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PURPOSE
Provide overview & opportunity to discuss purpose & use of Tiered Fidelity Inventory (TFI)

- Brief review of school-wide PBIS
- Overview & discussions of TFI use
Teach association of sounds w/ meaning?

How do we...?

Teach main idea of paragraph?

Help parents learn to defuse escalations?

Support children who cry easily?

Educate students who experience traumatic events?

Encourage value & use of scientific facts?

Reduce incidence & prevalence of HIV/AIDS in S. African schools?

Teach school-wide social skills?

Prevent occurrences of bullying behavior?

Increase attendance in disadvantaged schools?

Decrease out-of-school suspensions of kids of color?
Multi-tiered Systems of Support (MTSS)
MTSS = FRAMEWORK for enhancing development & implementation of CONTINUUM of evidence-based practices to achieve ACADEMICALLY & BEHAVIORALLY important outcomes for ALL students.
Implement w/ FIDELITY

Develop CONTINUUM of Evidence-based Practices & Systems

Decide with DATA

SCREEN Universally

PBIS & MTSS Share Functions

MONITOR PROGRESS Continuously

Use TEAM to Coordinate & Lead Implementation

Develop LOCAL EXPERTISE & Implementation Fluency

Supporting Important Culturally Equitable Academic & Social Behavior Competence

Supporting Culturally Relevant Evidence-based Interventions

Supporting Culturally Knowledgeable Staff Behavior

Supporting Culturally Valid Decision Making

Vincent, Randall, Cartledge, Tobin, & Swan-Bradway 2011; Sugai, O’Keeffe, & Fallon, 2012ab
Primary Prevention: School-/Classroom-Wide Systems for All Students, Staff, & Settings

Secondary Prevention: Specialized Group Systems for Students with At-Risk Behavior

Tertiary Prevention: Specialized Individualized Systems for Students with High-Risk Behavior

Tiered LOGIC

ALL

FEW

SOME

CONTINUUM OF SCHOOL-WIDE INSTRUCTIONAL & POSITIVE BEHAVIOR SUPPORT

Primary Prevention: School-/Classroom-Wide Systems for All Students, Staff, & Settings

Secondary Prevention: Specialized Group Systems for Students with At-Risk Behavior

Tertiary Prevention: Specialized Individualized Systems for Students with High-Risk Behavior
Major ODR per Grade Level (triangle): 2016-17
Horner et al.

13.4 - Mean Percentage Students (2016-17 Reg Ed) (Majors Only)

~8-15% T2/3 (excl. "Other")

Most students respond T1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade Level</th>
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Mean Percentage Students (2016-17 Reg Ed) (Majors Only)

~8-15%

Students 0 or 1

Students 2 to 5

Students 6+

12.6% students = 84% major ODR

~75-85% T2/3 (excl. “Other”)

Few % students occasion much attention
After 3 years, pilot schools have
• More than doubled # students meeting grade literacy level goals.
• More than halved # students at significant risk for reading failure.

CT’s K-3 Reading Model **Works**

Mike Coyne et al., April 2016
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PRACTICE</th>
<th>IMPLEMENTATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Effective</td>
<td>Maximum Student Benefits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Effective</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

“Doing it correctly?”

Fixsen & Blase, 2009
School-wide PBIS Tiered Fidelity Inventory (ver. 2.1): Abbreviated Guide

George Sugai
PBIS Center
University of Connecticut
25 Jan 2017
Tiered Fidelity of Implementation

Index of implementation fidelity of PBIS core features

- Tier I – all students, staff, places
- Tier II – small group
- Tier III - individual Support

Replaces

- School-wide Evaluation Tool (SET)
- Team Implementation Checklist (TIC)
- Benchmarks of Quality (BoQ)
- Benchmarks of Advanced Tiers (BAT)
- PBIS Self-Assessment Inventory (SAS)
- Phases of Implementation (POI)

Note: SET, ISSET and BoQ remain preferred research-quality fidelity measures

www.pbisapps.org
Abstract

Full and durable implementation of school-based interventions is supported by regular evaluation of fidelity of implementation. Multiple assessments have been developed to evaluate the extent to which schools are applying the core features of school-wide positive behavioral interventions and supports (SWPBIS). The SWPBIS Tiered Fidelity Inventory (TFI) was developed to be used as an initial assessment to determine the extent to which a school is using (or needs) SWPBIS, a measure of SWPBIS fidelity of implementation at all three tiers of support, and a tool to guide action planning for further implementation efforts. In this research, we evaluated the psychometric properties of the TFI in three studies: a content validity study, a usability and reliability study, and a large-scale validation study. Results showed strong construct validity for assessing fidelity at all three tiers, strong interrater and 2-week test–retest reliability, high usability for action planning, and strong relations with existing SWPBIS fidelity measures. Implications for accurate evaluation planning are discussed.
TFI Purpose

Self-assessment for
- Team action planning
- Informing others (e.g., staff, families, administrators)
- Implementation progress monitoring
- Implementation recognition

Reporting
- Total score (>80% = fidelity)
- Tier sub-scale
- W/in tier sub-scale
- Individual items

Note: Completed by team & guided by coach/facilitator

TFI Expectations

Facilitated by external individual
Practice 2x before conducting
Review materials & videos at www.pbisapps.org
Experience & fluency w/ MTSS/PBIS
Use data to action plan

Experience & fluency w/ MTSS/PBIS
**Scoring the SWPBIS Tiered Fidelity Inventory**

The TFI generates scores reflecting the percentage of implementation for Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III core features. Scores are determined by calculating the percentage of possible points awarded for items in each tier (section). No weighting of items is included in this calculation (see below).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Core Features</th>
<th>Items/ Points</th>
<th>Points Award/ Possible Points</th>
<th>Percentage of SWPBIS Implementation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tier I</td>
<td>1-15 / 30 points</td>
<td>____/ 30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tier II</td>
<td>1-13 / 26 points</td>
<td>____/ 26</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tier III</td>
<td>1-17 / 34 points</td>
<td>____/ 34</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**EXAMPLE: Subscale Reports over Time**

![Bar chart showing scores over time for Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III](chart.png)
EXAMPLE: Sub-subscale & Item Reports

• Sub-subscale
  • Tier I
    • Teams
    • Implementation
    • Evaluation
  • Tier II
    • Teams
    • Interventions
    • Evaluation
  • Tier III
    • Teams
    • Resources
    • Assessment
    • Support plan
    • Monitoring and adaptation
• Item report

NW Complex Area TFI Scores

- TFI Score: 53%
- Tier 1: 62%
- Tier 2: 51%
- Tier 3: 45%
Total TFI Scores for Nanakuli-Waianae Complex Area 2017

TFI Orientation of Administration
Administration Protocol

**Before**
- Set schedule
- Specify personnel
- Review existing fidelity, student impact data, & relevant permanent products
- Conduct walkthrough

**During**
- Review purpose, data sources
- Rates implementation (in, partial, not) by each member
- Discuss briefly
- Vote (majority, consensus)
- Record

**After**
- Prioritize high by tier & subscale
- Develop action plan for each high priority item
- Present to faculty/staff for approval

*Note: Plan 1 hr for Walkthrough, 1 hr for Self-Assessment, & 30 min action planning per tier*

Possible Pre-Administration Documentation

- Tier I
  - School team organizational chart (if available)
  - School/ District policies on social behavior/support
  - Team meeting minutes (last 3 meetings)
  - Student handbook
  - Professional development plan for past year
  - Prior PBIS fidelity measures (last two years)
  - Student behavioral data summary for past month
  - Major ODR/Day/Month compared to the national median
  - Universal screening measures and process
  - Any prior evaluation reports focused on social behavior
  - Any reports to school administration or board focused on social behavior
Examples **Tier 1** Supporting Documentation

