, families, and community members) provide input on universal foundations (e.g., expectations, consequences, acknowledgements) at least every 12 months. | * Surveys
* Voting results from parent/ family meeting
* Team meeting minutes
 | 0 = No documentation (or no opportunities) for stakeholder feedback on Tier I foundations1 = Documentation of input on Tier I foundations, but not within the past 12 months or input but not from all types of stakeholders2 = Documentation exists that students, families, and community members have provided feedback on Tier I practices within the past 12 months |
| **1.12 Discipline Data:**Tier I team has instantaneous access to graphed reports summarizing discipline data organized by the frequency of problem behavior events by behavior, location, time of day, and by individual student. | * School policy
* Team meeting minutes
* Student outcome data
 | 0 = No centralized data system with ongoing decision making exists1 = Data system exists but does not allow instantaneous access to full set of graphed reports2 = Discipline data system exists that allows instantaneous access to graphs of frequency of problem behavior events by behavior, location, time of day, and student |
| **1.13 Data-based Decision Making:** Tier I team reviews and uses discipline data and academic\* outcome data (e.g., Curriculum- Based Measures, state tests) at least monthly for decision-making. | * Data decision rules
* Staff professional
* development calendar
* Staff handbook
* Team meeting minutes
 | 0 = No process/protocol exists, or data are reviewed but not used1 = Data reviewed and used for decision- making, but less than monthly2 = Team reviews discipline data and uses data for decision-making at least monthly. If data indicate an academic\* or behavior problem, an action plan is developed to enhance or modify Tier I supports |
| \* MO SW-PBS trains and provides support for data-based decision making for social behavioral outcomes only. Although best practice would be to apply this logic to academic interventions and outcomes, teams are asked to reply on SW-PBS work only. |
| **1.14 Fidelity Data:**Tier I team reviews and usesSWPBIS fidelity (e.g., SET,BoQ, TIC, SAS, Tiered FidelityInventory) data at least annually. | * School policy
* Staff handbook
* School newsletters
* School website
 | 0 = No Tier I SWPBIS fidelity data collected1 = Tier I fidelity collected informally and/or less often than annually2 = Tier I fidelity data collected and used for decision making annually |

Scoring Criteria: 0=Not implemented; 1=Partially implemented; 2=Fully implemented

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **FEATURES** | **POSSIBLE DATA SOURCES** | **SCORING CRITERIA** |
| **1.15 Annual Evaluation:**Tier I team documents fidelity and effectiveness (including on academic\* outcomes) of Tier I practices at least annually (including year- by-year comparisons) that are shared with stakeholders (staff, families, community, district) in a usable format. | • Staff, student, and family surveys* Tier I handbook
* Fidelity tools
* School policy
* Student outcomes
* District reports
* School newsletters
 | 0 = No evaluation takes place, or evaluation occurs without data1 = Evaluation conducted, but not annually, or outcomes are not used to shape the Tier I process and/or not shared with stakeholders2 = Evaluation conducted at least annually, and outcomes (including academics\*) shared with stakeholders, with clear alterations in process based on evaluation |
| \* MO SW-PBS trains and provides support for data-based decision making for social behavioral outcomes only. Although best practice would be to apply this logic to academic interventions and outcomes, teams are asked to reply on SW-PBS work only. |