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Objectives

- Evaluation – the BIG picture
  - Benchmarks of Quality (BoQ)
    - Administration and completion – *what is it?*
    - Using results to boost implementation and validate outcomes – *how do you use it?*
  - PBS Implementation Checklist (PIC) & Walkthrough
    - Background, psychometric properties
    - Items, administration and timelines
    - Using results for action planning

Future Implications
Purpose of Evaluation

- To examine the extent to which teams are accurately selecting and implementing PBS systems and practices
- Allows teams to determine the extent to which target student outcomes are being and/or likely to be achieved
- To determine if teams are accurately and consistently implementing activities and practices as specified in their individualized action plan

*(PBIS Evaluation Blueprint, 2010)*
PBIS Evaluation Blueprint: A Work in Progress...

- **Context**
  - What was provided, who provided, who received

- **Input**
  - Professional development, value, perspective

- **Fidelity/Integrity**
  - Implemented as designed, w/fidelity, process evaluation

- **Impact/Progress Monitoring/Outcomes**
  - Behavior change, other schooling changes

- **Replication, Sustainability and Improvement**
  - Capacity, practice, policy
  - Expanding implementation, allocating resources

*(PBIS Blueprint, 2010)*
Factors to Consider in Developing Comprehensive Evaluation Systems

1) Systems Preparation
   – Readiness activities
2) Service Provision
   – Training and technical assistance
3) Identification and Assessment of Behavior Problems
   – Possible data sources
4) Evaluation Process
   – Timelines, data systems
5) Evaluation Data (across all three tiers)
   – Implementation Fidelity, Impact on Students, Attrition, Client Satisfaction
6) Products and Dissemination
   – Reports, materials, presentations, etc.

(modified from Childs, Kincaid & George, 2010)
Florida’s Evaluation Model

Systems Preparation
- District Action Plan
- District Readiness Checklist
- School Readiness Checklist
- New School Profile (includes ODR, ISS, OSS)

Service Provision
- Training
- On-going technical assistance
- FLPBS
- Districts
- Coaches
- Schools

Identification/Assessment
- Discipline Records
- ESE Referrals
- Surveys
- District Walkthroughs
  - Tier 1 PBS Walkthrough
  - PIC
- Classroom Assessment Tool
- Student rank/rating
- Teacher requests
- Lack of response
- BAT
- Behavior Rating Scale
- Daily Progress Report Charts

Evaluation Process
- Mid Year I
- Mid Year II
- End-Year

Implementation Fidelity
- PBS Implementation Checklist (PIC)
- Benchmarks of Quality (BoQ)
- Benchmarks for Advanced Tiers (BAT)
- School Demographic Data
- School-wide Implementation Factors
- Tier 3 plan fidelity checklist
- BEP Fidelity checklist

Impact
- Outcome data (ODR, ISS, OSS)
- FL Comprehensive Assessment Test
- Benchmarks of Quality
- School Demographic Data
- Tier 1 PBS Walkthrough
- Daily Progress Reports
- Behavior Rating Scales
- Climate Surveys

Project Impact
- Attrition Survey/Attrition Rates
- District Action Plans

Client Satisfaction
- School-Wide Implementation Factors
- District Coordinator’s Survey
- Training Evaluations

(Childs, Kincaid & George, 2010)

Products and Dissemination
- Annual Reports
- Revisions to training and technical assistance process
- National, State, district, school dissemination activities
- Website
- On-line training modules

This product was developed by Florida’s Positive Behavior Support Project through the University of South Florida; Louis de la Parte Florida Mental Health Institute funded by the State of Florida, Department of Education, Bureau of Exceptional Education and Student Services, through federal assistance under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA), Part B.
# Comprehensive Evaluation Blueprint:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Implementation Monitoring</th>
<th>Implementation Integrity</th>
<th>Implementation Research</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• <strong>TIC</strong> (1) Team Implementation Checklist</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sugai, Horner &amp; Lewis-Palmer (2001)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• <strong>PIC</strong> (1,2,3) PBS Implementation Checklist for Schools</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Childs, Kincaid &amp; George (2009)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• <strong>Walkthrough</strong> (1) Tier 1 PBS Walkthrough</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White, George, Childs &amp; Martinez (2009)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• <strong>MATT</strong> (2,3) Monitoring Advanced Tiers Tool</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anderson, Childs, Kincaid, Horner, George, Todd, Sampson, &amp; Spaulding (2011)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• <strong>BoQ</strong> (1) Benchmarks of Quality</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kincaid, Childs &amp; George (2005)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• <strong>BAT</strong> (2,3) Benchmarks for Advanced Tiers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anderson, Childs, Kincaid, Horner, George, Todd, Sampson &amp; Spaulding (2009)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• <strong>SET</strong> (1) School-wide Evaluation Tool</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sugai, Lewis-Palmer, Todd &amp; Horner (2001)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• <strong>ISSET</strong> (2,3) Individual Student Systems Evaluation Tool</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Implementation Integrity

Benchmarks of Quality (BoQ)

http://flpbs.fmhi.usf.edu/coachescorner.asp
Annual Self-Assessment Measures

• Designed to document the same content as the research measures but to do so more efficiently
• Most available online and provide a school team/coach with the ability to determine once a year if a school is implementing SWPBS practices at a level that would be expected to affect student outcomes
• Always guide development of action planning to assist in efficient and continuous improvement of systems used in the school

(PBIS Blueprint, 2010)
BoQ Creation: Based on Needs

- Reliably assess team’s implementation
- Distinguish Model Schools
- Easy to complete by Coaches with little training
- Quick to complete
- Provide feedback to team
- Clarify outcomes as related to implementation
Benchmarks of Quality

- Identified items aligned with SWPBS Training process
- 53 items addressing areas of:
  - Faculty commitment
  - Effective procedures for dealing with discipline
  - Data entry and analysis plan established
  - Expectations and rules developed
  - Reward/recognition program established
  - Lesson plans for teaching
  - Implementation plan
  - Classroom (in 2005 – Crisis Plan)
  - Evaluation
BoQ Validation Process

- Expert Review
- Pilot Study
- Florida & Maryland Schools
  - Elementary, Middle, High, Center/Alt
- Reliability – Test-retest, Inter-rater both >.01
- Concurrent Validity – SET/ODRs
- For more details see JPBI – Fall 2007
Use of the School-Wide Evaluation Tool (SET)

• SET is a validated research tool that combines multiple assessment approaches (interviews, observations, product reviews) to arrive at an implementation score

• Concerns:
  – Time
  – High scores
  – Potential for “practice effect”
  – May not reflect current activities
  – Not as useful for action planning

• Results of correlation with BoQ
  – Overall $r = .51$ ($p < .01$)
Scatterplot of SET and BoQ scores
BoQ Factor Analysis

• Exploratory and confirmatory analysis
  – Most items “hang together” within a critical element but fit better within a 5 factor structure
  – All but 4 of the 53 items were found to have internal consistency (strong items)
  – Item/total correlations indicated that 46 of the 53 items were highly correlated with total score
    • The 4 items without strong internal consistency were also found to lack item/total correlation
    • All 3 crisis items
    • Items dropped were replaced by Classroom items
Utility of the BoQ

- BoQ is reliable, valid, efficient and useful
- Moderate correlation with SET
- Data regarding association with ODRs
- Ease of use
  - Little training
  - Little time from team and Coach
  - Areas not unique to one training approach
  - Assist states that are rapidly expanding PBS efforts
- Specific team feedback: celebration/planning
Benchmarks Review

• Describe the Benchmarks of Quality (what is it?)
• Describe the psychometric properties of the Benchmarks of Quality (can we trust it?)
• Share your answers to these questions with your neighbor
Administration and Completion
3 Elements of the Benchmarks of Quality

- **Team Member Rating Form**
  - Completed by team members independently
  - Returned to coach/facilitator

- **Scoring Form**
  - Completed by coach/facilitator using Scoring Guide
  - Used for reporting back to team

- **Scoring Guide**
  - Describes administration process
  - Rubric for scoring each item
Method of Completion

• Coach/facilitator uses Scoring Guide to ascertain the appropriate score for each item, collects Team Member Rating forms, resolves any discrepancies, and reports back to team.

• **Alt. Option** – Scoring Form is completed at a team meeting with all members reaching consensus on the appropriate score for each item using the Scoring Guide rubric. The team identifies areas of strength and need.
Completion of BoQ
Step 1 – Coach’s Scoring

• The Coach/facilitator will use his or her best judgment based on personal experience with the school and the descriptions and exemplars in the *Benchmarks of Quality Scoring Guide* to score each of the 53 items on the *Benchmarks of Quality Scoring Form* (p.1 & 2). Do not leave any items blank.
## Benchmarks Practice: Scoring Form, Scoring Guide

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Critical Elements</th>
<th>STEP 1</th>
<th>STEP 2 ++, +, or _</th>
<th>STEP 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PBS Team</td>
<td>1. Team has broad representation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Team has administrative support</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Team has regular meetings (at least monthly)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. Team has established a clear mission/purpose</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1. Team has broad representation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Team has administrative support</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Team has regular meetings (at least monthly)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. Team has established a clear mission/purpose</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Benchmarks Practice: Scoring Form, Scoring Guide

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Critical Elements</th>
<th>STEP 1</th>
<th>STEP 2 ++, +, or _</th>
<th>STEP 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PBS Team</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Team has broad representation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Team has administrative support</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Team has regular meetings (at least monthly)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Team has established a clear mission/purpose</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Completion of BoQ
Step 2 – Team Member Rating

- The coach/facilitator will give the Benchmarks of Quality Team Member Rating Form to each SWPBS Team member to be completed independently and returned to the coach upon completion. Members should be instructed to rate each of the 53 items according to whether the component is "In Place," "Needs Improvement," or "Not in Place." Some of the items relate to product and process development, others to action items; in order to be rated as "In Place;" the item must be developed and implemented (where applicable). Coaches will collect and tally responses and record on the Benchmarks of Quality Scoring Form the team’s most frequent response using ++ for “In Place,” + for “Needs Improvement,” and – for “Not In Place.”
## Benchmarks Practice:
### Scoring Form, Team Members Rating Form

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Team Member</th>
<th>STEP 1</th>
<th>STEP 2</th>
<th>STEP 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Team Member A</strong></td>
<td>Team has broad representation</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>++</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Team has administrative support</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Team Member B</strong></td>
<td>Team has broad representation</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Team has administrative support</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Team Member C</strong></td>
<td>Team has broad representation</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Team has administrative support</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **In Place (++)**
- **Needs Improvement (+)**
- **Not In Place (-)**

**STEP 1**
- **Team has broad representation**
- **Team has administrative support**

**STEP 2**
- ++,
- +,
- _

**STEP 3**
## Benchmarks Team Member Tally Form

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Critical Elements</th>
<th>Benchmarks of Quality Questions</th>
<th>In Place (++)</th>
<th>Needs Improvement (+)</th>
<th>Not in Place (-)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PBS Team</td>
<td>1.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Commitment</td>
<td>5.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Completion of BoQ
Step 3 - Team Report

- The coach will then complete the *Team Summary* on p. 3 of the *Benchmarks of Quality Scoring Form* recording areas of discrepancy, strength and weakness.

- **Discrepancies** - If there were any items for which the team’s most frequent rating varied from the coaches’ rating based upon the Scoring Guide, the descriptions and exemplars from the guide should be shared with the team. This can happen at a team meeting or informally. If upon sharing areas of discrepancy, the coach realizes that there is new information that according to the *Scoring Guide* would result in a different score, the item and the adjusted final score should be recorded on the *Scoring Form*.
# Benchmarks Practice: Scoring Form, Team Members Rating Form

## Team Member A
1. Team has broad representation
   - X
2. Team has administrative support
   - X

## Team Member B
1. Team has broad representation
   - X
2. Team has administrative support
   - X

## Team Member C
1. Team has broad representation
   - X
2. Team has administrative support
   - X

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STEP 1</th>
<th>STEP 2</th>
<th>STEP 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Team has broad representation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Team has administrative support</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In Place (++)
Needs Improvement (+)
Not In Place (-)
Completion of BoQ
Step 4 – Reporting Back to Team

• After completing the remainder of the Benchmarks of Quality: Scoring Form, the coach will report back to the team using the Team Report page of the Benchmarks of Quality: Scoring Form. If needed, address items of discrepancy and adjust the score. The coach will then lead the team through a discussion of the identified areas of strength (high ratings) and weakness (low ratings). This information should be conveyed as “constructive feedback” to assist with action planning.
## Benchmarks Team Summary: Scoring Form

### Areas of Discrepancy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item #</th>
<th>Team Response</th>
<th>Coach’s Score</th>
<th>Scoring Guide Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>++, ++, +</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Administrator does not actively support the process</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Areas of Strength

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Critical Element</th>
<th>Description of Areas of Strength</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### Areas in Need of Development

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Critical Element</th>
<th>Description of Areas in Need of Development</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
## MAX SCORES PER ELEMENT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Critical Elements</th>
<th>STEP 1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>PBS Team</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Team has broad representation</td>
<td>3 2 1 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Team has administrative support</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Team has regular meetings (at least monthly)</td>
<td>2 1 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Team has established a clear mission/purpose</td>
<td>1 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Faculty Commitment</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Faculty are aware of behavior problems across campus (regular data sharing)</td>
<td>2 1 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Faculty involved in establishing and reviewing goals</td>
<td>2 1 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Faculty feedback obtained throughout year</td>
<td>2 1 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Effective Procedures for Dealing with Discipline</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Discipline process described in narrative format or depicted in graphic format</td>
<td>2 1 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Process includes documentation procedures</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Discipline referral form includes information useful in decision making</td>
<td>2 1 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Behaviors defined</td>
<td>3 2 1 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Major/minor behaviors are clearly identified/understood</td>
<td>2 1 0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total:**
- PBS Team: 7
- Faculty Commitment: 6
- Effective Procedures for Dealing with Discipline: 12
Alternative Option* for Completion of BoQ

*statistically validated as an alternative option
Alternative Option

Step 1 – Team Member Scoring

- The team member uses personal experience with PBS and the descriptions and exemplars in the *Benchmarks of Quality Scoring Guide* for each of the 53 items on the *Benchmarks of Quality Scoring Form* (p.1 & 2). The team will meet and reach consensus on the appropriate score for each item.
Alternative Option
Step 2 – Team Summary

- After completing the *Benchmarks of Quality: Scoring Form*, the team should use the *Team Report* page of the *Benchmarks of Quality: Scoring Form* to guide a discussion of the identified areas of strength (high ratings) and weakness (low ratings). This information should be used as “constructive feedback” to assist with action planning.
Submitting Your Evaluation

• **Step 5 – Reporting/Entering Data**
  - The coach/facilitator will enter the data from the *Benchmarks of Quality: Scoring Form* on [www.pbssurveys.org](http://www.pbssurveys.org)
  - See PBS Surveys Users Manual for specific instructions.
  - District/state coordinators may establish due dates for completion of the BoQ annually, or more frequently as needed.
Using the BoQ Results to Boost Implementation and Validate Outcomes
Using the BoQ Results

- Action plan to increase fidelity of implementation
  - School
  - District
  - State/project
- Outcome reporting
- Model school identification
BoQ Max Scores per Critical Element

## MAX SCORES PER ELEMENT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Critical Elements</th>
<th>STEP 1</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>PBS Team</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Team has broad representation</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Team has administrative support</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Team has regular meetings (at least monthly)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Team has established a clear mission/purpose</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Faculty Commitment</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Faculty are aware of behavior problems across campus (regular data sharing)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Faculty involved in establishing and reviewing goals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Faculty feedback obtained throughout year</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Effective Procedures for Dealing with Discipline</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Discipline process described in narrative format or depicted in graphic format</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Process includes documentation procedures</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Discipline referral form includes information useful in decision making</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Behaviors defined</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Major/minor behaviors are clearly identified/understood</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Suggested array of appropriate responses to minor (non office-managed) problem behaviors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Suggested array of appropriate responses to major (office-managed) problem behaviors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Data Extraction</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Data extraction collected and used (GPR data)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total** |
- PBS Team: 7
- Faculty Commitment: 6
- Effective Procedures for Dealing with Discipline: 12
- Data Extraction: 3
PBS Surveys - BoQ Report
Critical Elements

Graph showing the percent implemented for various critical elements:
- PBS Team
- Faculty Commitment
- Discipline Procedures
- Data Analysis
- Expectations Developed
- Reward Program
- Lesson Plans
- Implementation
- Crisis Plan
- Evaluation

Are our Benchmarks scores above 70 and rising?
Scores have never been over 70 and dropped 15 points last year.
PBS Surveys - BoQ Report
Overall Scores

Demonstration School Exemplar District: Demonstration District
Benchmarks of Quality Overall Scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Date Completed</th>
<th>Overall Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>200607</td>
<td>9/27/2006</td>
<td>83.00 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200607</td>
<td>12/8/2006</td>
<td>78.00 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200607</td>
<td>5/1/2007</td>
<td>56.00 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200708</td>
<td>10/2/2007</td>
<td>22.00 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200708</td>
<td>10/5/2007</td>
<td>96.00 %</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Are our schools implementing PBS with fidelity?

Average BoQ scores over 70% and increasing in all 10 domains.
Is there a difference in ODR outcomes for schools?
Low implementers have many more ODRs, but number is decreasing.
Is PBS impacting ISS in our schools?
High implementing schools have 70% fewer ISS and decreased by 50%.
High Implementing Florida PBS Schools (Scoring 70 or Above on BoQ)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School Year</th>
<th>Average Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2004-2005</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005-2006</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006-2007</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007-2008</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ODR Rates by Implementation Level Across School Years

Average Days ODR per 100 Students

Implementation Level

Low (BoQ < 70)
- 35 Schools
- 77 Schools
- 83 Schools
- 67 Schools

High (BoQ >=70)
- 38 Schools
- 76 Schools
- 107 Schools
- 161 Schools

Legend:
- 2004-2005
- 2005-2006
- 2006-2007
- 2007-2008
OSS Rates by Implementation Level Across School Years

Average Days OSS per 100 Students

Low (BoQ <70):
- 35 Schools
- 77 Schools
- 83 Schools
- 67 Schools

High (BoQ >=70):
- 38 Schools
- 76 Schools
- 107 Schools
- 160 Schools
Students at Level 3+ in Reading on Florida’s Comprehensive Assessment Test

- All FL Schools
- Low (BoQ<70)
- High (BoQ>=70)

Academic Achievement

Average Percentage Scoring Level 3+

- 2004-2005: 53, 60, 67
- 2005-2006: 57, 59, 58

State
Using Benchmarks Results

• How will you use the results of the Benchmarks?
  • At the school or district level?
  • As it relates to fidelity of implementation?
  • As it relates to outcomes?
  • As it relates to identifying model schools?
  • Other?

• QUESTIONS?
# Comprehensive Evaluation Blueprint:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Implementation Monitoring</th>
<th>Implementation Integrity</th>
<th>Implementation Research</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>TIC</strong> (1) Team Implementation Checklist&lt;br&gt; <em>Sugai, Horner &amp; Lewis-Palmer (2001)</em></td>
<td><strong>BoQ</strong> (1) Benchmarks of Quality&lt;br&gt; <em>Kincaid, Childs &amp; George (2005)</em></td>
<td><strong>SET</strong> (1) School-wide Evaluation Tool&lt;br&gt; <em>Sugai, Lewis-Palmer, Todd &amp; Horner (2001)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PIC</strong> (1,2,3) PBS Implementation Checklist for Schools&lt;br&gt; <em>Childs, Kincaid &amp; George (2009)</em></td>
<td><strong>BAT</strong> (2,3) Benchmarks for Advanced Tiers&lt;br&gt; <em>Anderson, Childs, Kincaid, Horner, George, Todd, Sampson &amp; Spaulding (2009)</em></td>
<td><strong>ISSET</strong> (2,3) Individual Student Systems Evaluation Tool&lt;br&gt; <em>Anderson, Lewis-Palmer, Todd, Horner, Sugai &amp; Sampson (2008)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Walkthrough</strong> (1) Tier 1 PBS Walkthrough&lt;br&gt; <em>White, George, Childs &amp; Martinez (2009)</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MATT</strong> (2,3) Monitoring Advanced Tiers Tool&lt;br&gt; <em>Anderson, Childs, Kincaid, Horner, George, Todd, Sampson, &amp; Spaulding (2011)</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Implementation Monitoring