- School teams organizational chart
- School & district policies on social behavior support
- Team meeting minutes
- Student handbook
- Professional development plan for past year
- Prior PBIS fidelity measures for last two years
- Student behavioral data summary for at least past two months, including ODR/day/month
- Universal screening measures, purposes, & process
- Other behavior related reports or evaluation (e.g., school climate, suspensions, attendance)

Examples **Tier 2** Supporting Documentation

- Meeting schedule/calendar
- At least last 2 team meeting minutes
- Screening procedures & decision rules for selecting students
- Practice procedural handbooks & supporting documentation
- Tier II data summaries at least for last 2 months
- Family communication systems
- Staff communication systems
- Most recent fidelity measures
Examples Tier 3 Supporting Documentation

- Meeting schedule/calendar
- At least last 2 team meeting minutes
- Screening procedures & decision rules for selecting students
- Assessment tools for Tier III (e.g., functional behavioral assessment, mental health, medical)
- 3 randomly selected active & current student support plans
- At least 2 behavior data summary reports

Feature Elements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feature Name</th>
<th>Data Sources</th>
<th>Scoring Criteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Feature</td>
<td>Possible data sources</td>
<td>0 = Not implemented</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 = Partially implemented</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2 = Fully implemented</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Example Tier 3 Supporting Documentation:

Feature Name: Detailed description of the feature.

Possible data sources:

- 0 = descriptors of the feature not being implemented
- 1 = descriptors of the feature being partially implemented
- 2 = descriptors of the feature being fully implemented
Self-assessment scoring

• PROCESS
  - State question
  - Review/refer to documentation
  - Individual rating
  - Discuss
  - Group rating

• SCORING of feature descriptors
  - 0 = not implemented
  - 1 = partially implemented
  - 2 = fully implemented

Tier I
School-wide PBIS Tiered Fidelity Inventory
1.1 Team Composition

Main Idea: Teams need people with multiple skills & perspectives to implement PBIS well.

Quick Check: Team Composition

- **SELF-ASSESSMENT**
  - Coordinator
  - Behavioral expertise
  - Administrative authority
  - Coaching expertise
  - Knowledge about academic/behavior outcomes
  - Knowledge about school operations
  - Family/Student perspective included

- **SCORING — Tier 1 Team...**
  0 = Does not exist or include coordinator, school administrator, or individuals with applied behavioral expertise
  1 = Exists, but does not include all identified roles or attendance of these members is below 80%
  2 = Exists w/coordinator, administrator, & all identified roles represented, & attendance of all roles is at or above 80%
### 1.2 Team Operating Procedures

**Main Idea:** Meetings procedures enable effective decision making, action planning, & tracking progress.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feature</th>
<th>Data Sources</th>
<th>Scoring Criteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tier I team meeting agendas and minutes</td>
<td></td>
<td>0 = Not implemented</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tier I meeting roles descriptions</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 = Partially implemented</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tier I action plan</td>
<td></td>
<td>2 = Fully implemented</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Feature Data Sources**

- Tier I team meeting agendas and minutes
- Tier I meeting roles descriptions
- Tier I action plan

- Tier I team does not use regular meeting format/agenda, minutes, defined roles, or a current action plan
- Tier I team has at least 2 but not all 4 features
- Tier I team meets at least monthly and uses regular meeting format/agenda, minutes, defined roles, AND has a current action plan

---

**Quick Check: Team Operating Procedures**

**SELF-ASSESSMENT**

- Regular, monthly meetings
- 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

**SCORING**

- Tier 1 team....

  - 0 = Does not use regular meeting format/agenda, minutes, defined roles, or current action plan
  - 1 = Has at least 2 but not all 4 features
  - 2 = Meets at least monthly & uses regular meeting format/agenda, minutes, defined roles, & has current action plan
1.3 Behavioral Expectations

**Main Idea:** Having school-wide, positive expectations is among best ways to establish positive social culture.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feature</th>
<th>Data Sources</th>
<th>Scoring Criteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
<td>TFI Walkthrough Tool</td>
<td>0 = Behavioral expectations have not been identified, are not all positive, or are more than 5 in number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Staff handbook</td>
<td>1 = Behavioral expectations identified but may not include a matrix or be posted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Student handbook</td>
<td>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</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Quick Check: Behavioral Expectations**

- **SELF-ASSESSMENT**
  - Has the team identified five or fewer behavioral expectations?
  - Do they include examples by location / setting?
  - Are they posted publically throughout the school?

- **SCORING — Behavioral Expectations**...
  - 0 = Have not been identified, are not all positive, or are more than 5 in number
  - 1 = Identified but may not include matrix or be posted
  - 2 = Are five or fewer, positive, posted, & identified for specific settings (i.e., matrix) & at least 90% of staff can list at least 67% of expectations
1.4 Teaching Expectations

**Main Idea:** Behavioral expectations need to be taught to all students to be effective.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feature</th>
<th>Data Sources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1.4 Teaching Expectations: Expected academic and social behaviors are taught directly to all students in classrooms and across other campus settings/locations. | • TPI Walkthrough Tool  
• Professional development calendar  
• Lesson plans  
• Informal walkthroughs |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Scoring Criteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 = Not Implemented</td>
<td>1 = Partially implemented</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 = Fully implemented</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

Quick Check: Teaching Expectations

- **SELF-ASSESSMENT**
  - Are regularly scheduled times identified for teaching expectations at least once per school year?
  - Is teaching schedule documented?
  - Are behavioral expectations taught to all students across all school settings (i.e., cafeteria, hallways, classrooms, etc.)?

- **SCORING – Expected behaviors....**
  - 0 = Are not taught
  - 1 = Are taught informally or inconsistently
  - 2 = Are taught formally w/ written schedules and directly to students across classroom & campus settings & at least 70% of students can list at least 67% of expectations
1.5 Problem Behavior Definitions

Feature | Data Sources | Scoring Criteria
--- | --- | ---
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 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

Main Idea: Operational definitions of problem behavior & consistent processes for responding to problem behavior improve “predictability” of social expectations in school. Focus on reducing reward for problem behavior.

Quick Check: Problem Behavior Definitions

- **SELF-ASSESSMENT**
  - Are problem behavior definitions written down & documented?
  - Do definitions clearly differentiate between staff-managed & office-managed problem behaviors?
  - Are all staff & faculty members trained on definitions?
  - Are definitions shared with families & students?

- **SCORING – Definitions & clear procedures...**
  - 0 = Do not exist or are not documented
  - 1 = Exist but are not clear and/or not organized by staff- versus office-managed problems
  - 2 = Are clearly defined, documented, trained, & shared w/ families
1.6 Discipline Policies

Main Idea: Preventative & positive approaches to discipline are most effective.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feature</th>
<th>Data Sources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.6 Discipline Policies: School policies and procedures describe and emphasize proactive, instructive, and/or restorative approaches to student behavior that are implemented consistently.</td>
<td>Discipline policy, Student handbook, Code of conduct, Informal administrator interview</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

Quick Check: Discipline Policies

- **SELF-ASSESSMENT**
  - Are disciplinary practices proactive & preventative?
  - Is emphasis on keeping children in school & classroom or on exclusionary practices?
  - Is documentation of discipline policies clear?
  - Do administrators report consistent use of proactive, preventative approaches?

- **SCORING** — Documentation includes...
  - 0 = Only reactive & punitive consequences
  - 1 = Emphasis on proactive approaches
  - 2 = Emphasis on proactive approaches & administrator reports consistent use
1.7 Professional Development

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

Main Idea: Keys to PBIS implementation are staff consistency, & staff informed of goals, process, & measures.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feature</th>
<th>Data Sources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1.7 Professional Development | - Professional development calendar  
- Staff handbook |

Scoring Criteria:

- 0 = Not implemented
- 1 = Partially implemented
- 2 = Fully implemented

Quick Check: Professional Development

- SELF-ASSESSMENT
  - Are trainings scheduled for school team members?
  - Is faculty-wide orientation led by the full Tier I team?
  - Is annual orientation scheduled for new faculty?
  - Are strategies documented for orienting substitutes or volunteers?
  - Is process for requesting assistance for behavioral concerns known by all, easy to follow, & encouraged?

- SCORING – Process....
  - 0 = Does not exist for teaching staff
  - 1 = Is informal/unwritten, not part of professional development calendar, &/or does not include all staff or all 4 core Tier I practices
  - 2 = Are formal for teaching all staff all aspects of Tier I system, including all 4 core Tier I practices
1.8 Classroom Procedures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feature</th>
<th>Data Sources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.8 Classroom Procedures: Tier I features (school-wide expectations, routines, acknowledgements, in-class continuum of consequences) are implemented within classrooms and consistent with school-wide systems.</td>
<td>Staff handbook, informal walkthroughs, progress monitoring, individual classroom data</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scoring Criteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 = Not implemented</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 = Partially implemented</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 = Fully implemented</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Main Idea: PBIS expectations & consequences need to be integrated into classroom systems. To improve consistency in behavior support practices across adults.

Quick Check: Classroom Procedures

- **SELF-ASSESSMENT**
  - Do classroom procedures match proactive school-wide disciplinary practices?
  - Are all core features of Tier I supports visible?
    - Positively stated expectations & consistent routines
    - System for acknowledging appropriate behavior
    - In-class system for responding to inappropriate behavior

- **SCORING** – Classrooms are...
  - 0 = Not implementing Tier I
  - 1 = Informally implementing Tier I but no formal system exists
  - 2 = Formally implementing all core Tier I features, consistent with school-wide expectations
1.9 Feedback and Acknowledgement

Main Idea: Students will sustain positive behavior only with regular strategies for continuous re-teaching & rewarding appropriate behavior. Formal systems are easier for teachers/staff to implement.

Quick Check: Feedback & Acknowledgement

- **SELF-ASSESSMENT**
  - Are students & staff interviewed at least 1/yr for receiving & distributing acknowledgements?
  - Are acknowledgements linked to school-wide expectations?
  - Are acknowledgements distributed across school settings?
  - Do at least 80% of interviewed students report receiving them?

- **SCORING — Formal system...**
  - 0 = Not in place for acknowledging students
  - 1 = Is in place & used by at least 90% of staff OR received by at least 50% of students
  - 2 = Is used by at least 90% of staff AND received by at least 50% of students
1.10 Faculty Involvement

**Main Idea:** Schools need active faculty engagement for successful & sustained PBIS implementation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feature</th>
<th>Data Sources</th>
<th>Scoring Criteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1.10 Faculty Involvement | • PBIS Self-Assessment Survey  
• Informal surveys  
• Staff meeting minutes | 0 = Not implemented  
1 = Partially implemented  
2 = Fully implemented |

Quick Check: Faculty Involvement

**SELF-ASSESSMENT**
- Process for receiving feedback on Tier I supports documented?
- Does that documentation include input from faculty?
- Was most recent feedback w/in past 12 months?
- How often is school-wide data shared with faculty?

**SCORING – Faculty...**
- 0 = Are not shown data at least yearly & do not provide input
- 1 = Have been shown data more than yearly OR have provided feedback on Tier I foundations w/in past 12 months but not both
- 2 = Shown data at least 4x/ year AND have provided feedback on Tier I practices w/in past 12 months
1.11 Student/Family/Community Involvement

**Main Idea:** Schools need active engagement of students, families & community to be successful.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feature</th>
<th>Data Sources</th>
<th>Scoring Criteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 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 foundations  
1 = Documentation of input on Tier I foundations, but not within the past 12 months or input not from all types of stakeholders  
2 = Documentation exists that students, families, and community members have provided feedback on Tier I practices (expectations, consequences and acknowledgements) within the past 12 months |

**Quick Check: Student/Family/Community Involvement**

- **SELF-ASSESSMENT**
  - Process for receiving feedback on Tier I supports documented?
  - Does documentation include input from faculty, students, & families?
  - Was most recent feedback w/in past 12 months?

- **SCORING – Documentation…**
  - 0 = Missing for stakeholder feedback on Tier I foundations
  - 1 = On Tier I foundations, but not w/in past 12 months or input not from all types of stakeholders
  - 2 = Exists that students, families, & community members provided feedback on Tier I practices w/in past 12 months
1.12 Discipline Data

**Main Idea:** Teams need right information in right form at right time to make effective decisions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feature</th>
<th>Data Sources</th>
<th>Scoring Criteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 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 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 |

**Quick Check: Discipline Data**

**SELF-ASSESSMENT**
- Does centralized data system to collect & organize behavior incident data exist?
- Does Tier I team have instantaneous access to graphed reports summarizing discipline data?
- Are data organized to review following: frequency of problem behavior events by behavior, location, time of day, & student?

**SCORING — Centralized data system...**
- 0 = W/ ongoing decision making exists
- 1 = Exists but does not allow instantaneous access to full set of graphed reports
- 2 = Exists & 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

Main Idea: Teams need right information in right form at the right time to make effective decisions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feature</th>
<th>Data Sources</th>
<th>Scoring Criteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 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 making for non-responders  
• Staff professional development calendar  
• Staff handbook  
• Team meeting minutes | 0 = Not implemented  
1 = Partially implemented  
2 = Fully implemented |

Quick Check: Data-Based Decision Making

• SELF-ASSESSMENT
  - 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?

• SCORING – Process or protocol.
  - 0 = Does not exist or data are reviewed but not used
  - 1 = Does exist but data reviewed & used for decision-making less than monthly
  - 2 = Does exist & team reviews discipline data & 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

**Main Idea:** Measuring fidelity is essential for maintaining high-criterion use of PBIS. Any Tier I fidelity measure is acceptable. Completing this inventory meets criterion for a "2" score.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feature</th>
<th>Data Sources</th>
<th>Scoring Criteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>36.14 Fidelity Data: Tier I team reviews and uses SWPBIS fidelity (e.g., SET, BoQ, Tic, SAS, Tiered Fidelity Inventory) data at least annually.</td>
<td>School policy, Staff handbook, School newsletters, School website</td>
<td>0 = Not implemented, 1 = Partially implemented, 2 = Fully implemented</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Feature Data Sources**
- School policy
- Staff handbook
- School newsletters
- School website

**Scoring Criteria**
- 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

Quick Check: Fidelity Data

**SELF-ASSESSMENT**
- Is team assessing fidelity of implementation at Tier I?
- Is fidelity assessed regular?
- Are fidelity data used for decision making & action planning at Tier I?

**SCORING – Tier 1 fidelity data are...**
- 0 = Not collected
- 1 = Collected informally &/or less often than annually
- 2 = Collected & used for decision making annually
### 1.15 Annual Evaluation

#### Feature

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.

#### Scoring Criteria

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scoring Criteria</th>
<th>0 = Not implemented</th>
<th>1 = Partially implemented</th>
<th>2 = Fully implemented</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No evaluation takes place, or evaluation occurs without data</td>
<td>Evaluation conducted, but not annually, or outcomes are not used to shape the Tier I process and/or not shared with stakeholders</td>
<td>Evaluation conducted at least annually, and outcomes (including academics) shared with stakeholders, with clear alterations in process based on evaluation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Main Idea

Implementation of core PBIS components is more likely if Tier I team self-assesses implementation status at least annually AND reports their status to relevant stakeholders (i.e., school community, school board, etc.).

---

### Quick Check: Annual Evaluation

#### SELF-ASSESSMENT

- Is evaluation conducted for Tier I systems?
- Does evaluation happen annually?
- Are outcomes shared w/ all stakeholders (faculty, students, family, board members, superintendent, etc.)?
- Are outcomes clearly linked to Tier I action plan?

#### SCORING — Evaluation...

- 0 = Does not take place, or occurs w/o data
- 1 = Conducted, but not annually, or outcomes are not used to shape Tier I process and/or not shared w/ stakeholders
- 2 = Conducted at least annually, & outcomes (including academics) shared w/ stakeholders, w/ clear alterations in process based on evaluation
Tier II

School-wide PBIS Tiered Fidelity Inventory

Tier II team can be 2-4 people with (a) behavior expertise & (b) authority to make decisions.

2.1 Team Composition

### Feature

- **2.1 Team Composition:** Tier II (or combined Tier II/III) team includes a Tier II systems coordinator and individuals able to provide (a) applied behavioral expertise, (b) administrative authority, (c) knowledge of students, and (d) knowledge about operation of school across grade levels and programs.

### Data Sources

- School organizational chart
- Tier II team meeting minutes

### Scoring Criteria

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>Not implemented</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Partially implemented</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Fully implemented</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Main Idea:** Tier II team needs individuals w/specific skills & perspectives to implement Tier II supports.
Quick Check: Team Composition

• SELF-ASSESSMENT
  - Coordinator
  - Applied behavioral expertise
  - Administrative authority
  - Knowledge about students
  - Knowledge about school operations

• SCORING – Tier II team...
  0 = Does not include coordinator or all 4 core areas of Tier II team expertise
  1 = Does not include coordinator & all 4 core areas of Tier II team expertise OR attendance of these members is below 80%
  2 = Composed of coordinator & individuals w/all 4 areas of expertise, AND attendance of these members is at or above 80%

2.2 Team Operating Procedures

Main Idea: Tier II teams need meeting foundations to operate efficiently & implement effective supports.
Quick Check: Team Operating Procedures

• SELF-ASSESSMENT
  - Regular, monthly meetings
  - Consistently followed meeting format
  - Minutes taken during & disseminated after each meeting or at least action plan items are disseminated
  - Participant roles are clearly defined
  - Action plan current to school year

• SCORING – Tier II team....
  - 0 = Does not use regular meeting format/agenda, minutes, defined roles, or current action plan
  - 1 = Has at least 2 but not all 4 features
  - 2 = Meets at least monthly & uses regular meeting format/agenda, minutes, defined roles, AND has a current action plan

Item Considerations

• Tier II team may be part of Tier I team, but regular meeting typically is needed to review Tier II data, & needed for new students nominated for Tier II.

• Clarify w/ teams if & how decision is made to transition from Tier I meeting items to Tier II meeting items.
## 2.3 Screening

**Main Idea:** Timely selection of students for Tier II supports improves effectiveness of Tier II implementation.

### Feature: Tier II team uses decision rules and multiple sources of data (e.g., ODRs, academic progress, screening tools, attendance, teacher/family/student nominations) to identify students who require Tier II supports.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Data Sources</th>
<th>Scoring Criteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Multiple data sources used (ODRs/Time out of instruction, Attendance, Academic performance)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Team Decision Rubric</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Team meeting minutes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• School Policy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

0 = No specific rules for identifying students who qualify for Tier II supports

1 = Data decision rules established but not consistently followed or used with only one data source

2 = Written policy exists that (a) uses multiple data sources for identifying students, and (b) ensures that families are notified when a student enters Tier II supports

### Quick Check: Screening

**SELF-ASSESSMENT**

- Written policy or rubric for identifying students in need of assistance
- Multiple data sources
- Process for notifying & including families

**SCORING**

- Written policy or rubric for identifying students in need of assistance
- Multiple data sources
- Process for notifying & including families

- 0 = No specific rules for identifying students who qualify for Tier II supports
- 1 = Data decision rules established but not consistently followed or used with only 1 data source
- 2 = Written policy exists that (a) uses multiple data sources for identifying students, and (b) ensures that families are notified when a student enters Tier II supports
2.4 Request for Assistance

Main Idea: Faculty, staff, families should have highly predictable, & low-effort strategy for requesting behavior assistance.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feature</th>
<th>Data Sources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 2.4 Request for Assistance: Tier II planning team uses written request for assistance form and process that are available to all staff, families, and students. | School Handbook  
• Request for Assistance Form  
• Family Handbook |
| Scoring Criteria | 0 = Not implemented  
1 = Partially implemented  
2 = Fully implemented |
| 0 = No formal process  
1 = Informal process in place for staff and families to request behavioral assistance  
2 = Written request for assistance process is in place and team responds to request within 3 days |

Quick Check: Request for Assistance

• Self-Assessment
  - Written policy or rubric for identifying students in need of assistance
  - Multiple data sources
  - Process for notifying & including families

• Scoring – Process...
  0 = Does not exist.
  1 = Is informal for staff & families to request behavioral assistance
  2 = Formal, written request for assistance process is in place & team responds to request w/in 3 days
Item Considerations

- The process for nominating a student should be easily understood and easily accessed by all.
- Families should know how to nominate a student and know the process when a student is nominated.
- Emphasis should be given on the success of the process when done early.

2.5 Sufficient Array of Tier II Interventions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feature</th>
<th>Data Sources</th>
<th>Scoring Criteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 2.5 Sufficient Array of Tier II Interventions: Tier II team has multiple ongoing behavior support interventions with documented evidence of effectiveness matched to student need. | - School Tier II Handbook  
- Targeted Interventions Reference Guide | 0 = No Tier II interventions with documented evidence of effectiveness are in use  
1 = Only 1 Tier II intervention with documented evidence of effectiveness is in use  
2 = Multiple Tier II interventions with documented evidence of effectiveness matched to student need |

**Main Idea:** Wide array of intervention options increases likelihood that student needs are met & done in timely way.
Quick Check: Sufficient Array of Tier II Interventions

- **SELF-ASSESSMENT**
  - Are multiple Tier II interventions readily available?
  - Do they have evidence base of effectiveness w/ students?

- **SCORING**
  - 0 = No Tier II interventions w/ documented evidence of effectiveness are in use
  - 1 = Only 1 Tier II intervention w/ documented evidence of effectiveness is in use
  - 2 = Multiple Tier II interventions w/ documented evidence of effectiveness matched to student need

Item Considerations

- Standard modifications of existing interventions meet criteria for sufficient array.
  - CICO for peer attention
  - CICO for academic task avoidance
- Many approaches for Tier II support
- Focus on Tier II supports that improve student success (e.g., do more than simply remove or control student)
- Combinations of support strategies may be very appropriate & efficient.
2.6 Tier II Critical Features

Main Idea: Tier II supports should focus on improving skills & context needed for student success.

Quick Check: Tier II Critical Features

• SELF-ASSESSMENT
  - Do all Tier II interventions include additional instruction/time for student skill development?
  - Do all Tier II interventions include additional structure/predictability?
  - Do all Tier II interventions include increased opportunities for feedback?

• SCORING – Tier II interventions....
  - 0 = Do not promote additional instruction/time, improved structure, or increased feedback
  - 1 = All provide some but not all 3 core Tier II features
  - 2 = All include all 3 core Tier II features

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feature</th>
<th>Data Sources</th>
<th>Scoring Criteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tier II Critical Features: Tier II behavior support interventions provide (a) additional instruction/time for student skill development, (b) additional structure/predictability, and/or (c) increased opportunity for feedback (e.g., daily progress report).</td>
<td>Universal lesson plans</td>
<td>0 = Not implemented</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tier II lesson plans</td>
<td>1 = Partially implemented</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Daily/weekly progress report</td>
<td>2 = Fully implemented</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>School schedule</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>School Tier II handbook</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- 0 = Tier II interventions do not promote additional instruction/time, improved structure, or increased feedback
- 1 = All Tier II interventions provide some but not all 3 core Tier II features
- 2 = All Tier II interventions include all 3 core Tier II features
2.7 Practices Matched to Student Need

Main Idea: Tier II support strategies are evidence-based, & designed w/ preliminary assessment information or assumptions about student need.

Quick Check: Practices Matched to Student Need

- **SELF-ASSESSMENT**
  - Does formalized process to select Tier II supports exist?
  - Does process take into account student need & contextual fit?

- **SCORING – Process**
  - 0 = Not p in place
  - 1 = Process for selecting Tier II interventions does not include documentation that interventions are matched to student need
  - 2 = Formal process in place to select practices that match student need and have contextual fit (e.g., developmentally and culturally appropriate)
2.8 Access to Tier I Supports

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feature</th>
<th>Data Sources</th>
<th>Scoring Criteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.8 Access to Tier I Supports: Tier II supports are explicitly linked to Tier I supports, and students receiving Tier II supports have access to, and are included in, Tier I supports.</td>
<td>Universal Lesson plans &amp; teaching schedule • Acknowledgement system • Student of the month documentation • Family communication</td>
<td>0 = No evidence that students receiving Tier II interventions have access to Tier I supports 1 = Tier II supports are not explicitly linked to Tier I supports and/or students receiving Tier II interventions have some, but not full access to Tier I supports 2 = Tier II supports are explicitly linked to Tier I supports, and students receiving Tier II interventions have full access to all Tier I supports</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Main Idea: Tier II supports are more effective when layered w/in Tier I.

Quick Check: Access to Tier I Supports

• SELF-ASSESSMENT
  - Are school's Tier II supports linked/layered/aligned w/ school-wide, universal system?
  - Do students receiving Tier II supports still receive full access to Tier I systems?

• SCORING
  - 0 = No evidence students receiving Tier II interventions have access to Tier I supports
  - 1 = Tier II supports are not explicitly linked to Tier I supports &/or students receiving Tier II interventions have some, but not full access to Tier I supports
  - 2 = Tier II supports are explicitly linked to Tier I supports, & students receiving Tier II interventions have full access to all Tier I supports
2.9 Professional Development

**Main Idea:** Effective Tier II supports require participation of many adults in school.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feature</th>
<th>Data Sources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 2.9 Professional Development: A written process is followed for teaching all relevant staff how to refer students and implement each Tier II intervention that is in place. | • Professional Development Calendar  
• Staff Handbook  
• Lesson plans for teacher trainings  
• School policy |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scoring Criteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 = Not implemented</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 = Partially implemented</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 = Fully implemented</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Quick Check: Professional Development**

**SELF-ASSESSMENT**

- Are trainings for school team members scheduled?
- Does Tier II team lead faculty-wide orientation?
- Is annual orientation for new faculty scheduled?
- Are strategies for orienting substitutes or volunteers documented?
- Is process for requesting assistance around behavioral concerns known by all, easy to follow, & encouraged?

**SCORING**

- 0 = No process for teaching staff in place
- 1 = Professional development & orientation process is informal
- 2 = Written process used to teach & coach all relevant staff in all aspects of intervention delivery, including request for assistance process, using progress report as instructional prompt, delivering feedback, & monitoring student progress
2.10 Level of Use

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feature</th>
<th>Data Sources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.10 Level of Use: Team follows written process to track proportion of students participating in Tier II supports, and access is proportionate.</td>
<td>Tier II enrollment data, Tier II team meeting minutes, Progress monitoring tool</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Main Idea:** Tier II supports that are used too little (e.g., 1%) or too much (e.g., 20%) are not sustainable.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feature</th>
<th>Scoring Criteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 = Not implemented</td>
<td>1 = Partially implemented</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 = Fully implemented</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Quick Check: Level of Use**

**SELF-ASSESSMENT**
- Is at least 5% of total population receiving Tier II supports?
- Does school have capacity to sustain effective supports for this proportion of students?

**SCORING — Team...**
- 0 = Does not track # of students responding to Tier II interventions
- 1 = Monitors student data but no data decision rules established to alter (e.g., intensify or fade) support
- 2 = Defines criteria & tracks proportion, w/ at least 5% of students receiving Tier II supports
Item Considerations

- Tier II team & administration should know proportion of students on Tier II supports.
- Level of Tier II supports should be between 3% & 17% to be effective & worth organizational costs.
- At least 70% of students should succeed on initial Tier II supports. If lower, consider if Tier III supports are missing or ineffective.

2.11 Student Performance Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feature</th>
<th>Data Sources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tier II team tracks proportion of students experiencing success (% of participating students being successful) and uses Tier II intervention outcomes data and decision rules for progress monitoring and modification.</td>
<td>• Student progress data (e.g., % of students meeting goals) • Intervention Tracking Tool • Daily/Weekly Progress Report sheets • Family communication</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feature Data Sources</th>
<th>Scoring Criteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 = Not implemented</td>
<td>1 = Partially implemented</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 = Fully implemented</td>
<td>2 = Fully implemented</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Main Idea: Tier II team needs regular access to information about student success to be able to adapt & improve Tier II supports.
Quick Check: Student Performance Data

**SELF-ASSESSMENT**
- Does system exist to collect & organize intervention outcome data?
- Does Tier II team have access to reports summarizing intervention outcome data?
- Does Tier II team have system w/ data decision rules to identify how Tier II supports should be altered?

**SCORING – Student data...**
- 0 = Not monitored
- 1 = Monitored but no data decision rules established to alter (e.g., intensify or fade) support
- 2 = Monitored (% of students being successful) & used at least monthly, w/ data decision rules established to alter (e.g., intensify or fade) support, & shared with stakeholders

---

**2.12 Fidelity Data**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feature</th>
<th>Data Sources</th>
<th>Scoring Criteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.12 Fidelity Data: Tier II team has a protocol for ongoing review of fidelity for each Tier II practice.</td>
<td>Tier II coordinator training, District technical assistance, Fidelity probe taken monthly by a Tier II team member</td>
<td>0 = Fidelity data are not collected for any practice 1 = Fidelity data (e.g., direct, self-report) collected for some but not all Tier II interventions 2 = Periodic, direct assessments of fidelity collected by Tier II team for all Tier II interventions</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Main Idea:** Fidelity assessments should always be included as part of implementation practice.
Quick Check: Fidelity Data

• SELF-ASSESSMENT
  - Does team assess fidelity of implementation at Tier II?
  - Does team regularly assess fidelity?
  - Are fidelity data used for decision making & action planning at Tier II?

• SCORING = Fidelity data...
  0 = Not collected for any practice
  1 = Collected for some but not all Tier II interventions (e.g., direct, self-report)
  2 = Collected directly by Tier II team for all Tier II interventions

2.13 Evaluation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feature</th>
<th>Data Sources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.13 Annual Evaluation: At least annually, Tier II team assesses overall effectiveness and efficiency of strategies, including data-decision rules to identify students, range of interventions available, fidelity of implementation, and on-going support to implementers, and evaluations are shared with staff and district leadership.</td>
<td>• Staff and student surveys&lt;br&gt;• Tier II handbook&lt;br&gt;• Fidelity tools&lt;br&gt;• School Policy&lt;br&gt;• Student outcomes&lt;br&gt;• District Reports</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scoring Criteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 = Not implemented&lt;br&gt;1 = Partially implemented&lt;br&gt;2 = Fully implemented</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Main Idea: Any strategy or procedure needs to be reviewed at least annually & revised to remain current & match changes in school.
Quick Check: Evaluation

**SELF-ASSESSMENT**
- Is evaluation conducted for Tier II systems annually?
- Are outcomes shared with all stakeholders (faculty, students, family, board members, superintendent, etc.)?
- Are outcomes clearly linked to Tier II action plan?

**SCORING – Evaluation...**
- 0 = Does not take place
- 1 = Conducted, but outcomes not used to shape Tier II process
- 2 = Conducted at least annually, & outcomes shared w/ staff & district leadership, clear alterations in process proposed based on evaluation

---

Tier III
School-wide PBIS Tiered Fidelity Inventory
3.1 Team Composition

### Main Idea:
Tier III teams need individuals with specific skills & perspectives to effectively provide & implement Tier III supports.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feature</th>
<th>Data Sources</th>
<th>Scoring Criteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.1 Team Composition: Tier III systems planning team (or combined Tier II/III team) includes a Tier III systems coordinator and individuals who can provide (a) applied behavioral expertise, (b) administrative authority, (c) multi-agency supports (e.g., person centered planning, wraparound, RENEW) expertise, (d) knowledge of students, and (e) knowledge about the operations of the school across grade levels and programs.</td>
<td>School organizational chart • Tier III team meeting minutes</td>
<td>0 = Tier III team does not include a trained systems coordinator or all 5 identified functions 1 = Tier III team members have some but not all 5 functions, and/or some but not all members have relevant training or attend at least 80% of meetings 2 = Tier III team has a coordinator and all 5 functions and attendance of these members is at or above 80%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Quick Check: Team Composition

**• SELF-ASSESSMENT**
- Coordinator
- Applied behavioral expertise
- Administrative authority
- Intensive support expertise
- Knowledge about students
- Knowledge about school operations

**• SCORING — Tier III team....**
- 0 = Does not include trained systems coordinator or all 5 identified functions
- 1 = Members have some but not all 5 functions, &/or some but not all members have relevant training or attend at least 80% of meetings
- 2 = Has coordinator & all 5 functions & attendance of these members is at or above 80%
3.2 Team Operating Procedures

Main Idea: Tier III teams need meeting foundations to operate efficiently & implement effective supports.

Quick Check: Team Operating Procedures

- **SELF-ASSESSMENT**
  - Regular, monthly meetings
  - Consistently followed meeting format
  - Minutes taken during & disseminated after each meeting (or at least action plan items are disseminated)
  - Participant roles are clearly defined
  - Action plan current to school year

- **SCORING — Tier III team...**
  - 0 = Does not use regular meeting format/agenda, minutes, defined roles, or current action plan
  - 1 = Has at least 2 but not all 4 features
  - 2 = Meets at least monthly & uses regular meeting format/agenda, minutes, defined roles, AND has a current action plan
3.3 Screening

Main Idea: Timely selection of students for Tier III supports improves effectiveness of Tier III implementation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feature</th>
<th>Data Sources</th>
<th>Scoring Criteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Tier III team uses decision rules and data (e.g., ODRs, Tier II performance, academic progress, absences, teacher/family/student nominations) to identify students who require Tier III supports. | School policy, Team decision rubric, Team meeting minutes | 0 = No decision rules for identifying students who should receive Tier III supports  
1 = Informal process or one data source for identifying students who qualify for Tier III supports  
2 = Written data decision rules used with multiple data sources for identifying students who qualify for Tier III supports, and evidence the policy/rubric includes option for teacher/family/student nominations |

Quick Check: Screening

**SELF-ASSESSMENT**
- Written policy or rubric for identifying students in need of assistance
- Multiple data sources
- Process for including family perspectives in the identification process

**SCORING**
- 0 = No decision rules for identifying students who should receive Tier III supports
- 1 = Informal process or one data source for identifying students who qualify for Tier III supports
- 2 = Written data decision rules used w/ multiple data sources for identifying students who qualify for Tier III supports, & evidence the policy/rubric includes option for teacher/family/student nominations
3.4 Student Support Team

Main Idea: Each student receiving Tier III supports benefits from having individualized team comprised of relevant stakeholders.

Quick Check: Student Support Team

• SELF-ASSESSMENT
  - Does each student receiving Tier III supports have unique support team?
  - Is membership of team representative of all relevant stakeholders (i.e., case manager, teacher, family, etc.)?

• SCORING – Individual student support teams...
  0 = Do not exist for all students who need them
  1 = Are not uniquely designed w/ input from student/family &/or team membership has partial connection to strengths & needs
  2 = Are uniquely designed w/ active input/approval from student/family w/ clear team membership link to student strengths & needs, & meet regularly to review progress data
3.5 Staffing

An administrative plan is used to ensure adequate staff is assigned to facilitate individualized plans for the students enrolled in Tier III supports.

- Administrative plan
- Tier III team meeting minutes
- FTE (i.e., paid time) allocated to Tier III supports

**Main Idea:** Each Tier III student support team needs person responsible for coordinating implementation efforts.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feature</th>
<th>Data Sources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.5 Staffing: An administrative plan is used to ensure adequate staff is assigned to facilitate individualized plans for the students enrolled in Tier III supports.</td>
<td>Administrative plan, Tier III team meeting minutes, FTE (i.e., paid time) allocated to Tier III supports</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Feature Data Sources**

**Scoring Criteria**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>Not implemented</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Partially implemented</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Fully implemented</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Quick Check: Staffing

- **SELF-ASSESSMENT**
  - Are personnel designated with responsibility of coordinating student-specific, Tier III teams?
  - Are personnel assigned to facilitate implementation of Tier III supports for students?

- **SCORING** — Personnel are...
  - 0 = Not assigned to facilitate individual student support teams
  - 1 = Assigned to facilitate some individual support teams, but not at least 1% of enrollment
  - 2 = Assigned to facilitate individualized plans for all students enrolled in Tier III supports
3.6 Student/Family/Community Involvement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feature</th>
<th>Data Sources</th>
<th>Scoring Criteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 3.6 Student/Family/Community Involvement: Tier III team has district contact person(s) with access to external support agencies and resources for planning and implementing non-school-based interventions (e.g., intensive mental health) as needed. | Three randomly selected Tier III student behavior support plans created in the last 12 months (see TFI Tier III Support Plan Worksheet) | 0 = District contact person not established  
1 = District contact person established with external agencies, OR resources are available and documented in support plans  
2 = District contact person established with external agencies, AND resources are available and documented in support plans |

Main Idea: Accessing external supports & resources, as needed, can enhance individual student support plans.

Quick Check: Student/Family/Community Involvement

• SELF-ASSESSMENT
  - Is there person responsible for connecting with external agencies?
  - Does school have process for accessing external resources?

