|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Question | Answer | Additional Resources |
|  |  |  |
| If we use the Tiered Fidelity Measure, will it cover the requirement to measure all Tier 1, Tier2, and Tier 3 or will we still need fidelity measures for each practice (e.g., Skillstreaming, Check and Connect etc.)? | Yes, the TFI can be used to assess MTSSB regardless of your specific “practice.” If your practice has another fidelity measure with multiple tiers that is fine to use in conjunction with a fidelity measure that assesses the multi-tiered framework.  Any evidence-based practice should have an accompanying fidelity measure. If the practice/ program does not have a fidelity measure either contact the authors, or consider using the TFI | For more on Fidelity:  <http://www.pbis.org/research/swpbs-fidelity-measure> |
| How would we measure fidelity of a specific program like RENEW? |
| Can you address the possible problems caused by relying on self-reports from schools, particularly concerning fidelity? | Self-reports have a long history of being inaccurate. However, when the self-report is from consensus of a team (not summary of individuals) and done with an external coach present, the accuracy of the information has been demonstrated to be valid and reliable. | For additional resources on Coaching:  <http://www.pbis.org/training/coach-and-trainer>  McIntosh et al., (2015) Technical Adequacy of the PBIS Tiered Fidelity Inventory.  *Submitted for publication* |
| What about trainings that are being provided as part of the SCTG that are not intended to be "practices" that will be implemented. Therefore, there would not be any fidelity measure. For example, we are providing Trauma Informed Care in Schools 2 hour overview but there is no expectation for implementation. | For any training provided clearly identify the expected outcomes for your participants. Those outcomes may be knowledge development but not necessarily implementation, this is especially relevant for some targeted or individual interventions. In that situation where implementation is not expected are there other teacher responsibilities (e.g. identification of students, providing progress data, etc.)? Be sure to clarify how attendees will use that information. Consider assessing knowledge post training through a quick survey or exit “test” to ensure the training was effective and attendees are walking away having learned relevant skills and information. |  |
| Are there publicly available guidelines for administering and scoring the TFI? | Guidelines for administering and scoring the TFI are located at PBIS Applications. Resources include a walkthrough video, scoring guide and action plan. | For more on the TFI:  <https://www.pbisapps.org/Applications/Pages/PBIS-Assessment-Surveys.aspx#tfi> |
| Can you possibly clarify the reporting cycle for these outcome measures? Quarterly, Semi-annually and/or Yearly? | The reporting cycle is yearly. All Priority Indicators, and additional LEA or SEA goals should be reported on once pear year. |  |
| As far as reporting, it sounds like we only need to report on schools that receive formal training or technical support derived from the grant. Is that correct? In other words, should schools previously trained and currently implementing be included in any way in the report? | Please do report on the schools included in grant funding. Also consider reporting on district-wide outcomes as a demonstration of building capacity within the district: the goal of the SCTG grant funds is capacity and sustainability of MTSS-B framework. |  |