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In the fall 2018, the Nevada Department of Education (NDE), in collaboration with Nevada’s Positive Behavior Interventions and Supports (PBIS) Technical Assistance Center, was awarded a second five-year federally-funded School Climate Transformation Grant (SCTG). Funded through this grant, the Nevada MTSS project seeks to improve its capacity to establish, scale-up, and sustain multi-tiered behavioral frameworks in Nevada’s schools by implementing School-wide Positive Behavior Support (SWPBS). The 2022–23 school year was the fourth grant year and the third year of full implementation.

In 2022–23, the MTSS project was implemented in eight target high-need school districts. Collectively, participating schools served 145,239 students, ranging from 126 students at Pyramid Lake Schools to 106,876 students in Clark County School District.

This report presents program evaluation findings for the 2022-23 school year. The evaluation uses a mixed-methods approach, drawing from multiple data sources and respondent groups, described below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 1. Evaluation Methods and Data Sources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Documentation Review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training Evaluations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TFI Data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SSFI and DSFI Data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Report Cards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLT Surveys</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DLT Surveys</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Metis Associates prepared this report on behalf of the Nevada PBIS Technical Assistance Center, which is located in the Nevada Center for Excellence in Disabilities at the College of Education and Human Development (University of Nevada, Reno).

The mission of the Nevada PBIS Technical Assistance Center is to provide the tools, knowledge, and skills for organizations to develop and sustain systems that support safety and social-emotional wellness.
STATEWIDE IMPLEMENTATION AND OUTCOMES

- State capacity to support Multi-Tiered System of Supports (MTSS) implementation has continued to increase, with the largest gains in Training, Policy, and Funding & Alignment (Figure 1). By 2023, Nevada scored the highest in Training and Local Implementation Demonstrations; Workforce Capacity and Stakeholder Engagement were the lowest-rated areas, similar to 2022.

- The Nevada MTSS initiative has improved the coordination and alignment of statewide behavioral health and academic initiatives. All SLT members who responded to the 2023 survey indicated that the initiative positively impacted this area.

- In 2022-23, the MTSS initiative continued to support statewide efforts on mental health and substance misuse prevention. For example, the state received a grant from Fund for Resilient Nevada to focus more intentionally on how to integrate opioid prevention efforts into the MTSS curriculum. And in September 2023, the Nevada PBIS Technical Assistance Center held a statewide MTSS event that brought together over 200 stakeholders from all the LEAs participating in the MTSS initiative. The event focused on helping LEAs discuss integration with their community partners and determine actionable steps to include mental health and substance misuse prevention efforts into their MTSS frameworks.

- Using ESSER funds, the Nevada MTSS Project brought on four new practice coaches in 2021-22 with expertise in social-emotional learning, behavior supports in schools, data collection and analysis, and academic response to intervention. These practice coaches developed new practice modules for an online platform. The modules went live in 2022-23 and were used as supplemental material for statewide trainings.

- In 2022-23, the Nevada MTSS project delivered 49 trainings to eight participating school districts. Almost all PD participants were satisfied with all aspects of their PD, and 96% reported that the offerings positively impacted their knowledge, skills, and future practices.

- Participating districts have shown important gains in their implementation fidelity, reporting increases in every area assessed through the DSFI (Figure 1). Districts scored highest in Leadership Teaming, Training and Policy; the lowest-rated areas were Workforce Capacity and Local Implementation Demonstrations. Since the beginning of the grant, districts have experienced the largest gains in Training, Funding & Alignment, and Policy.

Figure 1: Impact of MTSS Initiative on State and District Capacity (Top Rated Dimensions)*

*Earliest administrations spanned from 2018-19 through 2021-22, depending on when the schools joined the initiative.
Participating districts and schools have continued to build their capacity to implement PBIS and reported positive changes in their MTSS practices, particularly around the districts’ overall capacity and readiness to implement MTSS, the use of evidence-based practices and valid tools and processes to support MTSS implementation, and the use of data for decision making (Figure 2). The largest gains have been in integrating mental health services in MTSS; the percentage of DLT members reporting a moderate to significant impact increased from 56% in 2022 to 80% in 2023. Although there were also gains in districts’ use of opioid abuse prevention and mitigation strategies (from 17% in 2022 to 36% in 2023), this continues to be the lowest-rated area and should continue to be a priority next year.

Through coach and school trainings and supports, the MTSS project helped build local and regional capacity for MTSS implementation. Educators and administrators participating in the initiative reported large gains in knowledge and skills due to the trainings they received. Specifically, the percentage of respondents who reported being very to extremely knowledgeable about the topics covered in the PDs increased from 32% before the activities to 68% after the trainings.

Participating schools demonstrated gains in implementation fidelity. Participating schools that completed the TFI showed increases in both average ratio scores for each Tier, as well as the percentage of schools implementing each tier with fidelity, across years. Specifically, the percentage of schools implementing with fidelity increased from 62% to 76% for Tier 1, 16% to 34% for Tier 2, and 9% to 14% for Tier 3 (Figure 3).
STUDENT OUTCOMES. When looking at student outcomes, results show that schools across the board are struggling to reach pre-pandemic levels on most dimensions of student success; yet, higher-implementing outperformed lower-implementing sites in almost all instances, including: average daily attendance; chronic absenteeism; and incidents related to weapons, violence, use/possession of controlled substances, bullying, cyberbullying, and race discrimination (select findings presented in Figure 4). These promising results suggest that the initiative’s efforts to assist schools in implementing MTSS with fidelity are leading to improved outcomes for higher-implementing sites.

![Figure 4: Summary of Student Outcomes](image)

**Figure 4: Summary of Student Outcomes**

RECOMMENDATIONS

The following were recommendations stemming from feedback and data collected through the evaluation:

- Continue to develop and implement an action plan to enhance state capacity, particularly around areas rated the lowest in the State Systems Fidelity Inventory, which included Workforce Capacity and Stakeholder Engagement.

- Continue to support districts, particularly in areas that appeared to be more challenging or were rated lowest in various assessment tools used to track districts’ progress in MTSS implementation, including: Workforce Capacity and Local Implementation Demonstrations, the use of opioid abuse prevention and mitigation strategies, promoting district and school buy-in, and implementation at the secondary level.
Multi-Tiered System of Supports (MTSS) comes from two well-researched approaches: academic Response to Intervention (RTI) and School-wide Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports (PBIS) (McIntosh & Goodman, 2016).

Both academic and behavioral initiatives have certain fundamental principles that underlie the successful implementation of practices within the system. Typically, these principles are almost identical when discussed from optimized learning and prevention perspectives. Traditional academic initiatives and frameworks such as RTI take the preventative approach of delivering high-quality academic instruction for all students, differentiated instruction as needed, and a general teaming process for progress monitoring and decision-making. The same can and should be true for behavioral initiatives such as the PBIS framework, which focuses on preventing challenging behaviors. There is a social and emotional instruction system for all students, differentiated behavioral supports as needed, and a team process for progress monitoring and decision-making.

As a result of the partnership with the Nevada Department of Education’s Office for a Safe and Respectful Learning Environment, Nevada’s MTSS Project has strong foundations in PBIS and other social-emotional and behavioral initiatives. However, many LEAs elect to integrate their academic support systems within their frameworks to create a more comprehensive MTSS.

- **Tier 1 - Universal Supports for All Students.**
  Tier 1 includes instructional practices to support school-wide outcomes. Tier 1 is stewarded by a “school MTSS team” that attends training events and professional learning activities throughout the year to enhance their knowledge and deepen their implementation practice. The team is responsible for the leadership of MTSS, regular review of data, and oversight of the school MTSS action plan. Features of Tier 1 include delivery of a high-quality core curriculum, universal prevention programming, universal screening, data-based decision-making, teaming, and progress monitoring.

- **Tier 2 – Targeted Interventions for Students at Risk.**
  Tier 2 involves specialized group interventions to supplement the Tier 1 supports these students already receive. Tier 2 interventions include targeted and explicit instruction of skills, opportunities to practice new skills, and frequent feedback to the student. The role of the team’s advanced tiers includes matching student needs to interventions, monitoring progress, and evaluating the efficacy of targeted interventions.

- **Tier 3 - Individualized Supports for Few Students.**
  Tier 3 interventions are utilized for students with the highest need, based on a lack of responsiveness to Tier 1 and 2 supports. These interventions are evidence-based, informed by individualized assessment, and person-centered. Interventions are tailored to address the specific skill deficits as indicated within the individualized assessments. The role of the team at Tier 3 is like that of Tier 2; however, the team may collaborate with external and/or community-based providers to support the student.
In 2018, the Nevada Department of Education, in collaboration with the Nevada PBIS Technical Assistance Center, received a second five-year School Climate Transformation (SCT) grant from the United States Department of Education. The mission of the Nevada MTSS project is to build state and district capacity for supporting the sustained and broad-scale implementation of School-wide Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports (SWPBIS) in Nevada schools. It builds upon the successes of the first SCT grant implemented from 2015 to 2019.

Supported by these grants, the Nevada MTSS initiative has provided the necessary resources for ongoing on-site training and technical assistance through a behavior and data systems coaching hierarchy. Each district's capacity is being built during a three-year period in which State Coordinators from the Nevada PBIS Technical Assistance Center work closely with External Coaches within each district, who, in turn, work directly with Internal Coaches at each school.

The following page is the logic model describing the goals, inputs, activities, outputs, and outcomes of the Nevada PBIS efforts.
**GOAL**
What is the program trying to accomplish?

Improve state, district, and school capacity to implement MTSS through a multi-tiered integrated behavior framework.

**ACTIVITIES**
What are key components?

- Develop a hierarchy of training support, beginning with State Coordinators, at least one External Coach at each district and at least one Internal Coach at each of the individual schools.
- Provide training opportunities for project staff (e.g., APBS and PBIS Leadership conferences, national PBIS technical assistance center support).
- Create, train, and support District Leadership Teams (DLTs) and facilitate administration of DSFI to inform district action plans.
- Provide MTSS training and coaching for school teams.
- Conduct monthly meetings of state coordinators, external coaches, and internal coaches.
- Provide access to School-Wide Information System (SWIS) and train state and district staff in the use of SWIS data.
- Collect and review implementation and outcome data to inform project activities.
- Create a State Leadership Team (SLT), hold quarterly meetings, and administer SSFI to inform state’s action plan.

**INPUTS**
What resources are needed?

- 5-year USDOE School Climate Transformation grant
- NDE staffing and resources
- Nevada PBIS Technical Assistance Center staffing and resources
- State Coordinators
- Nevada PBIS network of partners
- State Leadership Team
- Participating school districts

**OUTPUTS**
What are the tangible products?

- Sequence and scope of trainings and supports
- Number of trainings offered
- Number of project staff and state coordinators trained
- Number and % of district staff trained; district action plans
- Training materials, videos, and podcasts
- SWIS data, data reports, and action plans based on data
- Number of SLT meetings, agendas, meeting minutes, and state action plan

**SHORT-TERM OUTCOMES**
What changes do we expect in 1-2 years?

**FOR THE STATE**
Increased knowledge and skills of project staff and state-level coordinators

**FOR DISTRICTS/SCHOOLS**
Increased district capacity to train, monitor, improve, and evaluate MTSS implementation

**FOR YOUTH**
Decrease in reported student behavior (ODRs, suspensions, referrals)

**LONG-TERM OUTCOMES**
What changes do we expect in 3-5 years?

**FOR THE STATE**
Increased capacity to provide supports to schools/districts

**FOR DISTRICTS/DISTRICTS**
Increased fidelity of implementation of Tier 2 (targeted) and Tier 3 (individual) practices

**FOR YOUTH**
Improved growth rate of academic performance (CRT, MAPS)

**FOR SCHOOLS/DISTRICTS**
Improved data collection tools, methods, and practices

**FOR SCHOOLS/DISTRICTS**
Improved fidelity of implementation of Tier 1 (universal) practices

**FOR SCHOOLS/DISTRICTS**
Improved data collection tools, methods, and practices

**FOR SCHOOLS/DISTRICTS**
Improved data collection tools, methods, and practices

**FOR SCHOOLS/DISTRICTS**
Improved data collection tools, methods, and practices

**FOR SCHOOLS/DISTRICTS**
Improved data collection tools, methods, and practices

**FOR SCHOOLS/DISTRICTS**
Increased school climate

**FOR YOUTH**
Increased high school graduation rates

**FOR SCHOOLS/DISTRICTS**
Improved data collection tools, methods, and practices

**FOR SCHOOLS/DISTRICTS**
Improved data collection tools, methods, and practices

**FOR SCHOOLS/DISTRICTS**
Improved data collection tools, methods, and practices

**FOR SCHOOLS/DISTRICTS**
Improved data collection tools, methods, and practices
Following the guidelines of implementation science, the Nevada MTSS Project supports LEAs in implementing MTSS in four stages: exploration, installation, initial implementation, and full implementation. The exploration stage focuses on assessing the organization’s needs, how well the proposed evidence-based practice (EBP) is considered “fits” the organization, and how practical it is to implement the EBP. When exploration results in the decision to move forward, installation begins. The installation stage focuses on building organizational and practitioner capacity to implement the EBP. After capacity is built, initial implementation begins. At this stage, staff begin to use the EBP with important attention given to collecting and using data to monitor implementation fidelity and outcomes. When the EBP is being used by staff with fidelity and with the organization’s valued results being achieved, the organization has moved into the stage of full implementation (National Implementation Research Network, 2020).

School districts participating in the MTSS Project have access to the following opportunities:

1) **Technical Assistance and Coaching for Participating Districts.** The Nevada PBIS Technical Assistance State Coaches work with each District Leadership Team (DLT) to build their capacity to develop, implement, assess, and refine their MTSS frameworks.

![Implementation Stages Diagram](image_url)

One role of the DLT is to engage in the thoughtful and ongoing alignment of budgets, personnel, and initiatives to reduce potential “silificaiton” and disproportionate access to opportunities and programming within the district. Fiscally, this includes developing a budget plan that prioritizes funding to support operating structures and capacity-building activities to implement MTSS. Financing and organizational resources across related initiatives must continually be examined to facilitate alignment and sustained implementation.

As districts advance and enhance their implementation at advanced tiers of MTSS, the DLT should formally identify, document, and endorse Tier 2 and Tier 3 evidence-based interventions that are contextually appropriate and adequately supported. At least annually, the DLT conducts a formal review (audit, resource mapping, initiative inventory) supported by the State MTSS Coordinator to document and refine the initiatives included within the district’s MTSS framework and examine the effectiveness, relevance, and fidelity of implementation. When it is determined that innovation is needed, the DLT utilizes initiative adoption procedures before adopting new programming, practices, or initiatives.

Lastly, the DLT is charged with MTSS alignment to district outcomes. As district-level strategic plans evolve, soft funding sources come and go, and leadership changes, MTSS can risk having a short-term “shelf life” if not aligned with publicly identified district outcomes and goals. Therefore, ensuring that the components of an LEA’s MTSS are directly aligned with key district performance goals in each LEA’s strategic plan rendition is imperative for durable and sustainable implementation.
In Nevada, the SEA provides coaching to the LEA, and the LEA provides coaching to the school building. Nevada’s SEA MTSS Team has 1 MTSS State Coordinator and 2.5 MTSS Regional Coordinators. The State Coordinator facilitates or co-facilitates the DLT in each participating LEA. The Regional Coordinators are responsible for building the capacity of the LEA coaches.

2) Nevada’s LEA Coaches formally implementing MTSS participate in a feedback program called Nevada’s Total Performance System (TPS) for Coaching, facilitated by the SEA Regional Coordinators. The TPS outlines coaching competencies, training responsibilities, and the expected coaching activities performed with the district and the school teams. MTSS Regional Coordinators also provide weekly coaching calls to build a community of practice, monthly meetings to provide feedback on the TPS coaching objectives for each LEA coach, and quarterly coaching professional development series to develop and enhance capacity. The MTSS Regional Coordinators also provide ongoing technical assistance through direct email, phone, and video conference communication to the LEA coaches.

3) MTSS Training Series for Participating School Teams. Participating school teams are invited to join a training series focusing on Tier 1, Tier 2, or Tier 3 strategies. School and district coaches can also participate in a coach training series. Each training series (Tier 1, Tier 2, Tier 3, and Coaches Professional Development Series) consists of an introductory workshop (one or two days) and four Professional Development sessions (half or full days) throughout the year. The scope and sequence of professional development are described in the graphic below.

Figure 8. Nevada MTSS Training Series

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TIER 1 TRAINING SERIES</th>
<th>TIER 2 TRAINING SERIES</th>
<th>TIER 3 TRAINING SERIES</th>
<th>COACHING SERIES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Initial Workshop: Tier 1 Universal Strategies (2 days)</td>
<td>Initial Workshop: Tier 2 Targeted Interventions (2 days)</td>
<td>Initial Workshop: Tier 3 Intensive Supports (2 days)</td>
<td>Initial Workshop: Coach Kick-Off (full day)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PD #1: School-Wide Data-Based Decision-Making (full day)</td>
<td>PD #1: Universal Screening and Tier 2 Intervention Selection (half day)</td>
<td>PD #1: Brief FBA/Competing Pathway (half day)</td>
<td>PD #1: Ethics &amp; Effective Spokesperson (full day)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PD #2: Classroom Systems &amp; Supports (full day)</td>
<td>PD #2: Progress Monitoring (half day)</td>
<td>PD #2: Comprehensive FBA/PTR (half day)</td>
<td>PD #2: Pre-Requisite Knowledge &amp; Experience (full day)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PD #3: Data-Based Tier 1 Enhancement in MTSS (full day)</td>
<td>PD #3: Communication to Staff, Parents, and Community (half day)</td>
<td>PD #3: School-Based Wraparound: RENEW (half day)</td>
<td>PD #3: Systems Coaching (full day)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PD #4: Disproportionality &amp; Sustainability (full day)</td>
<td>PD #4: Evaluating Efficacy &amp; Outcomes of Tier 2 Systems &amp; Social Validity (half day)</td>
<td>PD #4: Evaluating Efficacy &amp; Outcomes of Tier 3 (half day)</td>
<td>PD #4: Implementation Science (half day)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4) Supplemental Districtwide Awareness Trainings (by Request). These sessions are typically half-day or one-day and cover the following topics: Trauma-Informed Practices, Restorative Practices, School Mental Health, and Social-Emotional Academic Development.
In 2022–23, the Nevada MTSS project worked with 202 schools from eight districts across the state, served over 145,000 students, and delivered 49 trainings (Figure 9).

Almost all participants were satisfied with all aspects of the PD they participated in, and they reported that these PD offerings positively impacted their knowledge, skills, and future practices. During the 2022-23 school year, coaches, educators, and administrators attending MTSS trainings completed 645 training evaluations. Almost all participants were satisfied to highly satisfied with the training they attended, including the presenters (98%), the presentations (96%), content understanding (93%), and their ability to implement strategies/content learned (84%) (Figure 10). According to participants, the best training features were breakout rooms with the team, team and class discussions, and the resources, examples, and hands-on activities, particularly those with the data.

Best features of the sessions:
Awesome connections to in-classroom situations with which to apply these skills.
Getting further knowledge on PBIS and learning from presenters and peers.
Not only the presenters’ knowledge but the variety of examples to better help our understanding of the content.