• SCORING – District contact person...
  0 = Not established
  1 = Established w/ external agencies, OR resources are available & documented in support plans
  2 = Established w/ external agencies, AND resources are available & documented in support plans
## 3.7 Professional Development

### Feature Data Sources

- Professional Development Calendar
- Staff Handbook
- Lesson plans for teacher trainings
- School policy

### Scoring Criteria

- 0 = Not implemented
- 1 = Partially implemented
- 2 = Fully implemented

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feature</th>
<th>Data Sources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.7 Professional Development</td>
<td>Professional Development Calendar, Staff Handbook, Lesson plans for teacher trainings, School policy</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Main Idea:** Effective implementation of Tier III supports requires that relevant staff have knowledge base necessary for success.

### Quick Check: Professional Development

**• SELF-ASSESSMENT**

- Are trainings for Tier III team members scheduled?
- Does process exist to train/coach Tier III staff on basic behavioral theory?
- Does process exist to train/coach Tier III staff on function of behavior?
- Does process exist to train/coach Tier III staff on function-based interventions?

**• SCORING**

- 0 = No process for teaching staff in place
- 1 = Professional development & orientation process is informal
- 2 = Written process used to teach & coach all relevant staff in basic behavioral theory, function of behavior, & function-based intervention
### 3.8 Quality of Life Indicators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feature</th>
<th>Data Sources</th>
<th>Scoring Criteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.8 Quality of Life Indicators: Assessment includes student strengths and identification of student/family preferences for individualized support options to meet their stated needs across life domains (e.g., academics, health, career, social).</td>
<td>Three randomly selected Tier III student behavior support plans created in the last 12 months (see TFI Tier III Support Plan Worksheet)</td>
<td>0 = Quality of life needs / goals and strengths not defined, or there are no Tier III support plans 1 = Strengths and larger quality of life needs and related goals defined, but not by student/family or not reflected in the plan 2 = All plans document strengths and quality of life needs and related goals defined by student/family</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Main Idea:** Intensive student support plans should capitalize on skill strengths & include student/family perspectives.

### Quick Check: Quality of Life Indicators

- **SELF-ASSESSMENT**
  - Do Tier III support plans include student strengths & skills?
  - Do Tier III support plans include quality of life needs defined by student/family?

- **SCORING**
  
  0 = Quality of life needs, goals, & strengths not defined, or no Tier III support plans exist
  
  1 = Strengths & larger quality of life needs & related goals defined, but not by student/family or not reflected in plan
  
  2 = All plans document strengths & quality of life needs & related goals defined by student/family
3.9 Academic, Social, & Physical Indicators

### Feature | Data Sources | Scoring Criteria
--- | --- | ---
3.9 Academic, Social, and Physical Indicators: Assessment data are available for academic (reading, math, writing), behavioral (attendance, functional behavioral assessment, suspension/expulsion), medical, and mental health strengths and needs, across life domains where relevant. | Three randomly selected Tier III student behavior support plans created in the last 12 months (see Tier III Support Plan Worksheet) | 0 = Not implemented 1 = Partially implemented 2 = Fully implemented 0 = Student assessment is subjective or done without formal data sources, or there are no Tier III support plans 1 = Plans include some but not all relevant life-domain information (medical, mental health, behavioral, academic) 2 = All plans include medical, mental health information and complete academic data where appropriate

**Main Idea:** Tier III supports are more effective when designed W/ information related to student strengths & needs.

### Quick Check: Academic, Social, & Physical Indicators

**SCORING**
- 0 = Student assessment is subjective or done w/o formal data sources, or no Tier III support plans exist
- 1 = Plans include some but not all relevant life-domain information (medical, mental health, behavioral, academic)
- 2 = All plans include medical, mental health information & complete academic data where appropriate

**SELF-ASSESSMENT**
- Do Tier III support plans include medical information, as appropriate?
- Do Tier III support plans include mental health information, as appropriate?
- Do Tier III support plans include complete academic data, as appropriate?
3.10 Hypothesis Statement

Main Idea: Applicable hypothesis statement is determining factor in intervention effectiveness.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feature</th>
<th>Data Sources</th>
<th>Scoring Criteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.10 Hypothesis Statement: Behavior support plans include a hypothesis statement, including (a) operational description of problem behavior, (b) identification of context where problem behavior is most likely, and (c) maintaining reinforcers (e.g., behavioral function) in this context.</td>
<td>Three randomly selected Tier III student behavior support plans created in the last 12 months (see Tier III Support Plan Worksheet)</td>
<td>0 = No plans include a hypothesis statement with all 3 components, or there are no Tier III support plans&lt;br&gt;1 = 1 or 2 plans include a hypothesis statement with all 3 components&lt;br&gt;2 = All plans include a hypothesis statement with all 3 components</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Quick Check: Hypothesis Statement

- **SELF-ASSESSMENT**
  - Do Tier III support plans include a hypothesis statement?
  - If yes, does hypothesis statement include:
    - Operational description of problem behavior?
    - Identification of context where the problem is most likely?
    - Identification of maintaining reinforcers?

- **SCORING**
  - 0 = No plans include hypothesis statement w/ all 3 components, or no Tier III support plans exist
  - 1 = 1 or 2 plans include hypothesis statement w/ all 3 components
  - 2 = All plans include hypothesis statements w/ all 3 components
3.11 Comprehensive Support

Behavior support plans include or consider (a) prevention strategies, (b) teaching strategies, (c) strategies for removing rewards for problem behavior, (d) specific rewards for desired behavior, (e) safety elements where needed, (f) a systematic process for assessing fidelity and impact, and (g) the action plan for putting the support plan in place.

Main Idea: Individualized interventions need specific components to be most effective.

Quick Check: Comprehensive Support

**SELF-ASSESSMENT**
- Do Tier III support plans include:
  - Prevention strategies?
  - Teaching strategies?
  - Strategies for removing rewards for problem behavior?
  - Specific rewards for desired behavior?
  - Safety elements where needed?
  - Systematic process for assessing fidelity & impact?
  - Action plan?

**SCORING**
- 0 = No plans include all 7 core support plan features, or no Tier III support plans exist
- 1 = 1 or 2 plans include all 7 core support plan features
- 2 = All plans include all 7 core support plan features
### 3.12 Natural and Formal Supports

**Main Idea:** Some Tier III plans may need to include professionals, service providers, & individuals who are familiar w/ strengths & needs of student.

**Quick Check: Natural and Formal Supports**

- **SELF-ASSESSMENT**
  - Are individuals familiar w/ strengths & needs of student included in support plan?
  - Are quality of life needs represented w/ specific actions in support plan?
  - Are natural supports (i.e., peer, relative, neighbor, etc.) included in plan, as appropriate?

- **SCORING**
  - Plan includes...
    - 0 = No specific actions, or no plans w/ extensive support exist
    - 1 = Specific actions, but they are not related to quality of life needs &/or do not include natural supports
    - 2 = Specific actions, linked logically to quality of life needs, & they include natural supports
3.13 Access to Tier I & Tier II Support

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feature</th>
<th>Data Sources</th>
<th>Scoring Criteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 3.13 Access to Tier I and Tier II Support: Students receiving Tier III supports have access to, and are included in, available Tier I and Tier II supports. | • Three randomly selected Tier III student behavior support plans created in the last 12 months (see TIII Tier III Support Plan Worksheet) | 0 = Individual student support plans do not mention Tier I and/or Tier II supports, or there are no Tier III support plans  
1 = Individual supports include some access to Tier I and/or Tier II supports  
2 = Tier III supports include full access to any appropriate Tier I and Tier II supports and document how access will occur |

**Main Idea:** Tier III supports are more effective when layered w/in Tiers I & II.

---

**Quick Check: Access to Tier I and Tier II Support**

- **SELF-ASSESSMENT**
  - Are Tier III support plans linked/layered/aligned w/ school-wide, universal system?  
  - Do students receiving Tier III supports still receive full access to Tier I & Tier II systems?

