

Academic - Tiered Fidelity Inventory



Overview of the Academic - Tiered Fidelity Inventory

What is the purpose of the Academic - Tiered Fidelity Inventory?

The purpose of the Academic - Tiered Fidelity Inventory is to (a) measure fidelity of implementation of the essential academic components of an integrated, multi-tiered system and (b) provide a road map for school teams to action plan and monitor for continuous improvement.

The Academic - Tiered Fidelity Inventory (A-TFI) is intended to complement and align with the Tiered Fidelity Inventory.

How is the Academic - Tiered Fidelity Inventory administered?

The A-TFI is scored with a numerical system in the same fashion as the TFI, with criteria for either a 0, 1, or 2 rating. It is a school-level decision as to which team participates in this self-reflection.

Typically, it would be completed by a leadership, school improvement, or academic team responsible for continuous improvement. Members from behavioral/climate/attendance/mental wellness teams would be included in the administration if not currently on the continuous improvement team. An external coach from the division should facilitate a yearly review using the A-TFI, while the team(s) may use any portions or select tiers of the A-TFI at any point in the year for ongoing progress monitoring and action planning. A suggested protocol for the yearly review would call for the external coach to present the item, allow members to read the item and review supporting data, and then call for a group vote. Areas of disagreement would be discussed.

Further, the decision was made to follow the Tiered Fidelity Inventory format for ease of use by teams familiar with this tool. It is noted that there may be differences in the intent of a feature as matched to the TFI. The A-TFI can be utilized as a stand-alone document, such that if a school team has not completed a TFI in the past, it would not present a hindrance.

How is the Academic - Tiered Fidelity Inventory utilized?

The Academic - Tiered Fidelity Inventory reflects the extent to which the data, systems, and practices needed in an integrated three-tiered framework at the schoolwide level are in place. The information yielded is important for schools and divisions as they move forward in implementation. The A-TFI, along with the TFI and associated enhancements, will provide a comprehensive picture of schoolwide improvement efforts for **ALL** students.

Tier 1: Universal Academic Features

Subscale: Teams

Feature	Possible Data Sources	Scoring Criteria
<p>1.1 Team Composition Each team in the school includes staff with expertise to support the function of the team and represents the diversity of the building.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Meeting structure flow chart Meeting agendas with team members List of team members and their roles 	<p>0 = Membership of school team does not include appropriate expertise or represent the diversity of the building.</p> <p>1 = Teams have either expertise or diversity, but not both.</p> <p>2 = Teams have appropriate expertise and represent the diversity of the building.</p>
<p>1.2a Team Alignment Each school team (e.g., grade level, content, department, leadership) have (a) defined goals that support the strategic plan and/or continuous improvement plan; (b) defined communication loops among all teams and all faculty; and (c) regularly scheduled meetings.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Meeting structure flow chart with team goals Team action plans Meeting agenda “Working Smarter Not Harder” document Communication plan 	<p>0 = Teams exist but do not meet feature criteria for goals, communication loops, or regular meetings.</p> <p>1 = Teams are able to document two of the three feature criteria for goals, communication loops, or regular meetings.</p> <p>2 = Teams are able to document goals, communication loops, and regular meetings.</p>
<p>1.2b Team Operating Procedures All school teams have operating procedures that include (a) agenda; (b) minutes; and (c) defined roles and responsibilities.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Meeting agendas and notes Roles and responsibility documentation 	<p>0 = Meeting notes exist, but evidence of procedures is not present.</p> <p>1 = Teams are able to document two of the three feature criteria for agenda, minutes, and roles/responsibilities.</p> <p>2 = Teams are able to document agenda, minutes, and roles/responsibilities.</p>

Subscale: Implementation

Feature	Possible Data Sources	Scoring Criteria
<p>1.3 Aligned Curricula Evidence-based curricula are organized into clearly defined learning objectives and progressions that are aligned to state standards.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Curriculum maps • Pacing guides • Lesson plans • Curriculum guides 	<p>0 = Curricula are not evidence-based and have unclear descriptions or the objectives are not aligned.</p> <p>1 = Curricula at all grade levels are evidence-based AND either meet qualifications for defined learning objectives or are aligned to state standards.</p> <p>2 = Curricula at all grade levels are evidence-based and meet qualifications for defined learning objectives/progressions AND are aligned to state standards.</p>
<p>1.4a Evidence-Based Practices Teachers strategically select and use evidence-based practices that are supported by the division/school and matched to learner needs.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lesson plans • Initiative maps • Tier definition • Resource maps • Quality core instruction guides • Meeting minutes reflect use of a selection tool for evidence-based practices • Walkthrough tool/document and/or data 	<p>0 = Division/school has not defined quality core instruction and/or inconsistent use of evidence-based practices as defined in quality core instruction.</p> <p>1 = Evidence-based practices are outlined in the definition of quality core instruction by division/school but are used inconsistently or not matched to student need.</p> <p>2 = Evidence-based practices are outlined in the definition of quality core instruction by division/school AND are used consistently AND matched to student needs.</p>
<p>1.4b Lesson Plans A process for lesson plan development includes the knowledge, skills, and cognitive levels matched to the success criteria of the objectives in the curriculum.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lesson plans reflect task analysis of criteria for success • Lesson plans indicate supports at each level of task • Minutes from collaborative planning sessions 	<p>0 = Inconsistent use of a process or structure for lesson planning or plans focused only on activities.</p> <p>1 = A clear process for developing lesson plans is used but matched to only two of the elements of knowledge, skills, and cognitive levels.</p> <p>2 = A process is used for developing lesson plans that includes knowledge, skills, and cognitive levels and they are matched to the success criteria of the objectives in the curriculum</p>

Feature	Possible Data Sources	Scoring Criteria
<p>1.4c Relevant Objectives Learning objectives are matched to real-world relevance and student experiences.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Lesson plans Minutes from collaborative planning sessions Walkthrough data Student survey data 	<p>0 = Learning objectives are unclear in the link to real world relevance or consideration of student experiences.</p> <p>1 = Learning objectives are presented without either adjustment to real world relevance or student experiences.</p> <p>2 = Learning objectives are presented with a clear match to real world relevance and student experiences.</p>
<p>1.5 Performance Measures Measures of student performance include goals with success criteria and are communicated to students.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Lesson goals include success feature criteria Student rubrics and/or checklists Minutes from collaborative planning sessions Performance based assessment 	<p>0 = Goals do not include success criteria and are not communicated to students.</p> <p>1 = Goals with success criteria are defined but not communicated to students.</p> <p>2 = Clearly defined goals with success criteria are communicated to students.</p>
<p>1.6a Formative Assessment Teachers utilize formative assessment to inform teaching, lesson plan adjustment, and remediation.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Examples of formative assessment Examples of lesson plans with adjustments Examples of plans for remediation Walkthrough observations 	<p>0 = Evidence of formative assessment is not present.</p> <p>1 = Evidence of formative assessment is present but not utilized to impact instruction.</p> <p>2 = Evidence of formative assessment is present and utilized to impact teaching, lesson plan adjustment, and remediation.</p>
<p>1.6b Instructional Adjustment A procedure is in place for teams to evaluate Tier 1 data that results in instructional adjustment.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Grade level/content team, professional learning community, and/or data meeting agendas Unit plans Lesson plans that reflect adjustment Data meeting reflection sheets Programmatic data Documentation of a data meeting process used by teams 	<p>0 = Data evaluation and instructional decisions are made informally.</p> <p>1 = A procedure is in place for evaluating instructional data without a formal process for decisions around instructional changes or adjustments.</p> <p>2 = A procedure is in place for evaluating instructional data with resulting evidence of clear instructional changes or adjustments.</p>

Feature	Possible Data Sources	Scoring Criteria
<p>1.7a Professional Learning A written process is used to provide high quality professional learning for faculty/staff on all quality core instructional and assessment practices.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Professional learning calendar • Teacher handbook • Embedded professional learning plan 	<p>0 = No written process for high quality professional learning.</p> <p>1 = A written process is in place for high quality professional learning but does not include opportunities related to quality core instruction and assessment practices as defined by the division.</p> <p>2 = A written process for high quality professional learning exists and includes opportunities related to quality core instruction and assessment practices.</p>
<p>1.7b Coaching Staff receive coaching in the planning, teaching, and assessment of the academic curricula.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Coaching plans • Coaching responsibility definition • Coaching schedule • Evidence of a division and/or school coaching process • Peer observation schedule 	<p>0 = Coaching does not occur.</p> <p>1 = Irregular opportunities for coaching exist.</p> <p>2 = Coaching follows a process to address planning, teaching, and assessment.</p>
<p>1.7c Collaborative Planning Time for collaborative planning is in the schedule (including special education and resource staff) with accountability for the resulting instructional plan.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • School schedule • Meeting minutes or agenda from collaborative planning session • Collaborative planning session template • Lesson plan template/format 	<p>0 = Time for collaborative planning does not exist in the school schedule.</p> <p>1 = Common planning is scheduled but is inconsistently used or without necessary representation.</p> <p>2 = Consistent common planning time that results in an observable instructional plan.</p>
<p>1.8 Instructional Practices Evidence-based practices and routines are implemented with fidelity and consistency across all classrooms (e.g., activating prior knowledge, explicit instruction, engagement, feedback, scaffolding).</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Walkthrough data • Data collection tools • Administrator observation data • Peer observation data 	<p>0 = Evidence-based practices and routines are implemented inconsistently.</p> <p>1 = Practices are implemented in lessons but are not implemented with fidelity across 80% of classrooms.</p> <p>2 = 80% of staff utilize documented routines and evidence-based practices with fidelity.</p>

Feature	Possible Data Sources	Scoring Criteria
<p>1.9 Student Involvement Instruction includes opportunities for students to participate in (a) the process of setting learning goals; (b) tracking of progress towards the learning goals; and (c) metacognitive reflection on learning.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Self-monitoring • performance charts • Student goal statements • Aim lines • Lesson plans • Instructional observation data 	<p>0 = Inconsistent use of opportunities for student self-monitoring.</p> <p>1 = Instruction includes two of the three feature criteria for process, tracking progress, and metacognition.</p> <p>2 = Instruction includes opportunities for process, tracking progress, and metacognition.</p>
<p>1.10 Collective Teacher Efficacy Leaders and staff support a system of collective teacher efficacy around effective practices including (a) teacher voice; (b) goal consensus around student achievement; and (c) knowledge of each other's work.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Team meeting minutes • Collaborative planning schedule • Faculty meeting agendas • Professional Learning Community (PLC) minutes • Staff surveys 	<p>0 = Unclear if the three feature criteria exist.</p> <p>1 = Evidence of two of the feature criteria of voice, goal consensus, and knowledge of work.</p> <p>2 = Evidence of the three feature criteria of voice, goal consensus, and knowledge of work.</p>
<p>1.11 Family and Community Engagement School provides a system for diverse opportunities to authentically engage family and community stakeholders in instruction.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Resource map • Family surveys • Communication plan • Written description of family/community engagement • Documentation of stakeholder input • Guidance document 	<p>0 = Family engagement limited to primarily communication.</p> <p>1 = Engagement occurs but not systematically or in a written plan.</p> <p>2 = A documented system exists for authentic engagement with family and community stakeholders.</p>

Subscale: Evaluation

Feature	Possible Data Sources	Scoring Criteria
<p>1.12a Data Alignment Team(s) have access to a consistent and integrated data dashboard (e.g. attendance, academics, behavior, emotional wellness) that allows for disaggregation by demographics and skills for Tier I instructional effectiveness.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • School data dashboard • Team meeting agendas and meeting notes • Quarterly data reports 	<p>0 = No integrated dashboard.</p> <p>1 = Dashboard available and meets feature criteria for either disaggregation capability or integrated to reflect all aspects of the student profile.</p> <p>2 = Integrated dashboard with disaggregation capabilities exists.</p>

Feature	Possible Data Sources	Scoring Criteria
<p>1.12b Universal Screening Schoolwide universal screening for all students is conducted for literacy and mathematics. <i>Secondary: Early warning system utilized for screening.</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Universal screening tool • Early warning system data • Team meeting agendas and meeting notes 	<p>0 = No universal screening.</p> <p>1 = Universal screening is conducted with some students but not all students or in either literacy or mathematics but not both.</p> <p>2 = Universal screening exists for all students in literacy and mathematics.</p>
<p>1.13 Data-Informed Decision Making The team has adopted and utilizes a schoolwide problem solving process inclusive of data, systems, and practices.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Schoolwide problem-solving process template • Team meeting notes • Professional learning plan 	<p>0 = Uniform schoolwide problem solving process not adopted.</p> <p>1 = Adequate schoolwide problem solving process adopted but not utilized consistently.</p> <p>2 = Schoolwide problem solving process adopted and used consistently with data, systems, and practices.</p>
<p>1.14 Fidelity Data A system is in place to monitor fidelity of Tier I including (a) assessments; (b) instruction; and (c) implementation.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Walkthrough data • Fidelity tools • Tier definition • Assessment schedule 	<p>0 = Zero or one of three feature criteria of assessments, instruction, or implementation is met.</p> <p>1 = Two of three feature criteria of assessments, instruction, or implementation are met.</p> <p>2 = System in place which meets feature criteria in assessments, instruction, and implementation.</p>
<p>1.15a Outcome Data Schoolwide data indicate improved outcomes in reading, math, behavior, and attendance that lead to at least 80% proficiency in core.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Student outcome data (e.g., attendance, discipline, math, behavior, PALS, universal screening data) 	<p>0 = Zero or one of the four areas for improved outcomes meets 80% core proficiency.</p> <p>1 = Two or three of the four areas for improved outcomes meet 80% core proficiency.</p> <p>2 = Student outcome data indicate 80% core proficiency in all four areas.</p>
<p>1.15b Annual Evaluation Schoolwide data are shared at least annually with all stakeholders in a usable format and inclusive of trend data across years.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Stakeholder reports • Stakeholder surveys • Faculty meeting notes • School website • Family meeting notes • School Board meeting notes 	<p>0 = Inconsistent data sharing practices.</p> <p>1 = One or two of feature criteria met for sharing annually, usable format, and trend data.</p> <p>2 = Data are shared annually, usable, and inclusive of trends across years.</p>

Tier 2: Targeted Academic Features

Subscale: Teams

Feature	Possible Data Sources	Scoring Criteria
<p>2.1 Team Composition Tier II (or combined Tier II/III) team includes staff members with (a) intervention expertise; (b) knowledge of the intervention system (e.g., systems coordinator); (c) an administrator role; and (d) knowledge of students.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> List of team members Inclusion of additional staff as needed as per team minutes 	<p>0 = Tier II team meets no more than one of the feature criteria for team composition.</p> <p>1= Tier II meets two of the four feature criteria for team composition.</p> <p>2= Tier II team includes coordinator and meets all four feature criteria for team composition.</p>
<p>2.2a Team Operating Procedures Tier II 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"> Tier II team meeting agendas and minutes Tier II meeting roles and descriptions Tier II action plan 	<p>0 = Tier II team does not use regular meeting format/agenda, minutes, defined roles, or a current action plan.</p> <p>1 = Tier II team has at least two but not all four feature criteria.</p> <p>2 = Tier II team meets at least monthly and uses regular meeting format/agenda, minutes, defined roles, AND has a current action plan.</p>
<p>2.2b Team Alignment All team(s) responsible for providing Tier II supports maintain a procedure for ensuring communication among teams at all tiers for effective student planning.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Cross meeting communication agenda Aligned dashboard Student intervention plans Team membership 	<p>0 = There is no evidence of communication between teams.</p> <p>1= Communication exists primarily between Tier II team(s) or intervention providers.</p> <p>2 = Communication exists between all tiers to align the data and structures to ensure an integrated student plan.</p>
<p>2.3 Decision Rules Tier II team(s) ensure (a) specific decision rules for entry and exit; (b) written procedure for using decision rules; (c) the use of multiple measures; and (d) communication of decision rules to all stakeholders including families.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Aligned dashboard Written evidence of entry and exit criteria Written entry and exit criteria include multiple measures Team meeting minutes Written procedures for entering and exiting intervention(s) Tier definition/resource map 	<p>0 = There is an inconsistent process for access to intervention.</p> <p>1 = At least two of the four feature criteria are met for decision rules.</p> <p>2 = All four feature criteria are met for decision rules.</p>

*Item remains the same as Tiered Fidelity Inventory.