PBS Implementation Checklist (PIC)

http://flpbs.fmhi.usf.edu/coachescorner.asp
Progress Monitoring Measures

• Designed to assess the same core features as the research and annual self-assessment measures

• Used by school teams (typically with the support of their coach) on a frequent basis (e.g. monthly, every two months, or quarterly) to guide action planning during the implementation process

• Requires 15-20 minutes to complete online and are used by the team, coach and trainer to tailor actions, supports, and training content associated with assisting the school to implement with high fidelity

(PBIS Evaluation Blueprint, 2010)
PIC Purpose

- Provides school teams a “snapshot” of where they are in the implementation of PBS
  - Implementation of Critical Elements at Tier 1
  - Implementation of Tiers 2 and 3
- 44 questions
- Guides action planning and team activities
PIC Development Process

• Derived from the highest point areas indicated by the Factor Analysis of the BoQ
• Expert Review
• Florida Pilot
  – Elementary, Middle, High, Center/Alt
• Coach scoring
  • Scale: 0="No", 1="Somewhat" and 2="Yes"
• Online administration
• No total score but graphic displays
Factors of the PIC: Implementation Level

- Preparation: 0-8 score
- Initiation: 0-18 score
- Implementation: 0-18 score
- Maintenance: 0-10 score
- Extension into Tier 2: 0-14 score
- Extension into Tier 3: 0-20 score
Factor Analysis of the PIC

- Identify factors that “hold together” and are items internally consistent/strong?
- Descriptive statistics (09-10)
  - testing “internal consistency” of six PBS Implementation Checklist factors (N=398)
  - Cronbach’s coefficient alpha range = 0.79-0.97
  - Strong internal consistency for all of the factors
## Factors of the PIC: Tier 1 Critical Elements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Score Range</th>
<th>Identifiers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Coach and team</td>
<td>0-12 score</td>
<td>#1,3,4,5,6,7,20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buy-in</td>
<td>0-4 score</td>
<td># 2,27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expectations</td>
<td>0-4 score</td>
<td># 8,14,15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rewards</td>
<td>0-4 score</td>
<td># 9,16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discipline</td>
<td>0-4 score</td>
<td># 17,18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DBDM</td>
<td>0-12 score</td>
<td># 10,19,20,21,23,25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training</td>
<td>0-14 score</td>
<td># 3,4,8,11,12,14,23,24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents/community</td>
<td>0-6 score</td>
<td># 13,22,26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Is there a correlation between the PIC (Tier 1 section) and BoQ?

- BoQ is reliable, valid, efficient and useful for Tier 1

- Ease of use but still has some concerns:
  - Time - Not as useful for **frequent** action planning
  - Intended to self-assess, **not** progress monitor
Is there a correlation between the PIC (Tier 1 section) and BoQ?

- Results of correlation with BoQ Total Score
  - N=579 (09-10), Pearson r=.71 (p<.01)
  - N=432 (10-11), Pearson r=.62 (p<.01)

- Results of regression analyses indicated that higher PIC score was a significant predictor of higher BoQ score
Is there a correlation between the PIC (Tiers 2-3 section) and BAT?

- BAT has strong internal consistency (factor analysis), stability in administration (test/retest), theoretical confidence (expert panel) for Tiers 2-3

- Concerns:
  - Time - Not as useful for frequent action planning
  - Intended to self-assess, not progress monitor
  - Concurrent validity has yet to be demonstrated statistically
Is there a correlation between the PIC (Tiers 2-3 section) and BAT?

Results of correlation with BAT

- N=296 (09-10), Pearson r=.57 (p<.0001)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std Dev</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total BAT</td>
<td>296</td>
<td>80.06</td>
<td>26.73</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total PIC Tier 23</td>
<td>296</td>
<td>26.84</td>
<td>9.04</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- there are small correlations between the individual items on both BAT items and PIC Tiers 2-3 section items
  - but over 99% of those correlations are significant (p<0.05)
Use of the PIC

• Who completes the PBS Implementation Checklist?
  • The Coach
  • Must be familiar with the school team
    – Or completed as team activity with consensus achieved on each item

• When is the PIC completed?
  • Completed 3 and 6 months into the school year
  • November 1\textsuperscript{st} and March 1\textsuperscript{st} annually
  • Web-based data entry
Who looks at the PIC data?

• Team
• Coach
• District Coordinators
• Trainers/State Evaluation
## PBS Implementation Checklist

**Tier 1 Universal PBS**

Preparation:

**Tier 2 Supplemental PBS**

**Tier 3 Intensive PBS**

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>35. Data-based decision-making is used to identify students in need of Tier 3 supports</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36. Student’s needs are prioritized to assure that students with the most intensive needs are supported</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37. An FBA is conducted that identifies the problem, the events that reliably predict the problem behavior and the consequences that maintain the problem behavior</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38. At least 1 hypothesis is developed from the FBA to explain the student’s problem behavior</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39. Tier 3 interventions are matched to the function of the behavior</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40. A BIP is developed that includes procedures to prevent problem behaviors, teach appropriate behavior, and reinforce/reward appropriate behavior</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41. Teachers are “coached” in how to implement the BIP accurately and effectively</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

0=No, 1=Somewhat, 2=Yes
PIC Critical Elements: Coach and Team

1. School-level administrators support PBS - active involvement, funding allocated, etc.

3. PBS Team has been established and trained - full staff representation, team meeting schedule established; attended FLPBS trainings, has a current action plan.

4. PBS Coach has been trained - attends summer trainings, attends coaches and regional meetings; knowledgeable about PBS, Behavioral Theory, and data-based decision making; skilled in facilitation, problem solving process, and public speaking.

5. PBS Team meets at least once a month.

6. PBS Coach attends those meetings.

7. PBS Team shows a good working relationship with the Coach.

20. Discipline data are used in PBS Team meetings to identify problems and guide school decisions.
PIC Critical Elements: Buy-In

2. Staff support PBS – staff provided overview and reached 80% agreement to implement PBS.

27. Morale is sustained among staff and students - staff and student attendance and participation in PBS efforts is high, system in place to recognize staff (and parent) contributions.
PIC Critical Elements: Expectations

8. 3-5 expectations have been clearly defined and teaching plans have been described to staff.

14. Behavior expectations and reward systems are taught formally and informally to students - occurs multiple times during the year to include transferring students, integrated into curriculums, common language used by staff and students across settings; dates for reward activities have been set and placed on school calendars.

15. Behavior expectations have been posted throughout the school - including hallways, cafeteria, playground, special rooms, restrooms, offices, and classrooms.
PIC Critical Elements:
Rewards

9. System for rewarding students has been developed – written documentation required for full score.

16. Positive behaviors are rewarded consistently across staff and settings.
PIC Critical Elements: Discipline

17. Procedures for handling inappropriate behaviors are implemented consistently across staff and settings.

18. Office discipline forms are completed consistently and accurately across staff.
PIC Critical Elements: Data-based Decision-Making

10. Strategy for collecting and using discipline data has been established.
19. Discipline data are gathered and entered into the database consistently and in a timely manner.
21. Discipline data are summarized and reported to staff on a regular basis.
23. Data and staff feedback are used to make decisions regarding additional training and professional staff development.
25. Data and staff feedback are used to revise and update the PBS action plan for the school and district - reviewed and revised as needed.
PIC Critical Elements: Training

3. PBS Team has been established and trained - full staff representation, team meeting scheduled established; attended FLPBS trainings, has a current action plan.

4. PBS Coach has been trained - attends summer trainings, attends coaches and regional meetings; knowledgeable about PBS, Behavioral Theory, and data-based decision making; skilled in facilitation, problem solving process, and public speaking.

8. 3-5 expectations have been clearly defined and teaching plans have been described to staff.

11. A plan has been developed to provide training and support to staff and teachers – including substitutes, student/intern teachers, and new staff.
12. New and returning staff have been oriented and trained in PBS processes—rationale, reward system, office vs. classroom managed behaviors, formalized procedure for handling behavior problems, flowchart developed, problem behaviors clearly defined.

14. Behavior expectations and reward systems are taught formally and informally to students—occurs multiple times during the year to include transferring students, integrated into curriculums, common language used by staff and students across settings; dates for reward activities have been set and placed on school calendars.

23. Data and staff feedback are used to make decisions regarding additional training and professional staff development.

24. A plan is in place for training new PBS team members—including new administrators, staff, and district personnel.
PIC Critical Elements: Parents/Community

13. Parents have been oriented to PBS.

22. Parents and community members are actively involved in PBS related activities, programs, and/or services.

26. Links with the community and other resources have been established to assist with funding and incentives.
Using PIC Results

• Use the PIC to guide your PBS team towards implementation with fidelity at all three tiers

• Improvements since last BoQ?

• Are we doing what we said we would do?
  – RtI:Behavior implementation
  – Implemented with fidelity

• Is it working?
  – sustainability of implementation
  – benefits for students, staff, community over time
School Tier 1 Critical Elements (elementary school - BoQ)
School Implementation Level (elementary school - PIC)
School Tier 1 Critical Elements (elementary school - PIC)

BELCHER ELEMENTARY SCHOOL
PIC - Tier1 Critical Elements

Fall          Spring

% of Possible Points Scored

Tier1 Critical Element

Coach and Team  Buy-in  Expectations  Rewards  Discipline  DBDM  Training  Parents/Community
District Implementation Level (all schools - BoQ)

Pinellas

Avg Benchmark Score per Critical Element Category (all school types)

- 2007-2008
- 2008-2009
- 2009-2010

Avg Possible Points Scored

Critical Element Category

- PBS Team
- Faculty Commitment
- Effective Procedures
- Data Entry Plan
- Expectations
- Reward Program
- Lesson Plans
- Implementation Plan
- Crisis Plan
- Evaluation
- Classroom
- TOTAL SCORE
District Implementation Level (across all schools - PIC)
District Tier 1 Critical Elements (all schools - PIC)

![Bar graph showing the average percentage of possible points scored by Tier 1 Critical Elements for Fall and Spring seasons. The elements include Coach and Team, Buy-In, Expectations, Rewards, Discipline, Data-Driven Decision Making, Training, and Parent/Community involvement. The graph highlights the performance across different critical elements with a focus on the spring season.]
District Implementation Level (only elementary schools - BoQ)
District Implementation Level
(only elementary schools - PIC)
District Tier 1 Critical Elements (only elementary schools - PIC)

Pinellas
PIC - Tier 1 Critical Elements (Grouped by Elementary)

Avg Possible Points Scored

- Coach and Team
- Buy-In
- Expectations
- Rewards
- Discipline
- DBDM
- Training
- Parents/Community

PBS Implementation Level/School Type
District Implementation Level (only high schools - BoQ)
District Implementation Level (only high schools - PIC)

Pinellas

PIC - Implementation Level
(Grouped by High)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PBS Implementation Level/School Type</th>
<th>Fall</th>
<th>Spring</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tier1 Preparation</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tier1 Initiation</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tier1 Implementation</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tier1 Maintenance</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tier2 Supplemental</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tier3 Intensive</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tier4 Intensive</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tier5 Intensive</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
District Tier 1 Critical Elements (only high schools - PIC)

Pinellas
PIC - Tier 1 Critical Elements (Grouped by High)

Avg Possible Points Scored

- Coach and Team: Fall - 79, Spring - 80
- Buy-In: Fall - 42, Spring - 47
- Expectations: Fall - 46, Spring - 48
- Rewards: Fall - 62, Spring - 64
- Discipline: Fall - 65, Spring - 65
- DBDM: Fall - 59, Spring - 65
- Training: Fall - 46, Spring - 55
- Parents/Community: Fall - 25, Spring - 31

PBS Implementation Level/School Type
Action Planning with the PIC

- Define items marked “No” or “Somewhat” in place
- Identify the items that will make the biggest impact
- Define a task analysis of activities to achieve items
- Allocate tasks to people, time, reporting event
Using the PIC Results

- Action plan to increase fidelity of implementation
  - School
  - District
  - State/project
- Outcome reporting
- Identification of Model school candidates
  - Indication of who should apply
What if I Question the Results?

• District Level verification
• 2nd completion by internal/external coach
• On-site Walk-through

• QUESTIONS?
Implementation Monitoring

Tier 1 PBS Walkthrough

http://flpbs.fmhi.usf.edu/modelschools.asp
Tier 1 PBS Walkthrough

• Independent observation to support team’s perception of Tier 1 PBIS implementation
• Visibility of expectations and rules
  – Across campus, including 5 randomly selected classrooms
• Interview random staff, faculty & students
On-site Tier 1 PBS Walkthrough

- Tool is used as a quick glance during school site visit to determine SWPBS evidence
- Adapted from the SET ("mini-SET")
- Created as a reliability measure against BOQ score and outcome data submitted
- Allows the observer to provide feedback to the PBS Team and administration
- Completed by a peer PBS Coach or District Coordinator
  - Someone who has not been working directly with the team – outside observer
- Part of the PBS Model School application process
Is there a correlation between the total score on the Walkthrough and BoQ?

- **Total BoQ Sub-scales and Total Walkthrough scores Descriptive Statistics**
- **N=223 (07-09), Pearson r=.20 (p<.0027)**
- **N=346 (09-10), Pearson r=.58 (p<.0001)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std Dev</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Walkthrough</td>
<td>223</td>
<td>35.72</td>
<td>4.32</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BoQ</td>
<td>223</td>
<td>90.66</td>
<td>5.71</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std Dev</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Walkthrough</td>
<td>346</td>
<td>28.16</td>
<td>6.26</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BoQ</td>
<td>346</td>
<td>80.67</td>
<td>17.46</td>
<td>18.69</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Purpose: This tool is meant for use as a quick glance when visiting a school to see if School-Wide PBS:RtIB is evident. It will allow the observer to provide feedback to the PBS:RtIB team and administration. The Tier 1 PBS Walkthrough is to be completed by a peer PBS:RtIB Coach or District Coordinator and is a required element of the Model School application.

School: ______________________________________________________
Observer: ___________________________ Date: ______________

School Expectations
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________

Visibility
Visit each area on campus listed below and indicate where Expectation Posters are visible:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YES</th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>YES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☐ Hallways</td>
<td>☐ Main Office</td>
<td>☐ Classrooms</td>
<td>☐ Cafeteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Media Center</td>
<td>☐ Gym/Playground</td>
<td>☐ Computer Lab</td>
<td>☐ Other: __________</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Based upon the school’s data, record the most problematic areas on campus in the spaces below. Then indicate whether Rules Posters are visible in the areas by checking Yes or No under each setting listed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Problem Area</th>
<th>Poster Visible</th>
<th>☐ Yes</th>
<th>☐ No</th>
<th>☐ Yes</th>
<th>☐ No</th>
<th>☐ Yes</th>
<th>☐ No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Classrooms (Visit a total of 5 classrooms from a variety of classes/grades)
- Visit 5 classrooms (maximum) to determine if Rules Posters are visible.
  
  Indicate how many classrooms had visible Rules Posters.