- **SCORING – Individual support plans...**
  0 = Do not mention Tier I &/or Tier II supports, or no Tier III support plans exist  
  1 = Some access to Tier I &/or Tier II supports  
  2 = Full access to any appropriate Tier I & Tier II supports & document how access will occur
3.14 Data System

**Main Idea:** Teams need right information in right form at right time to make effective decisions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feature</th>
<th>Data Sources</th>
<th>Scoring Criteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Reports to staff</td>
<td>3.14 Data System: Aggregated (i.e., overall school-level) Tier III data are summarized and reported to staff at least monthly on (a) fidelity of support plan implementation, and (b) impact on student outcomes.</td>
<td>0 = Not implemented 1 = Partially implemented 2 = Fully implemented</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Staff meeting minutes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Staff report</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Scoring — Quantitative data...**

0 = Not collected

1 = Collected on outcomes &/or fidelity but not reported monthly

2 = Collected on student outcomes AND fidelity & are reported to staff at least monthly

**Quick Check: Data System**

- **SELF-ASSESSMENT**
  - Does system exist to collect & organize intervention outcome data?
  - Does Tier III team have access to reports summarizing intervention outcome data?
  - Does team assess fidelity of implementation at Tier III?
  - Is fidelity regularly assessed?
  - Are fidelity data used for decision making & action planning at Tier III?

- **SCORING — Quantitative data...**
  - 0 = Not collected
  - 1 = Collected on outcomes &/or fidelity but not reported monthly
  - 2 = Collected on student outcomes AND fidelity & are reported to staff at least monthly
3.15 Data-based Decision Making

Main Idea: Teams need to regularly review fidelity/outcome data to identify how Tier III supports should be altered.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feature</th>
<th>Data Sources</th>
<th>Scoring Criteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.15 Data-based Decision Making: Each student’s individual support team meets at least monthly (or more frequently if needed) and uses data to modify the support plan to improve fidelity of plan implementation and impact on quality of life, academic, and behavior outcomes.</td>
<td>• Three randomly selected Tier III student behavior support plans created in the last 12 months (see TFI Tier III Support Plan Worksheet) • Team meeting schedules</td>
<td>0 = Student individual support teams do not review plans or use data 1 = Each student’s individual support team reviews plan, but fidelity and outcome data are not both used for decision making or not all teams review plans 2 = Each student’s individual support team continuously monitors data and reviews plan at least monthly, using both fidelity and outcome data for decision making</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Quick Check: Data-based Decision Making

• SELF-ASSESSMENT
  - Do Tier III support teams have access to reports summarizing intervention outcome/fidelity data?
  - How do Tier III support teams use data to identify how Tier II supports should be altered?

• SCORING – Individual student support team...
  - 0 = Does not review plans or use data
  - 1 = Reviews plan, but fidelity & outcome data are not used for decision making or not all teams review plans
  - 2 = Continuously monitors data & reviews plan at least monthly, using fidelity & outcome data for decision making
3.16 Level of Use

**Main Idea:** Tier III supports that are used too little (e.g. fewer than 1%) or too much (e.g. more than 5%) are not sustainable.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feature</th>
<th>Data Sources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.16 Level of Use: Team follows written process to track proportion of students participating in Tier III supports, and access is proportionate.</td>
<td>Student progress data Tier III team meeting minutes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scoring Criteria</th>
<th>0 = Not implemented 1 = Partially implemented 2 = Fully implemented</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 = School does not track proportion or no students have Tier III plans</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 = Fewer than 1% of students have Tier III plans</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 = All students requiring Tier III supports (and at least 1% of students) have plans</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Quick Check: Level of Use

**SELF-ASSESSMENT**

- Are between 1% & 5% of total population receiving Tier III supports?
- Does school have capacity to sustain effective supports for this proportion of students?

**SCORING**

- 0 = School does not track proportion or no students have Tier III plans
- 1 = Fewer than 1% of students have Tier III plans
- 2 = All students requiring Tier III supports (at least 1% of students) have plans
3.17 Annual Evaluation

### Scoring Criteria

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feature</th>
<th>Data Sources</th>
<th>Scoring Criteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 3.17 Annual Evaluation: At least annually, the Tier III systems team assesses the extent to which Tier III supports are meeting the needs of students, families, and school personnel; and evaluations are used to guide action planning. | Tier III team meeting minutes  
Tier III team Action Plan  
Team member verbal reports | 0 = No annual review  
1 = Review is conducted but less than annually, or done without impact on action planning  
2 = Written documentation of an annual review of Tier III supports with specific decisions related to action planning |

**Main Idea:** Any strategy or procedure needs to be reviewed at least annually & revised to remain current & match changes in school.

### Quick Check: Annual Evaluation

**SELF-ASSESSMENT**

- Is evaluation conducted for Tier III systems?
- Does evaluation happen annually?
- Are outcomes shared with relevant stakeholders (faculty, students, family, etc.)?
- Are outcomes clearly linked to Tier III action plan?

**SCORING**

- 0 = No annual review
- 1 = Review is conducted but less than annually, or done w/o impact on action planning
- 2 = Written documentation of annual review of Tier III supports w/ specific decisions related to action planning
Appendix A: SWPBIS Tiered Fidelity Inventory Walkthrough Tool

Overview

Purpose
This form is used as part of completing the SWPBIS Tiered Fidelity Inventory's Tier 1 subscale. Use this form to interview a random selection of staff (at least 10% of staff or at least 5 for smaller schools) and students (minimum of 10). This process should take no more than 15 minutes.

Who Should Complete the Tool
It is recommended that this tool is completed by an individual who is external to the school (e.g., external coach, coordinator, evaluator). This use allows for the Tiered Fidelity Inventory to serve as more of an external evaluation than self-assessment. Alternatively, an individual from the school team may complete this tool if the purpose of assessment is for progress monitoring between external evaluations.

Procedure
Randomly select staff and students as you walk through the school. Use this page as a reference for all other interview questions. Use the interview form to record staff and student responses.
Staff Interview Questions

Interview at least 10% of staff or at least 5 for smaller schools

1. What are the ________ (school rules, high 5%, 3 bees)? (Define what the acronym means)
2. Have you taught the school rules/behavioral expectations this year?
3. Have you given out any ________ since ________?
   (rewards for appropriate behavior) (2 months ago)

Student Interview Questions

Interview a minimum of 10 students

1. What are the ________ (school rules, high 5%, 3 bees)? (Define what the acronym means)
2. Have you received a ________ since ________?
   (reward for appropriate behavior) (2 months ago)

SWPBIS Tiered Fidelity Inventory Walkthrough Tool
Interview and Observation Form

School __________________________  Date ______
District __________________________  State ______

Data collector __________________________

Name of School-wide Expectations:
1. __________________________
2. __________________________
3. __________________________
4. __________________________
5. __________________________

Name of Acknowledgment System:
______________________________
### Staff Questions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Staff Questions</th>
<th>Outline for at least 4 staff members</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>What are the school rules?</td>
<td>Record the # of rules known.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have you taught the school rules' behavior expectations to students this year?</td>
<td>Have you given out any of them since _____? (2 mos.)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Student Questions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student Questions</th>
<th>Outline for at least 25 students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>What are the school rules?</td>
<td>Record the # of rules known.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have you received any of them since _____?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>