**Directions:** Team members may use this to record individual scores **prior to completing team voting** for consensus. Team members should use the “quick check” boxes to inform the score. If all the boxes cannot be checked off, the score is likely **not a 2**. The TFI is intended to be completed by members of a school’s System Planning Team, with the active presence and guidance of an external [district] coach.

|  |
| --- |
| **Tiered Fidelity Inventory – Tier 1** |
| **Tier 1 Subscale and Feature** | **Definition** | **Possible Data Sources** | **Criteria***0=Not implemented;* *1=Partially implemented;* *2=Fully implemented*  | **Score 0, 1, 2** |
| ***TEAMS*** |  |  |  |  |
| * 1. **Team Composition**

**Quick Check:*** Coordinator
* Behavioral expertise
* Administrative authority
* Coaching expertise
* Knowledge about academic/behavior outcomes
* Knowledge about school operations
* Family perspective included (Student perspective included in high schools)
 | 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 these members is above 80%  |  |
| * 1. **Team Operating Procedures**

**Quick Check:*** Regular, monthly meetings (team roster & meeting schedule)
* Consistently followed meeting format
* Minutes taken during and disseminated after each meeting (or at least action plan items are disseminated)
* Participant roles are clearly defined
* Action plan current to the school year
 | 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 plan 1= Tier I team has at least 2 but not all 4 features 2 = Tier I team meets at least monthly and uses regular meeting format/agenda, minutes, defined roles, **AND** has a current action plan  |  |
| ***IMPLEMENTATION*** |  |  |  |  |
| * 1. **Behavioral Expectations**

**Quick Check:*** Has the team identified five or fewer behavioral expectations?
* Do they include examples by location / setting?
* Are they posted publicly throughout the school?
 | 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 number 1 = Behavioral expectations identified but may not include a matrix or be posted 2 = 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  |  |
| * 1. **Teaching Expectations**

**Quick Check:*** Are regularly scheduled times identified for teaching all expectations at least once per school year?
* Is there a documented teaching schedule?
* Are behavioral expectations taught to all students across all school settings (i.e., cafeteria, hallways, classrooms, etc.)?
 | 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 taught 1 = Expected behaviors are taught informally or inconsistently 2 = 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  |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **1.5 Problem Behavior Definitions****Quick Check:*** Are problem behavior definitions written down and documented?
* Do the definitions clearly differentiate between staff-managed and office-managed problem behaviors?
* Are all staff and faculty members trained on the definitions?
* Are the definitions shared with families and students?
 | 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 documented 1 = Definitions and procedures exist but are not clear and/or not organized by staff- versus office-managed problems 2 = Definitions and procedures for managing problems are clearly defined, documented, trained, and shared with families  |  |
| **1.6 Discipline Policies****Quick Check:*** Are disciplinary practices proactive and preventative?
	+ Do they help keep children in school and the classroom or is there a reliance on exclusionary practices?
* Is there clear documentation of discipline policies?
* Do administrators report consistent use of proactive, preventative approaches?
 | 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 consequences 1 = Documentation includes and emphasizes proactive approaches 2 = Documentation includes and emphasizes proactive approaches **AND** administrator reports consistent use  |  |
| **1.7 Professional Development****Quick Check:** * Are there scheduled trainings for school team members?
* Is there a faculty-wide orientation led by the full Tier I team?
* Is there a scheduled annual orientation for new faculty?
* Are there documented strategies for orienting substitutes or volunteers?
* Is the process for requesting assistance around behavioral concerns known by all, easy to follow, and encouraged?
 | A written process is used for orienting all faculty/staff on 4 core Tier I SWPBIS practices: (a) teaching school-wide 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 place 1 = Process is informal/unwritten, not part of professional development calendar, and/or does not include all staff or all 4 core Tier I practices 2 = Formal process for teaching all staff all aspects of Tier I system, including all 4 core Tier I practices  |  |
| **1.8 Classroom Procedures****Quick Check:*** Do classroom procedures match proactive school-wide disciplinary practices?
* Are all core features of Tier I supports visible in classrooms? (formal/informal walkthrough data)
	+ Positively stated expectations and consistent routines
	+ System for acknowledging appropriate behavior
	+ In-class system for responding to inappropriate behavior
 | Tier I features (school-wide expectations, routines, acknowledgements, in-class continuum of consequences) are implemented within classrooms and consistent with school-wide systems.  | * Staff handbook
* Informal walkthroughs
* Progress monitoring
* Individual classroom data
 | 0 = Classrooms are not formally implementing Tier I 1 = Classrooms are informally implementing Tier I but no formal system exists 2 = Classrooms are formally implementing all core Tier I features, consistent with school-wide expectations  |  |
| **1.9 Feedback and Acknowledgement****Quick Check:*** Are students and staff interviewed at least once a year (i.e., walkthrough) to see if they are receiving and distributing acknowledgements?
* Are those acknowledgements linked to school-wide expectations?
* Are they distributed across school settings?
* Do at least 50% of students interviewed report receiving them?
 | A formal system (i.e., written set of procedures for specific behavior feedback that is [a] linked to school-wide 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 students 1 = Formal system is in place but is used by at least 90% of staff **and/or** received by at least 50% of students 2 = 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****Quick Check:*** Is there documentation of a process for receiving feedback on Tier I supports?
* Does that documentation include input from faculty (i.e., SAS)?
* Is the feedback utilized to improve systems/practices? If so, do the faculty know?
* Was the most recent feedback within the past 12 months?
* How often is school-wide data shared with faculty?
 | 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
* Informal surveys
* Staff meeting minutes
* Team meeting minutes
 | 0 = Faculty are not shown data at least yearly and do not provide input 1 = Faculty have been shown data more than yearly **OR** have provided feedback on Tier I foundations within the past 12 months but not both 2 = Faculty are shown data at least 4 times per year **AND** have provided feedback on Tier I practices within the past 12 months  |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **1.11 Student/ Family/ Community Involvement****Quick Check:*** Is there documentation of a process for receiving feedback on Tier I supports?
* Does that documentation include input from students, families and the community?
* Is the feedback utilized to improve systems/practices? If so, do the students, families and community know?
* Was the most recent feedback within the past 12 months?
 | 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 foundations 1 = Documentation of input on Tier I foundations, but not within the past 12 months or input but not from all types of stakeholders 2 = Documentation exists that students, families, and community members have provided feedback on Tier I practices within the past 12 months  |  |
| ***EVALUATION*** |  |  |  |  |
| **1.12 Discipline Data****Quick Check:*** Is there a centralized data system to collect and organize behavior incident data? (data collection process and/or referral form used to capture who, what, when, where, why)
* Is adequate time scheduled and staffing allocated to ensure that incident referral data in the data system will be current to within a week at all times?
* Does the Tier I team have instantaneous access to graphed reports summarizing discipline data?
* Are those data organized to review: frequency of problem behavior by behavior, location, time of day and student?
* Can the team drill down on school-wide data to create precision statements? (who, what, when, where, why)
* Does an external coach have access to the data system so the Tier I team may receive ongoing coaching on the use of school-wide data for decision-making?
 | 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 exists 1 = Data system exists but does not allow instantaneous access to full set of graphed reports 2 = 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****Quick Check:*** Does the team have access to discipline data for the entire student body (school-wide)?
* Does the team have access to academic data for the entire student body?
* Are those data clearly and logically linked to the annual action plan for Tier I?
* Are those data reviewed at least monthly?
* Are there at least 3 team members (1 admin, 1 PBIS coach & 1 data analyst) trained and proficient in using the data system to problem-solve with precision by drilling down on school-wide data? (i.e., SWIS trained – drill down tool)
 | 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 used 1 = Data reviewed and used for decision-making, but less than monthly 2 = 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  |  |
| **1.14 Fidelity Data****Quick Check:*** Is the team assessing fidelity of implementation at Tier I?
* Is there regular assessment of fidelity?
* Are the fidelity data used for decision making and action planning at Tier I?
 | Tier I team reviews and uses SWPBIS fidelity (e.g., SET, BoQ, TIC, SAS, Tiered Fidelity Inventory) data at least annually.  | * School policy
* Staff handbook
* School newsletters
* School website
 | 0 = No Tier I SWPBIS fidelity data collected 1 = Tier I fidelity collected informally and/or less often than annually 2 = Tier I fidelity data collected and used for decision making annually  |  |
| **1.15 Annual Evaluation****Quick Check:*** Is there an evaluation conducted for Tier I systems?
* Does this happen annually?
* Are the outcomes shared with all stakeholders (faculty, students, family, board members, superintendent, etc.)?
* Are the outcomes clearly linked to a Tier I action plan?
 | 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 data 1 = Evaluation conducted, but not annually, or outcomes are not used to shape the Tier I process and/or not shared with stakeholders 2 = Evaluation conducted at least annually, and outcomes (including academics) shared with stakeholders, with clear alterations in process based on evaluation  |  |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Total Score** | **Items/Points** | **Points Award/Points Possible** | **Percentage of PBIS Implementation** |
| Tier 1 | 1-15 / 30 points | \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ / 30 |  |