– PD Participants

---

**Figure 9. 2022-23 School Implementation at a Glance**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SCHOOL</th>
<th>NUMBER OF SCHOOLS</th>
<th>NUMBER OF STUDENTS</th>
<th>NUMBER OF TRAININGS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>145,239</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charter</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>17,329</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clark</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>106,876</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Churchill</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3,130</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carson City</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6,141</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humbolt</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2,350</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lyon</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>8,616</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pershing</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>663</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pyramid Lake</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Figure 10. Participant Satisfaction with Aspects of PD**

*How satisfied are you with the following aspects of the training you attended? (N=645)*

- **Presenters**
  - Highly satisfied: 72%
  - Satisfied: 26%
  - Somewhat satisfied: 2%
  - Not satisfied: 3%

- **Presentation**
  - Highly satisfied: 57%
  - Satisfied: 39%
  - Somewhat satisfied: 3%

- **Understanding of content**
  - Highly satisfied: 46%
  - Satisfied: 47%
  - Somewhat satisfied: 9%

- **Ability to implement**
  - Highly satisfied: 35%
  - Satisfied: 49%
  - Somewhat satisfied: 15%
The Nevada PBIS Technical Assistance Center has worked collaboratively with the NDE, specifically the Office of Safe and Respectful Learning Environments, on the SCT Grant over the past several years. One of the key goals of the grant is to build state capacity for supporting the implementation of MTSS and fostering greater alignment, coordination, and integration of other key initiatives and supports. The 2022-23 evaluation results indicate Nevada has continued to make great strides in these critical areas.

- **State capacity to support MTSS implementation has increased, with considerable gains in Policy, Funding & Alignment, and Leadership Teaming.** During the 2022-23 school year, the NDE completed its fourth State Systems Fidelity Inventory (SSFI) assessment to determine the state's current capacity for MTSS and areas needed to focus on for improvement. An annual action plan was created from the areas targeted for growth. As shown in Figure 11, in 2023, Nevada scored the highest in training (85%), Local Implementation Demonstrations (83%), and coaching (80%). And, over the last four years, the state has experienced the largest gains in Training (35 percentage points), Policy (34 percentage points) and Funding & Alignment (25 percentage points). Nevada scored the lowest in Workforce Capacity and Stakeholder Engagement.

**Figure 11. Results from the State Systems Fidelity Inventory (SSFI)**

- **Local Implementation Demonstrations**: 2020 - 83%, 2023 - 83%
- **Policy**: 2020 - 16%, 2023 - 50%
- **Evaluation**: 2020 - 58%, 2023 - 75%
- **Funding & Alignment**: 2020 - 25%, 2023 - 50%
- **Coaching**: 2020 - 80%, 2023 - 80%
- **Stakeholder Engagement**: 2020 - 33%, 2023 - 33%
- **Training**: 2020 - 50%, 2023 - 85%
- **Leadership Teaming**: 2020 - 40%, 2023 - 60%
- **Workforce Capacity**: 2020 - 12%, 2023 - 25%
The Nevada State Leadership Team continued to guide and support statewide implementation and alignment efforts. In 2022-23, the SLT met quarterly to foster collaboration and coordination among diverse stakeholders, including several behavioral health grants and initiatives awarded to the Department of Education, school districts, the Nevada Association of School Psychologists, the Nevada School Counselor Association, and State Departments.

Overall, members of the SLT provided very positive feedback about the structure and helpfulness of the SLT meetings. Most SLT members responding to the survey indicated that the role of the SLT was somewhat clear (60%) or very clear (40%), that the frequency of the meetings was the right amount (75%), that the format was good (60%) or excellent (15%), and that the content of the meetings was somewhat helpful (60%) or very helpful (40%) (Figure 12).

**Figure 12. Feedback on SLT Meetings (SLT Survey, N=27)**

- **Overall role:**
  - Somewhat clear: 60%
  - Very clear: 40%

- **Frequency:**
  - Too infrequent: 25%
  - Right amount: 75%

- **Format:**
  - Fair: 25%
  - Good: 60%
  - Excellent: 15%

- **Content:**
  - Somewhat helpful: 60%
  - Very helpful: 40%
  - Too infrequent: 25%

When asked if they had any suggestions on how to improve the effectiveness of the SLT meetings, respondents provided a variety of recommendations, including:

- The meetings were well-organized and productive. Please make sure each meeting recaps what we did and the next steps to complete during the current meeting.
- Please consider holding smaller grouped meetings to ensure all voices are heard and all voices feel welcomed.
- Designated & thoughtfully selected representatives per LEA/SEA/state agency to promote consistent attendance and appropriate representation.
- Include information on academics.

- The Nevada MTSS initiative, particularly the SLT, has resulted in better coordination and alignment at the state level. Specifically, 100% of SLT members reported that the initiative positively impacted increasing coordination and collaboration at the state level, including those who said it had a moderate (64%) to significant impact (29%). SLT members also highlighted several other successes and challenges at the state level, summarized below.

---

**Biggest successes:**

The State's commitment to the work and ongoing support with collaboration and resources.

More districts are interested in implementing MTSS framework with fidelity and have gained a better understanding of the MTSS initiative.

– SLT Members
Table 2. State Successes and Challenges

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Successes</th>
<th>Challenges</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>✓ The State’s commitment to the work and ongoing supports</td>
<td>✓ Confusion about how to align and create cohesion amongst initiatives (academic, behavioral, and mental/SEL) within the MTSS framework</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ Increased coordination, alignment, and conversations across the state</td>
<td>✓ Ensuring buy-in and commitment from district leadership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ More districts interested in implementing MTSS and increased fidelity of implementation</td>
<td>✓ Team effectiveness at the secondary level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ Continued advocacy for fiscal and policy prioritization of MTSS</td>
<td>✓ Educator shortages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>✓ Need additional supports for academics</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

During the 2023-23 school year, the state continued to promote mental health and opioid abuse prevention strategies and practices through curriculum development and statewide trainings.

- Nevada’s SB69 requires the NDE to publish an evidence-based list of substance abuse prevention curricula to be utilized with Nevada youth. The Nevada MTSS project, in collaboration with the NDE, has collected baseline data from all LEAs and Community Coalitions regarding current programming and level of evidence. The baseline data allowed for the outline of new training content to meet the identified needs of addressing the opioid crisis through MTSS.

- In September 5-7, 2023, the Nevada PBIS Technical Assistance Center organized a statewide event, Nevada’s Integrated MTSS Summit, in Reno, Nevada. The Summit brought together over 200 district and community leaders from participating LEAs across the state. Through keynote speakers, breakout sessions, and district/community planning time, participants learned how to strengthen district/community partnerships and determine actionable steps to include mental health and substance misuse prevention efforts into their MTSS frameworks.

- The MTSS project emphasizes the inclusion of universal and targeted screeners, identification of evidence-based practices to match student needs, collaboration with community-based providers to support students, and progress monitoring and data-decision rules for mental health interventions. District Leadership Teams (DLT) have been encouraged to include community providers and members of their local community coalitions to shift towards a District Community Leadership Team (DCLT). At least 2 LEAs so far have been successful in adopting this model of interconnected systems.

- As a result of the outcomes of the Nevada MTSS Project, additional competitive federal funds have been secured to enhance school-based behavioral health efforts, including:
  - the Substance Abuse and Mental Health Administration’s Project AWARE,
  - Bureau of Justice Administration’s Stop School Violence Grant,
  - Substance Abuse and Mental Health Administration’s Trauma-Informed Systems in Schools, and
  - Fund for Resilient Nevada grant.

Each grant has identified high-need LEAs to partner on enhancement efforts focused around MTSS.
In spring 2023, the state launched the Trauma Informed Services in Schools (TISS) Project in three participating districts: Churchill, Lyon, and Pershing. The goal of this project is to improve school-based services to address trauma in schools using a Multi-tiered System of Supports (MTSS) framework. The project provides training for staff in trauma interventions, promotes the use of trauma screening across students, and aims to increase referrals for school-based mental health services. Leveraging the MTSS framework and integrating mental health is often referred to as creating an Interconnected Systems Framework (ISF) which will provide evidenced-based services inside the school and increase collaborative relationships with community providers.

Five TISS training events took place between May and September of FY23. Schools conducted a baseline assessment of their trauma responsiveness by completing the Trauma Responsive Schools Implementation Assessment (TRSIA). These data are being used at the building and district level teams to address areas for growth with respect to enhancing the trauma responsive strategies within buildings. All schools are measuring their PBIS implementation utilizing the TFI and district MTSS coaches are supporting site teams to advance their tiered frameworks based on these individualized data. In the spring, an initiatives audit of all prevention and intervention programs was conducted, providing insight to the data, system, and outcomes with respect to each initiative across the tiers. Strengths and gaps were identified, and that audit has led to the selection of additional trauma prevention, intervention, and treatment programming across the tiers based on identified needs.

In addition, the Nevada Department of Education (NDE) participated in cross-departmental development of an Interconnected Systems Framework (ISF) workgroup where we identified shared state level policy and program goals. This is an ongoing partnership with the NDE, the University of Nevada-Reno Positive Behavioral Interventions & Supports Technical Assistance Center (UNR-PBIS TA Center), Nevada Department of Health and Human Services (NVDHHS), Division of Healthcare Finance and Policy (DHCFP), Nevada Parents Educating Parents (NV PEP), and Youth MOVE.

- **Using ESSER funds, the Nevada MTSS Project brought on four new practice coaches with expertise in social-emotional learning, behavior supports in schools, data collection and analysis, and academic response to intervention.** These practice coaches spent most of the 2021-22 school year developing new practice modules for an online platform. The platform launched in January of 2023 with approximately 20 practice modules, and new materials are added to the platform regularly. Systems guidance and practices are available across all three tiers of interventions, and materials and worksheets are used to guide teams through implementation. Live coaching on practices is also available to participating school teams upon request.

- **Nye County School District joined the MTSS initiative.** In 2022-23, Nye County School District (NCSD) created a formal MTSS District Leadership Team; school trainings began in the summer of 2023.
Participating districts have shown important gains in implementing fidelity in multiple areas.

In 2023, seven of the eight participating districts completed the District Systems Fidelity Inventory (DSFI) assessment to determine their capacity for MTSS and areas of improvement (data were not available for Pyramid Lake). With support from Nevada MTSS coaches, districts created action plans for the areas targeted for growth. Data for 2023 were compared to the districts’ first administration of the DSFI (which was 2020 for all districts except Carson City, which joined in 2021-22). As shown in the figure below, districts completing at least two administrations of the DSFI experienced the largest gains in Training (from 30% to 68%), Funding & Alignment (from 42% to 72%), and Policy (from 41% to 67%) (Figure 13). In 2023, these districts scored the highest in Leadership Teaming (76%), Training (68%), and Policy (67%). Districts rated Workforce Capacity and Local Implementation Demonstrations the lowest in 2023.

Figure 13. Results from the District Systems Fidelity Inventory (DSFI)
In 2022-23, the MTSS project continued to build local and regional capacity for MTSS implementation through coach training and support. Coaches were very satisfied with the trainings, highlighting the numerous benefits of attending.

As shown in Figure 5 earlier in this report, the Nevada MTSS project has built a statewide coaching hierarchy that builds local MTSS implementation capacity with district, community, and state support. This included state-level coordinators, external coaches at the district level, and internal coaches at the school level. As of the 2022-23 school year, districts supported 12 external coaches. These coaches were integral to the implementation of MTSS statewide. External coaches received training from the Nevada PBIS TA Center State Coordinators throughout the year and turnkeyed that training to their districts. Evaluation results show that coaches were satisfied with the MTSS training they received during the year. Almost all surveyed coaches reported that they were **highly satisfied** or **satisfied** with the presenters of the trainings (98%), the presentations given (97%), that they understood the content presented (98%), and that they feel they can implement aspects from the training (94%).

![Figure 14. Coach Satisfaction with Aspects of MTSS Training (2023 PD Feedback Forms)](image)

Participating districts and schools have continued to build their capacity to implement MTSS and reported positive changes in their MTSS practices.

Most respondents completing the 2023 DLT survey reported that the MTSS project positively impacted key outcomes in each area assessed (Figure 15). Most respondents reported a **moderate to significant** impact on the districts’ capacity and readiness to implement MTSS (92%), evidence-based practices to support MTSS implementation (86%), using valid tools and processes (86%), integration of school mental health services in MTSS framework (80%), quality of data systems and use of data for decision-making (76%), and cohesion and alignment of MTSS strategies and interventions (68%). Similar to the previous year, using opioid abuse prevention and mitigation strategies was rated the lowest (36%) and remains a priority area moving forward.

**Successes of DLT initiatives:**

*We have provided training to all 10 sites. We are finally getting structured support in place for our schools.*

– DLT Members

*Always so helpful to have time to reflect and work on Tier 2 and Tier 3 strategies.*

*I always walk away with ideas to infuse into our existing system.*

– Coaches
DLT respondents were also asked to reflect on their most significant accomplishments, as well as the challenges they have experienced in the past year. The results are summarized in the table below.

### Table 3. District/School Successes and Challenges

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Successes</th>
<th>Challenges</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>✓ Identifying schools and developing action plans</td>
<td>✓ Lack of district and/or staff buy-in</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ Providing training for teams and staff members</td>
<td>✓ Implementation at the secondary level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ Using data to create Tier 2 and Tier 3 interventions</td>
<td>✓ Misinformation or misconceptions around MTSS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ More cohesive teams and systems in place</td>
<td>✓ Limited capacity and time to dedicate to MTSS implementation, given concurrent initiatives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ Schools embracing new strategies/systems</td>
<td>✓ Lack of academic support</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Administrators and educators participating in the training reported considerable gains in content knowledge. Furthermore, 96% of district and school staff reported they would change how they do their job due to what they learned at the trainings.

In 2022-23, educators and administrators attending MTSS trainings completed 586 training evaluations and reported gains in their content knowledge (Figure 16). Specifically, the percentage of administrators and educators who were very to extremely knowledgeable increased from 32% before the training to 68% after the training.

The 2022-23 evaluation results also show that participating schools achieved important gains in their Tiered Fidelity Inventory (TFI) scores, thus reflecting systemic improvements to provide better student support. As part of the MTSS initiative, participating schools must complete the TFI to assess implementation fidelity. The TFI measures the extent to which the critical MTSS components are in place in a school.

- At Tier 1, the TFI assesses team composition and meeting effectiveness, consistent universal practices, including teaching school-wide expectations, acknowledgment systems for recognizing good behavior, structured discipline systems that emphasize proactive and instructional consequences, staff and community involvement in the Tier 1 systems, the use of data to evaluate Tier 1 practices, and more.

- At Tier 2, the TFI assesses team composition and meeting effectiveness, systems to identify students who may benefit from Tier 2 services, the availability and usage of Tier 2 services, the use of data to evaluate Tier 2 practices, and more.

- At Tier 3, the TFI assesses team composition and meeting effectiveness, systems to identify students who may benefit from Tier 3 services, the adequacy of Tier 3 behavior plans, using data to evaluate Tier 3 practices and more.

We received usable info we can go back and use right away.

Thank you so much for your time and insight! I always look forward to these PBIS Boosters – it gets me hyped for the year!

– School staff
TFI results for 2022-23 show that most schools participating in the MTSS program implemented Tier 1 with fidelity.