Feature	Possible Data Sources	Scoring Criteria
<p>2.4 Request for Assistance Tier II planning team uses a written request for assistance form and process that are timely and available to all staff, families, and students.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> School handbook Request for assistance form Family handbook 	<p>0 = No formal process exists.</p> <p>1 = An informal process is in place for staff and families to request assistance.</p> <p>2 = A written request for assistance form and process are in place and the team responds to the request within three days.</p>

Subscale: Interventions

Feature	Possible Data Sources	Scoring Criteria
<p>2.5 Intervention Resources Tier II providers have access to multiple evidence-based interventions matched to student need.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Resource map Student data Meeting minutes Description of interventions Selection process 	<p>0 = There are limited supports.</p> <p>1 = An instructional match is not consistently evident or is unavailable.</p> <p>2 = A continuum of evidence-based supports to match instructional needs exists.</p>
<p>2.6a Tier II Intervention System Features Tier II interventions are clearly defined and include (a) scheduled time; (b) identified provider; (c) a progress monitoring schedule; and (d) a fidelity measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Interim reports Aim line School schedule Progress monitoring data Tier definition/resource map Fidelity documents 	<p>0 = Tier II interventions are provided but not clearly defined or monitored.</p> <p>1 = At least two of the four feature criteria are met for intervention systems.</p> <p>2 = All four feature criteria are met for systems intervention.</p>
<p>2.6b Tier II Intervention Practice Features Tier II interventions include (a) increased time, intensity and dosage; (b) increased opportunities for feedback; and (c) increased structures and prompts.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> School schedules Fidelity tools Programmatic descriptions Lesson plans 	<p>0 = Intervention design is not clear and/or inconsistently utilized.</p> <p>1 = At least two of the three feature criteria are met.</p> <p>2 = All three feature criteria are met.</p>
<p>2.7 Intervention Selection A process exists for selecting evidence-based interventions and creating a match to student need.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Resource map Evidence-based selection tool Individual student data Data outcomes Documentation of selection process 	<p>0 = Intervention selection is not clear and/or inconsistently utilized.</p> <p>1 = A process exists for intervention selection OR matching to student need.</p> <p>2 = A process exists for selecting evidence-based interventions AND matching to student need.</p>

Feature	Possible Data Sources	Scoring Criteria
<p>2.8 Aligned Interventions All interventions are aligned with Tier I content and coordinated with Tier I schedules to maintain access to Tier I content.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Student and school schedules • Intervention plans 	<p>0 = Alignment and access to Tier I content are inconsistent.</p> <p>1 = Either alignment OR access to content exists.</p> <p>2= Students receive interventions that align with the Tier I content as they continue to receive Tier I instruction with their peers.</p>
<p>2.9 Professional Learning Teams have access to professional learning (a) needed to provide intervention supports with fidelity; (b) needed for all staff to reinforce the intervention; and (c) to support families in order to assist students</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Professional learning plans • Professional learning calendar • Fidelity checklists • Evidence of family support • Faculty meeting minutes • Staff handbook 	<p>0 = No more than one of the three feature criteria is met for professional learning.</p> <p>1 = Two of the feature three criteria are met for professional learning.</p> <p>2 = All three of the feature criteria are met for professional learning.</p>

Subscale: Evaluation

Feature	Possible Data Sources	Scoring Criteria
<p>2.10 Level of Use Team follows written process to track proportion of students with equitable access to and participation in Tier II.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Documentation of process • Tier II enrollment data • Tier II meeting minutes • Student enrollment data for school 	<p>0 = There is a lack of written process and/or student data.</p> <p>1 = The team tracks proportion of students OR equitable participation.</p> <p>2 = Team tracks both proportion of students AND equitable participation.</p>
<p>2.11 Progress-Monitoring For each intervention, there are progress-monitoring data (a) for students receiving Tier II supports; (b) which are displayed and discussed to make decisions monthly regarding individual progress; and (c) within each intervention, the percent of students making sufficient progress (i.e., reducing the gap) is provided.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Agenda and minutes for data team meetings • Parent contact logs • Data meeting minutes • Meeting logs with percent of students • Intervention tracking tool 	<p>0 = No more than one of the three feature criteria is met for progress monitoring.</p> <p>1 = Two of the three feature criteria are met for progress monitoring.</p> <p>2 = All three of the feature criteria are met for progress monitoring.</p>

Feature	Possible Data Sources	Scoring Criteria
<p>2.12 Fidelity Data Tier II team has a protocol for ongoing review of fidelity for each Tier II practice.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • School schedule • Intervention attendance sheets • Fidelity measure specific to the intervention • Scheduled fidelity checks 	<p>0 = Fidelity data are not collected for any Tier II practices.</p> <p>1 = Fidelity data collected for some of the interventions.</p> <p>2 = A schedule for ongoing fidelity checks for all Tier II interventions exists.</p>
<p>2.13 Annual Evaluation. At least annually, the team evaluates and shares with stakeholders (a) effectiveness of interventions; (b) utility of decision rules; (c) fidelity of implementation; (d) need for additional professional learning; and (e) disproportionality of students in intervention.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Annual report • Presentations to stakeholders • Student outcomes • Intervention tracking tool • Level of use data 	<p>0 = There is irregular evaluation and sharing of data.</p> <p>1 = The team meets annually OR shares information with stakeholders AND includes the five components.</p> <p>2 = Team meets at least annually and shares data with stakeholders that include the five components of evaluation.</p>

Tier 3: Intensive Academic Features

Subscale: Teams

Feature	Possible Data Sources	Scoring Criteria
<p>3.1 Team Composition Tier III (or combined Tier II/III) team includes staff members with (a) intervention expertise; (b) knowledge of the intervention system (e.g., systems coordinator); (c) an administrator role; (d) knowledge of students (includes family member); and (e) multi- agency supports.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • List of team members • Meeting minutes • School organizational chart • Resource map/tier definition for Tier 3 	<p>0 = Tier III team meets no more than one of the feature criteria for team composition.</p> <p>1= Tier III team meets at least two of the five feature criteria for team composition.</p> <p>2 = Tier III team includes coordinator and meets all five feature criteria for team composition.</p>
<p>3.2a Team Alignment All team(s) responsible for providing Tier III supports maintain a procedure for ensuring communication among teams at all tiers and outside agencies for effective student planning</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cross meeting communication agenda • Aligned dashboard • Student intervention plans • Team membership • Memorandum of Understanding agreements (MOU) 	<p>0 = No evidence of communication among teams.</p> <p>1= Communication exists primarily among Tier III teams or intervention providers.</p> <p>2 = Communication exists among all tiers and agencies to align the data and structures to ensure an integrated student plan.</p>
<p>3.2b Team Operating Procedures Tier III 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"> • Tier III meeting agendas and minutes • Tier III meeting roles descriptions • Tier III action plan 	<p>0 = Tier III team does not use regular meeting form/agenda; minutes; defined roles; or a current action plan.</p> <p>1 = Tier III team has at least two but not all four feature criteria.</p> <p>2 = Tier III team meets at least monthly and uses regular meeting format/agenda, minutes, defined roles, AND has a current action plan.</p>
<p>3.3 Decision Rules Tier III team(s) ensure (a) specific decision rules for entry and exit; (b) written procedure for using decision rules; (c) the use of multiple measures; and (d) communication of decision rules to all stakeholders including families.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Aligned dashboard • Written evidence of entry and exit criteria • Written entry and exit criteria include multiple measures • Team meeting minutes • Written procedures for entering and exiting intervention 	<p>0 = Inconsistent process for access to intervention.</p> <p>1 = At least two of the four feature criteria are met for decision rules.</p> <p>2 = All four feature criteria are met for decision rules.</p>

*Item remains the same as Tiered Fidelity Inventory.

Feature	Possible Data Sources	Scoring Criteria
3.4 Student Support Process Students receiving Tier III supports are (a) monitored at least weekly; (b) have an individualized plan; and (c) include parent involvement in the plan.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Progress monitoring data Student plans Tier III meeting minutes Problem solving team minutes 	0 = Inconsistent monitoring and individualized planning. 1 = Supports indicate two of the three feature criteria. 2 = Supports indicate all three feature criteria for student support.

Subscale: Resources

Feature	Possible Data Sources	Scoring Criteria
3.5 Staffing An administrative plan is used to ensure that adequate staff are available to deliver and monitor Tier III supports.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Administrative plan Tier III meeting minutes Student intervention plans Organizational chart School schedule 	0 = Staff are not available to deliver and monitor Tier III supports. 1 = Staff are intermittently available to monitor and deliver Tier III supports. 2 = All Tier III plans are delivered and monitored on a regular basis.
3.6 Student/Family/Community Involvement Tier III team has division contact person(s) with access to external support agencies and resources for planning and implementing additional interventions (e.g., mental health, family assistance programs, technical assistance) as needed.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Tier III meeting minutes MOU agreements Student plans 	0 = Division contact person not established. 1 = Division contact person established with external agencies OR resources are available and documented. 2 = Division contact person established with external agencies AND resources are available and documented.
3.7 Professional Learning A written process is followed to provide teams access to professional learning (a) needed to provide intervention supports with fidelity; (b) needed for all staff to reinforce the intervention; and (c) to support families in order to assist students.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Professional learning plans Professional learning calendar Fidelity checklists Evidence of family support Faculty meeting minutes Staff handbook 	0 = No more than one of the three feature criteria is met for professional learning. 1 = Two of the three feature criteria are met for professional learning. 2 = All three of the feature criteria are met for professional learning.
3.8 Review of Strengths and Preference Assessment includes student strengths and identification of student/family preferences for support options to meet their academic, health, career, and social needs.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Meeting minutes Phone logs Home visitation logs Intervention plans 	0 = Lack of evidence of student strengths and family preference. 1 = Student strengths reflected in plan OR family preference reflected in plan. 2 = Students strengths and family preference reflected in plan.

Feature	Possible Data Sources	Scoring Criteria
<p>3.9 Aligned Data Indicators Data relevant to all aspects of student development are available and utilized for intervention planning (e.g., academic, behavioral, medical, mental health, attendance).</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Aligned dashboard ● Meeting minutes ● Parent sources ● Intervention plan 	<p>0 = Aligned data not available or a plan is not present.</p> <p>1 = Plan developed with some but not all indicators of student development.</p> <p>2 = All data relevant to student development indicated in intervention planning.</p>
<p>3.10 Hypothesis Statement Intervention plan reflects a hypothesis statement inclusive of a clear definition that indicates all aspects of student need based on current assessment and prior performance.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Record review ● Data summary ● Meeting minutes ● Intervention plans ● Progress monitoring reports 	<p>0 = Plan does not reflect a hypothesis statement.</p> <p>1 = Plan reflects a hypothesis inclusive of prior performance OR current assessment.</p> <p>2 = Plan reflects a hypothesis inclusive of prior performance AND current assessment.</p>
<p>3.11 Intensity of Supports Instructional delivery includes (a) explicit instruction; (b) high levels of feedback; (c) targeted lesson design; (d) increased dosage; and (e) smaller group size.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Tier definition/resource map ● Intervention plans ● Lesson plans ● Programmatic descriptions ● School schedule ● Professional learning plan ● Progress monitoring plan ● Student goal statements 	<p>0 = Instruction includes none or one of the feature criteria.</p> <p>1 = Instruction includes up to three feature criteria for intensity of supports.</p> <p>2 = Instruction includes all five feature criteria for intensity of supports.</p>
<p>3.12 Formal Support Students participate in intervention planning, as appropriate, inclusive of specialist, external agency, if warranted, and family support</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Planning meeting minutes ● Intervention plan 	<p>0 = Lack of evidence of formal plan.</p> <p>1 = Plan exists but lacks evidence of specialist support.</p> <p>2 = Plan exists with support from specialist, student and external agency, if warranted, and family.</p>
<p>3.13 Access to Tier I and Tier II Supports Students receiving Tier III supports have access to, and are included in, the relevant curricula in Tier I and Tier II.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Individual student schedules ● School schedules ● Tier definition/resource maps ● Intervention plan 	<p>0 = Lack of evidence of access to Tier I and Tier II supports.</p> <p>1 = Evidence of access but limited evidence of participation.</p> <p>2 = Evidence of access and participation in Tier I and Tier II, as appropriate.</p>

Feature	Possible Data Sources	Scoring Criteria
<p>3.14 Fidelity of Intervention A process exists to monitor and provide feedback on the fidelity of intervention plans and instruction.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Observation checklists • Walkthroughs • Meeting minutes • Documentation of process 	<p>0 = Lack of evidence of evaluation of fidelity.</p> <p>1 = Process for collecting fidelity data on both intervention plans and instruction in place but lack of evidence of feedback.</p> <p>2 = Process for collecting fidelity data and providing feedback for intervention plans and instruction exists.</p>

Subscale: Evaluation

Feature	Possible Data Sources	Scoring Criteria
<p>3.15 Progress Monitoring The progress monitoring data for students receiving Tier III supports are collected at least weekly and decisions made at least monthly regarding individual progress.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Agenda and minutes for data team meetings • Parent contact logs • Documentation of data meeting structures • Meeting logs with percent of students • Progress monitoring charts • Aim lines 	<p>0 = No evidence of consistent monitoring or data decisions.</p> <p>1 = Progress monitoring data collected at least weekly OR student progress discussed at least monthly.</p> <p>2 = Progress monitoring data are collected at least weekly AND student progress discussed at least monthly.</p>
<p>3.16 Level of Use Team follows written process to track proportion of students with access to and participation in Tier III and access and participation is equitable.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Documentation of process • Tier III enrollment data • Tier III meeting minutes • Student enrollment data for school 	<p>0 = Lack of written process and/or student data.</p> <p>1 = Team tracks either proportion of students or equitable participation but not both.</p> <p>2 = Team tracks proportion of students AND equitable participation.</p>
<p>3.17 Annual Evaluation At least annually, the Tier III team (a) assesses the extent to which Tier III supports are meeting the needs of students, families, and school personnel; (b) uses evaluations to guide action planning; and (c) reports evaluation results to stakeholders.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Tier III meeting minutes • Tier III team action plan • Faculty meeting agendas • School board presentations • Newsletters • Evaluation summary 	<p>0 = No annual evaluation.</p> <p>1 = Evaluation completed and used to guide action planning OR delivered to stakeholders.</p> <p>2 = Annual evaluation is used to guide action planning AND reported to stakeholders.</p>

Resources Supportive of the Academic TFI

Books

Archer A. & Hughes C., *Explicit Instruction, Effective and Efficient Teaching*, The Guilford Press, 2011, pp. 224-227.

Aquilar, E., *The Art of Coaching Teams*, Jossey-Bass, 2016.

Baker B. & Ryan C., *The PBIS Team Handbook*, Free Spirit Publishing Inc., 2014, pp. 1-11, 16-34, 39-41, 49- 52, 91.

Constantino, S., *Engage Every Family*, Corwin, 2016.

Council for Exceptional Children, *High Leverage Practices for Inclusive Classrooms*, Rutledge, 2019.

Donohoo, Jenni, *Collective Efficacy: How Educators Beliefs Impact Student Learning*, Corwin, 2017.

Fisher D. & Frey, N. *Checking for Understanding: Formative Assessment Techniques for Your Classroom, 2nd Edition*, the Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, 2007

Fisher, D., Frey, N., and Hattie, J., *Visible Learning for Literacy*, Corwin, 2016.

Hattie, J., Fisher, D., and Frey, N. *Visible Learning for Mathematics*, Corwin, 2017.

McIntosh, K., & Goodman, S., *Integrated Multi-Tiered System of Support*, Guilford Press, 2016.

Sotrmon, M., Reinke, W., Herman K. and Lembke, E., *Academic and Behavior Support for At-Risk Students*, The Guilford Press, 2012, pp. 102-103, 109-119, 121-122, 130-133, and 142-143.

Tomlinson, C. A. & McTighe, J. *Integrating Differentiated Instruction and Understanding by Design: Connecting Content and Kids*, Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, 2006.

Wiliam, Dylan, *Creating the Schools Our Children Need*, Learning Sciences International, 2018.

Wiliam, Dylan, *Embedded Formative Assessment*, Solution Tree Press, 2011.

Journal Articles and Documents

Brookhart, S. M. (2016). Higher-Order Thinking. *Educational Leadership*, 74(2), 10-15.

Chaparro, E. A., Nese, R.N.T. & McIntosh, K. (2015). Examples of Engaging Instruction to Increase Equity in Education. *Positive Behavioral Intervention & Supports*.

Griner, A. C. & Stewart, M. L. (2016). Addressing the Achievement Gap and Disproportionality Through the Use of Culturally Responsive Teaching Practices. *Urban Education*, 48(4), 585–621.

McIntosh, K., Girvan, E. J., Horner, R. H., Smolkowski, K. & Sugai, G. (2014). Recommendations for Addressing Discipline Disproportionality in Education. *Positive Behavioral Intervention & Supports*.

Tomlinson, C. A. (2015). Teaching for Excellence in Academically Diverse Classrooms. *SYMPOSIUM: 21st Century Excellence in Education, Part 2*

Websites

Center on Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports: <https://www.pbis.org>

Colorado Department of Education: RtI Implementation Rubric:

https://www.cde.state.co.us/sites/default/files/documents/rti/downloads/pdf/rubrics_school.pdf

Council for Exceptional Children: <http://www.cec.org>

National Center on Intensive Intervention: <https://www.intensiveintervention.org>

RtI Action Network: <http://www.rtinetwork.org>

Virginia Department of Education: <http://www.doe.virginia.gov/>