Note: See www.pbisapps.org for Tiers 2 and 3 of the TFI at [https://www.pbisapps.org/Resources/SWIS%20Publications/SWPBIS%20Tiered%20Fidelity%20Inventory%20(TFI).pdf](https://www.pbisapps.org/Resources/SWIS%20Publications/SWPBIS%20Tiered%20Fidelity%20Inventory%20%28TFI%29.pdf)

 ***PBIS Action Plan:***

**Directions:**

1. Fill in the final scores from the team-completed TFI in column 2 below.
2. Each team member should choose/circle their top 3 action items from items with scores of 0 or 1.
3. The team should action plan on the top 3 items based on team member input.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Subscale and Tier 1 Features** | ***Score from TFI: 0, 1, 2*** | ***Action Steps:*** | ***Who?*** | ***When?*** |
| **TEAMS** |  |  |  |  |
| 1.1 Team Composition |  | 1. 2.  |  |  |
| 1.2 Team Operating Procedures |  | 1. 2.  |  |  |
| **IMPLEMENTATION** |  |  |  |  |
| 1.3 Behavioral Expectations |  | 1. 2.   |  |  |
| 1.4 Teaching Expectations |  | 1. 2.  |  |  |
| 1.5 Problem Behavior Definitions |  | 1. 2.  |  |  |
| 1.6 Discipline Policies |  | 1. 2.   |  |  |
| 1.7 Professional Development |  | 1. 2.  |  |  |
| 1.8 Classroom Procedures |  | 1.2.  |  |  |
| 1.9 Feedback and Acknowledgement |  | 1.2.  |  |  |
| 1.10 Faculty Involvement |  | 1. 2.  |  |  |
| 1.11 Student/Family/ Community Involvement |  | 1. 2.  |  |  |
| **EVALUATION** |  |  |  |  |
| 1.12 Discipline Data |  | 1. 2. |  |  |
| 1.13 Data-based Decision Making |  | 1. 2.  |  |  |
| 1.14 Fidelity Data |  | 1. 2. |  |  |
| 1.15 Annual Evaluation |  | 1. 2. |  |  |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **OTHER ACTION STEPS:** | ***Who?***  | ***When?*** |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |