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Objectives

- Briefly describe Florida’s evaluation system for state, district, and school levels
- Describe Florida’s comprehensive model for evaluating all three tiers of PBS
- Review critical questions to assist in building a scalable and sustainable system
- Review methods of data collection procedures, tools, analysis and training

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 Blueprint, 2005)

PBIS Evaluation Blueprint: A Work in Progress...

- Documenting Context
  - What was provided, who provided, who received
- Documenting Input
  - Professional development, value, perspective
- Documenting Fidelity
  - Implemented as designed, w/fidelity, process evaluation
- Documenting Impact
  - Behavior change, other schooling changes
- Replication/Sustainability Indicators
  - Capacity, practice, policy
- Implications for Improving Practice
  - Expanding implementation, allocating resources (PBIS Blueprint, 2009)

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, in press)
(1) Systems Preparation

- Tier 1
  - District Readiness Checklist
  - District Action Plan
  - School Readiness Checklist
  - Baseline data

- Tier 2
  - School Readiness
    - Implementation of Tier 1
    - School Infrastructure

- Tier 3
  - District Action Plan
  - Systems change
  - Evaluation of products and processes
  - Establish vision and goals

(2) Service Provision

Training and ongoing technical assistance

- Training
  - Tier 1: District and multi-district on-site
  - Tier 2: District, multi-district, web-based
  - Tier 3: Post assessment, goal setting, systems/process established

Organizational Chart for Communication, Reporting & Training

District Coordinator's Satisfication of Services
(3) Identification & Assessment

- Tier 1
  - Discipline records, attendance, ESE referrals, baseline BoQ, action plans, climate surveys, coaches surveys, walkthrough (mini SET), PBS Implementation Checklist (PIC)
- Classroom
  - Discipline records, teacher requests, student rankings/ratings, ESE referrals, observations, Classroom Assessment Tool
- Tier 2
  - Discipline records, teacher requests, student rankings/ratings (SSBD, TRF, etc.), lack of response to Tier 1, Daily Progress Reports, PBS Implementation Checklist (PIC), Benchmarks for Advanced Tiers (BAT)
- Tier 3
  - Above items, lack of response to Tier 2, Behavior Rating Scale, plans, climate surveys, coaches surveys, walkthrough (mini SET), referrals, observations, Classroom Assessment Tool

Teacher Nomination

Student Initials  Grade/Period  Tier (Step 2)

- Rank top 3 externalizing and top 3 internalizing students
- Check “YES” if personally taught expectations to the student
- Check “YES” if personally given a SW-PBS reward to student

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Externalizing</th>
<th>Academic Concerns</th>
<th>Personally Taught</th>
<th>Personally Given</th>
<th>SW Reward</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Behavior Rating Scale

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Behavior</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Timings</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8 or more</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recklessly</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>18 or more</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Requesting Attention/Assistance</td>
<td>50% or more</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(4) Evaluation Process

- Timelines for State Evaluation
  - Baseline (due date varies)
  - Mid Year I – due 10/31
    - School Profile
    - PBS Implementation Checklist (PIC) (Tiers 1-3)
  - Mid Year II – due 2/28
    - PBS Implementation Checklist (PIC) (Tiers 1-3)
  - End Year – due 6/15
    - Benchmarks of Quality (BoQ) (Tier 1)
    - Benchmarks for Advanced Tiers (BAT) (Tiers 2-3)
    - Outcome Data Summary
    - School-wide Implementation Factors (SWIF)
- Web-based Data Entry and Reporting
- PBSES
- Statewide Student Database – Academic/Behavior
(5) Evaluation Data

a) Implementation Fidelity
   - PIC (All Tiers)
   - BoQ (Tier 1)
   - BAT (Tiers 2-3)
   - SWIF (All Tiers)
   - Walkthrough (Tier 1)
   - Tier 2 & 3 intervention specific fidelity measures

b) Impact on Students
   - Outcome data (ODR, ISS, OSS)
   - Academic achievement
   - School Demographic Data (e.g. ethnicity)
   - Attendance
   - DPR charting

(5) Evaluation Data

(a) Implementation Fidelity

1. Are schools trained in SWPBS implementing with fidelity? Across years? Across school types?
   - BoQ, BAT, School Demographic Data

2. What factors are related to implementing with fidelity?
   - SWIF survey, BoQ, BAT

PBIS Evaluation Blueprint: A Work in Progress...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research</th>
<th>Self-Assessment</th>
<th>Progress Monitoring</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
SW PBIS: Implementing a Continuum of Effective Systems & Practices

**Brief Walk-through**

**On-Site PBIS Walkthrough**

Purpose: This tool is meant to be a quick glance when visiting a school to see if School Wide PBIS is viable. It will allow the observer to provide feedback to the PBIS team and administration.

**Evaluation**

Circle the following locations where Expectation Points were visible:

- Hallways
- Main Office
- Classrooms
- Cafeteria
- Library
- Other

Observer:

School Expectations:

Date: __________

**Benchmarks for Advanced Tiers**

**Score Summary for BAT Sections**

![Score Summary Chart]

**Fidelity Measure: Specific to Interventions**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Behavior Education Program</th>
<th>Fidelity of Implementation Measure (BFM-TM)</th>
<th>Scoring Guide</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School: ___________</td>
<td>Date: ___________</td>
<td>Pre: ___________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District: ___________</td>
<td>State: ___________</td>
<td>Data collector: ___________</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Evaluation Question: Data Sources**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>P = permanent product; O = Observation</th>
<th>Score: 0-2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Does the school employ a BFM coordinator whose job is to answer the BFM (e.g., hours per week allocated)?</td>
<td>0 = No BFM Coordinator, 1 = BFM Coordinator but less than 10 hours per week allocated, 2 = BFM Coordinator, 10+ hours per week allocated.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Does the school budget contain an allocated amount of money to generate the BFM (% employee?</td>
<td>BFM Budget</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Are students who are referred to the BFM process taught within a week?</td>
<td>0 = more than 2 weeks between referral and BFM process, 1 = within 2 weeks, 2 = within a week.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**School-Wide Implementation Factors (SWIF)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>High Implementing (70+ on BoQ)</th>
<th>Low Implementing (-70 on BoQ)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Expectations and rules clearly defined</td>
<td>Expectations and rules clearly defined</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrator committed to PBS, willing to teach and model PBS, willing to reward students</td>
<td>Administrator committed to PBS, willing to teach and model PBS, willing to reward students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Representative and committed PBS Team</td>
<td>Representative and committed PBS Team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reward system works</td>
<td>Reward system works</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PBS Coach's guidance with process</td>
<td>PBS Coach's guidance with process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students' responses to rewards and activities</td>
<td>Students' responses to rewards and activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adequate funding</td>
<td>Adequate funding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team Process Evaluation</td>
<td>Team Process Evaluation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Descriptive Data: Teams**

- Team functioning did not effectively differentiate school teams implementing with high or low fidelity with better or worse outcomes
- Teams implementing Tier 1 PBS with fidelity saw substantially different effects on all four outcome measures

**Impact on Student Behavior**

1. Do schools implementing SWPBS decrease ODRs, days of OSS?
   - ODRs, ISS, OSS
2. Do schools implementing SWPBS realize an increase in academic achievement?
   - FCAT scores
3. Is there a difference in outcomes across school types?
   - ODRs, ISS, OSS, FCAT scores, school demographic data
4. Do schools implementing with high fidelity have greater outcomes implementers with low fidelity?
   - BoQ, ODRs, ISS, OSS
5. Do teams that work well together have greater outcomes than those that don’t work as well together?
   - Team Process Evaluation, ODRs, ISS, OSS
Percent change in ODR, ISS and OSS rates per 100 students before and after PBS implementation

Percent decrease in ODR, ISS, OSS rates per 100 students after 1 year of implementation (by school type)

Percent change in ODR, ISS and OSS rates per 100 students after 1 year of implementation (by school type)

Percent decrease in ODR, ISS, OSS rates per 100 students after 1 year of implementation (by school type)

(c) Attrition
1. Why do schools discontinue implementation of SWPBS?
   - Attrition Survey

(d) Consumer Satisfaction
1. Are our consumers satisfied with the training, technical assistance, products and support received?
   - SWIF survey
   - District Coordinators survey
   - Training evaluation
   - Climate surveys
(6) Products and Dissemination

- Annual Reports
- Revisions to Training
- Revisions to Technical Assistance process
- Dissemination activities:
  - National, state, district, school levels
- Revisions to Website
- Online training modules

Improvements Made

1. Increased emphasis on BoQ results for school and district-level action planning
2. Increased training to District Coordinators and Coaches and TA, targeted areas of deficiency based upon data
3. Team Process Evaluation no longer used
4. Academic data used to increase visibility and political support
5. Specialized training for high schools
6. Identifying critical team variables impacted via training and TA, activities
7. Revised Tier 1 PBS Training to include classroom strategies, problem-solving process within RtI framework
8. Enhanced monthly TA activities

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 a state in determining if Tier 1 PBS process is working, but also why or why not it is working
4. Address state, district, school systems issues that may impact implementation success
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