Students (Ask a total of 5 students from a variety of classes/grades)
- Ask 5 students (maximum) if they know the Expectations. Indicate how many students are able to tell you all the expectations.

Staff (Ask a total of 5 staff members the following questions)
- Do you have a school-wide team to address behavior/discipline across campus? Indicate how many staff know about the team.
- Can you name the School-wide Expectations? Indicate how many staff are able to tell you all the expectations.
- Have you taught the School-wide Expectations? Indicate how many staff report teaching all the expectations.
- Have you seen the school’s discipline data this year? Indicate how many staff report seeing the data.
Tier 1 PBS Walkthrough

Purpose: This tool is meant for use as a quick glance when visiting a school to see if School-Wide PBS:RtIB is evident. It will allow the observer to provide feedback to the PBS:RtIB team and administration. The Tier 1 PBS Walkthrough is to be completed by a peer PBS:RtIB Coach or District Coordinator and is a required element of the Model School application.

School: ______________________________________________________  
Observer: ______________________________  Date: ________________

School Expectations

__________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________

Visibility

Visit each area on campus listed below and indicate where Expectation Posters are visible:

YES
☐ Hallways  YES  ☐ Main Office  YES  ☐ Classrooms  YES  ☐ Cafeteria
☐ Media Center  YES  ☐ Gym/Playground  YES  ☐ Computer Lab  YES  ☐ Other: ________________

Based upon the school’s data, record the most problematic areas on campus in the spaces below. Then indicate whether Rules Posters are visible in the areas by checking Yes or No under each setting listed.

Problem Area

________________________________________________________________________

Poster Visible  ☐ Yes  ☐ No  ☐ Yes  ☐ No  ☐ Yes  ☐ No  ☐ Yes  ☐ No
**Classrooms** (Visit a total of 5 classrooms from a variety of classes/grades)
- Visit 5 classrooms (maximum) to determine if Rules Posters are visible.  
  *Indicate how many classrooms had visible Rules Posters.*

**Students** (Ask a total of 5 students from a variety of classes/grades)
- Ask 5 students (maximum) if they know the Expectations.  
  *Indicate how many students are able to tell you all the expectations.*

**Staff** (Ask a total of 5 staff members the following questions)
- Do you have a school-wide team to address behavior/discipline across campus?  
  *Indicate how many staff know about the team.*

- Can you name the School-wide Expectations?  
  *Indicate how many staff are able to tell you all the expectations.*

- Have you taught the School-wide Expectations?  
  *Indicate how many staff report teaching all the expectations.*

- Have you seen the school’s discipline data this year?  
  *Indicate how many staff report seeing the data.*
BoQ: 42. Classroom rules are defined for each of the school-wide expectations and are posted in classrooms.

WT: Visit main areas on campus including classrooms to determine if Expectations Posters are visible AND Visit 5 classrooms to determine if Rules Posters are visible.
Behaviors Taught

BoQ: 44. Expected behavior routines in classrooms are taught

WT: Ask 5 students if they know the Expectations. Ask 5 staff members, “Have you taught the School-Wide Expectations”? 
Who looks at the Tier 1 PBS Walkthrough data?

- Team
- Coach
- District Coordinators (possibly)
- Trainers/State Evaluation (only if applying for Model School status)
- Anyone who makes a site visit can conduct a Walkthrough
Elementary School

Graph showing the percentage distribution of various elements at T1, T2, and T3.

- ODR
- ISS
- OSS
- BoQ
- WT
- Fall PIC T1
- Sp PIC T1
- Fall PIC T2
- Sp PIC T2
- Fall PIC T3
- Sp PIC T3

%
Middle School

Academics:
Increase in 3/3 areas of FCAT
Reading
High School

Academics: Increase in 2/3 areas of FCAT Reading

High School

%
Implementation Monitoring Tools

• Will you progress monitor your school(s)?
  – If so, how often? Which instrument(s)?
  – Who is responsible to administer, collect and synthesize the data?
  – How will it be reported back to the team?

• How will you use the results?
  • At the school, district, or state/project level?
  • As it relates to fidelity? Outcomes? Identifying potential Model Schools? Other?
In Summary…

1. Know what you want to know
2. Compare fidelity of implementation with outcomes – presents a strong case for implementing Tier 1 PBS with fidelity
3. Additional sources of data can assist in determining if Tier 1 PBS process is working, but also why or why not it is working
4. Address systems issues that may impact implementation success
Evaluation Instruments

• PBIS TA Center:

• FLPBS:RtIB Project Coach’s Corner:
  – http://flpbs.fmhi.usf.edu/coachescorner.asp

• PBIS Assessment:
  – https://www.pbisassessment.org/home
Some Resources


More Resources


Enroll now for Summer!

Courses taught by:
Don Kincaid,
Heather George,
Lise Fox, Kwang Sun Blair

Completely on-line
Program web site at:
http://pbs.cbc.usf.edu/
Contact

Heather Peshak George, Ph.D.
- Associate Professor
- Co-PI, Co-Director & PBIS Research Partner

Phone: (813) 974-6440
Fax: (813) 974-6115
Email: flpbs@fmhi.usf.edu
Website: http://flpbs.fmhi.usf.edu