



**Tiered Fidelity Inventory: Tier 1 Table**

Feature		Possible Data/Evidence Sources	Scoring Criteria (2=Fully implemented; 1=Partially implemented; 0=Not implemented)
<b>Teams</b>			
1.1	<p><b>Team Composition:</b></p> <p>Team includes a school administrator, a family/community member, and individuals able to provide (a) applied behavioral expertise, (b) coaching expertise, (c) knowledge of student academic and behavior patterns, (d) knowledge about the operations of the school across grade levels and programs, and for high schools, (e) student representation.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>School organizational chart</li> <li>Tier 1 team meeting minutes</li> </ul>	<p><b>2</b> = Tier 1 team exists with coordinator, administrator, and all identified roles represented, AND attendance of all roles is at or above 80%</p> <p><b>1</b> = Tier 1 team exists, but does not include all identified roles or attendance of these members is below 80%</p> <p><b>0</b> = Tier 1 team does not exist or does not include coordinator, school administrator, or individuals with applied behavioral expertise</p>
1.2	<p><b>Team Operating Procedures:</b></p> <p>Team meets at least monthly and has (a) regular meeting format/agenda, (b) minutes, (c) defined meeting roles, and (d) a current action plan.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Tier 1 team meeting agendas and minutes</li> <li>Tier 1 meeting roles descriptions</li> <li>Tier 1 action plan</li> </ul>	<p><b>2</b> = Tier 1 team meets at least monthly and uses regular meeting format/agenda, minutes, defined roles, AND has a current action plan</p> <p><b>1</b>= Tier 1 team has at least 2 but not all 4 features</p> <p><b>0</b> = Tier 1 team does not use regular meeting format/agenda, minutes, defined roles, or a current action plan</p>
<b>Implementation</b>			
1.3	<p><b>Behavioral Expectations:</b></p> <p>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.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>TFI Walkthrough Tool</li> <li>Staff handbook</li> <li>Student handbook</li> </ul>	<p><b>2</b> = 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</p> <p><b>1</b> = Behavioral expectations identified but may not include a matrix or be posted</p> <p><b>0</b> = Behavioral expectations have not been identified, are not all positive, or are more than 5 in number</p>

Adapted from SWISBIS Tiered Fidelity Inventory version 2.1



# LOS ANGELES UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT

## Policy bulletin

### ATTACHMENT E-1

Feature		Possible Data/Evidence Sources	Scoring Criteria (2=Fully implemented; 1=Partially implemented; 0=Not implemented)
1.4	<p><b>Teaching Expectations:</b></p> <p>Expected academic and social behaviors are taught directly to all students in classrooms and across other campus settings/locations.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>TFI Walkthrough Tool</li> <li>Professional development calendar</li> <li>Lesson plans</li> <li>Informal walkthroughs</li> </ul>	<p><b>2</b> = 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</p> <p><b>1</b> = Expected behaviors are taught informally or inconsistently</p> <p><b>0</b> = Expected behaviors are not taught</p>
1.5	<p><b>Problem Behavior Definitions:</b></p> <p>School has clear definitions for behaviors that interfere with academic and social success and a clear policy/ procedure (e.g., flowchart) for differentiating between office-managed versus staff-managed problems.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Staff handbook</li> <li>Student handbook</li> <li>School policy</li> <li>Discipline flowchart</li> </ul>	<p><b>2</b> = Definitions and procedures for managing problems are clearly defined, documented, trained, and shared with families</p> <p><b>1</b> = Definitions and procedures exist but are not clear and/or not organized by staff- versus office-managed problems</p> <p><b>0</b> = No clear definitions exist, and procedures to manage problems are not clearly documented</p>
1.6	<p><b>Discipline Policies:</b></p> <p>School policies and procedures describe and emphasize proactive, instructive, and/ or restorative approaches to student behavior that are implemented consistently.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Student handbook</li> <li>Code of conduct</li> <li>Informal administrator interview</li> </ul>	<p><b>2</b> = Documentation includes and emphasizes proactive approaches AND administrator reports consistent use</p> <p><b>1</b> = Documentation includes and emphasizes proactive approaches</p> <p><b>0</b> = Documents contain only reactive and punitive consequences</p>
1.7	<p><b>Professional Development:</b></p> <p>A written process is used for orienting all faculty/staff on PBIS/RP practices: (a) teaching school-wide expectations, (b) community building activities (c) acknowledging appropriate behavior, (d) correcting errors, and (e) requesting assistance.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Professional development calendar</li> <li>Staff handbook</li> </ul>	<p><b>2</b> = Formal process for teaching all staff all aspects of Tier 1 system, including all 4 core Tier 1 practices</p> <p><b>1</b> = Process is informal/unwritten, not part of professional development calendar, and/or does not include all staff or all 4 core Tier 1 practices</p> <p><b>0</b> = No process for teaching staff is in place</p>

Adapted from SWISBIS Tiered Fidelity Inventory version 2.1



# LOS ANGELES UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT

## Policy bulletin

### ATTACHMENT E-1

Feature		Possible Data/Evidence Sources	Scoring Criteria (2=Fully implemented; 1=Partially implemented; 0=Not implemented)
1.8	<p><b>Classroom Procedures:</b></p> <p>Tier 1 features (school-wide expectations, routines, acknowledgments, in-class continuum of consequences) are implemented within classrooms and are consistent with school-wide systems.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Staff handbook</li> <li>• Informal walkthroughs</li> <li>• Progress monitoring</li> <li>• Individual classroom data</li> </ul>	<p><b>2</b> = Classrooms are formally implementing all core Tier 1 features, consistent with school-wide expectations</p> <p><b>1</b> = Classrooms are informally implementing Tier 1 but no formal system exists</p> <p><b>0</b> = Classrooms are not implementing Tier 1</p>
1.9	<p><b>Feedback and Acknowledgement:</b></p> <p>A formal system (i.e., written set of procedures for specific behavior feedback that is [a] linked to school-wide expectations and [b] used within classrooms and across settings) is in place.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• TFI Walkthrough Tool</li> <li>• Staff handbook</li> </ul>	<p><b>2</b> = Formal system for acknowledging student behavior is used by at least 90% of staff AND received by at least 50% of students</p> <p><b>1</b> = Formal system is in place and is used by at least 90% of staff OR received by at least 50% of students</p> <p><b>0</b> = No formal system for acknowledging students</p>
1.10	<p><b>Faculty Involvement:</b></p> <p>Faculty are shown school-wide data regularly and provide input on universal foundations (e.g., expectations, acknowledgments, definitions, consequences) at least every 12 months.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Staff meeting minutes</li> <li>• Team meeting minutes</li> </ul>	<p><b>2</b> = Faculty are shown data at least 4 times per year AND have provided feedback on Tier 1 practices within the past 12 months</p> <p><b>1</b> = Faculty have been shown data more than yearly OR have provided feedback on Tier 1 foundations within the past 12 months but not both</p> <p><b>0</b> = Faculty are not shown data at least yearly and do not provide input</p>

Adapted from SWISBIS Tiered Fidelity Inventory version 2.1



# LOS ANGELES UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT

## Policy bulletin

### ATTACHMENT E-1

Feature		Possible Data/Evidence Sources	Scoring Criteria (2=Fully implemented; 1=Partially implemented; 0=Not implemented)
Evaluation			
1.11	<p><b>Student/Family/Community Involvement:</b></p> <p>Stakeholders (students, families, and community members) provide input on expectations, consequences, and acknowledgments at least every 12 months.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Surveys</li> <li>Voting results from parent/family meeting</li> <li>Team meeting minutes</li> </ul>	<p><b>2</b> = Documentation exists that students, families, and community members have provided feedback on Tier 1 practices within the past 12 months</p> <p><b>1</b> = Documentation of input on Tier 1 foundations, but not within the past 12 months or input but not from all types of stakeholders</p> <p><b>0</b> = No documentation (or no opportunities) for stakeholder feedback on Tier 1 foundations</p>
1.12	<p><b>Discipline Data:</b></p> <p>Team has access to data summarizing discipline.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>School policy</li> <li>Team meeting minutes</li> <li>Student outcome data (Office referrals, suspension, etc.)</li> </ul>	<p><b>2</b> = Discipline data system exists that allows instantaneous access to graphs of frequency of problem behavior events by behavior, location, time of day, and student</p> <p><b>1</b> = Data system exists but does not allow instantaneous access to full set of graphed reports</p> <p><b>0</b> = No centralized data system with ongoing decision making exists</p>
1.13	<p><b>Data-based Decision Making:</b></p> <p>Team reviews and uses discipline data at least monthly for decision-making.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Data decision rules</li> <li>Staff professional development calendar</li> <li>Staff handbook</li> <li>Team meeting minutes</li> </ul>	<p><b>2</b> = Team reviews discipline data and uses data for decision-making at least monthly. If data indicate a problem, an action plan is developed to enhance or modify Tier 1 supports</p> <p><b>1</b> = Data reviewed and used for decision-making, but less than monthly</p> <p><b>0</b> = No process/protocol exists, or data are reviewed but not used</p>

Adapted from SWISBIS Tiered Fidelity Inventory version 2.1



# LOS ANGELES UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT

## Policy bulletin

### ATTACHMENT E-1

Feature		Possible Data/Evidence Sources	Scoring Criteria (2=Fully implemented; 1=Partially implemented; 0=Not implemented)
1.14	<p><b>Fidelity Data:</b></p> <p>Team reviews and uses SWPBIS fidelity (e.g., Tiered Fidelity Inventory) data at least annually.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>School policy</li> <li>Staff handbook</li> <li>School newsletters</li> <li>School website</li> </ul>	<p><b>2</b> = Tier 1 fidelity data collected and used for decision making annually</p> <p><b>1</b> = Tier 1 fidelity collected informally and/or less often than annually</p> <p><b>0</b> = No Tier 1 SWPBIS fidelity data collected</p>
1.15	<p><b>Annual Evaluation:</b></p> <p>Team documents fidelity and effectiveness of Tier 1 practices at least annually (including year-by-year comparisons) that are shared with stakeholders (staff, families, community, district) in a usable format.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>School policy</li> <li>Student outcome data (Office referrals, suspension, etc.)</li> <li>Staff, student, and family surveys</li> <li>School newsletters</li> </ul>	<p><b>2</b> = Evaluation conducted at least annually, and outcomes shared with stakeholders, with clear alterations in process based on evaluation</p> <p><b>1</b> = Evaluation conducted, but not annually, or outcomes are not used to shape the Tier 1 process and/or not shared with stakeholders</p> <p><b>0</b> = No evaluation takes place, or evaluation occurs without data</p>

*Adapted from SWISBIS Tiered Fidelity Inventory version 2.1*