In 2022-23, 111 schools completed one or more administrations of the TFI. Results in Figure 17 show that 68% of schools were implementing Tier 1 with fidelity; smaller percentages were implementing Tier 2 and Tier 3 with fidelity (32% and 14%, respectively). As one would expect, schools that have been participating longer (and therefore are receiving PD in higher levels of Tiers) were more likely to implement each Tier with fidelity. Among schools receiving Tier 3 PD, most were scoring Tier 1 (92%), Tier 2 (79%), and Tier 3 (58%) with fidelity.

Results across years also show that participating schools have achieved important gains in implementation fidelity across tiers.

Of the 111 schools completing one or more TFI’s in 2022-23, 93 had completed earlier administrations of the TFI. As shown in Figure 18, participating schools have demonstrated significant gains in MTSS/PBIS implementation throughout the grant. Specifically, the percentage of schools implementing with fidelity increased from 62% to 76% for Tier 1, 16% to 34% for Tier 2, and 9% to 14% for Tier 3. Similarly, average ratio scores (percent of total points scored) increased across all dimensions over the same period (Figure 18).
The evaluation team obtained discipline, school attendance, academic performance, and dropout data from the Nevada state report cards. Given the COVID-19 pandemic and resulting school closures, data for the last three years should be interpreted cautiously. Furthermore, other reporting requirements, such as state assessments and chronic absenteeism rates, were waived and not reported for the 2019-20 school year.

**Methodological Note:**

- In this section, we compare outcomes for two groups of schools: higher implementing schools (i.e., subset of participating schools that were implementing Tiers 1, 2, and/or 3 with fidelity in 2022-23), and lower implementing schools (i.e., participating schools that were not implementing any tier with fidelity). Fidelity of implementation was assessed using the Tiered Fidelity Inventory (TFI); high fidelity is defined as reaching 70% or above.

- The number of schools included in each set of outcome analyses is different because: 1) some outcomes are only relevant to some (not all) grade levels (for example, academic performance only includes grades 3-8 in elementary/middle schools); 2) the state has suppressed data for specific schools where the Ns were too small or their data was above or below a certain threshold; and 3) some schools did not report data for specific outcomes.

- **SCHOOL ATTENDANCE**

Following national trends, Nevada schools experienced declines across the board in school attendance due to the COVID-19 pandemic. However, as shown in Figure 19, higher-implementing schools had smaller declines in ADA from 2018-19 to 2022-23 than lower-implementing schools.

*Figure 19. Trends in Average Daily Attendance (Nevada State Report Card Data)*

*Note: the state reported an ADA of “>95” for 208 of the 321 schools with matched ADA across years. Rather than treating them as missing, these schools were included in the analyses with an ADA of 96.103 (95 plus a quarter standard deviation of ADA across schools).
**CHRONIC ABSENTEEISM**

Nevada state report card data on chronic absenteeism rates were available for 2018-19, 2020-21, 2021-22, and 2022-23. As shown in Figure 20, since the COVID pandemic, Nevada schools have experienced considerable increases in chronic absenteeism rates across the board; however, higher-implementing schools had smaller increases in chronic absenteeism rates from 2018-19 to 2022-23 than lower-implementing schools. Furthermore, over the last two years, both groups of schools experienced declines in absenteeism rates.

![Figure 20. Trends in Chronic Absenteeism Rates (Nevada State Report Card Data)*](image)

- *Note: the state reported a rate of "<5" for 59 of the 323 schools with matched chronic absenteeism data across years. Rather than treating them as missing, these schools were included in the analyses with a rate of 0.92 (5 minus a quarter standard deviation of the rate across schools).*

**MATHEMATICS AND ELA PERFORMANCE**

Data on students’ performance in the Grades 3-8 mathematics and ELA state tests were collected and analyzed. Test requirements were waived in 2019-20, so data are not presented for that year. These analyses included a smaller set of schools that served grades 3-8.

- Figures 21 and 22 show sharp declines in proficiency rates from 2018-19 to 2020-21 across the board; proficiency rates have slightly increased since then but have not yet reached prepandemic levels.
- Results also show that higher-implementing schools had lower declines from 2018-19 to 2022-23 than lower-implementing schools.
Figure 21. Math Proficiency Rates (Nevada State Report Card Data)

- Higher-implementing schools (N=64)
- Lower-implementing schools (N=90)

Percentage Point Change (2018-19 to 2022-23):
- 8.6
- 9.7

Figure 22. ELA Proficiency Rates (Nevada State Report Card Data)

- Higher-implementing schools (N=66)
- Lower-implementing schools (N=98)

Percentage Point Change (2018-19 to 2022-23):
- 9.8
- 10.6
• **DROP OUT RATES**

Dropout data were collected and analyzed for participating and non-participating schools; only middle schools and high schools with matched data across five years were included in this analysis. As shown in Figure 23, dropout rates have fluctuated over time for lower-implementing schools (with an overall drop from 4.2% in 2018-19 to 3.5% in 2022-23; whereas the rate for higher-implementing schools has remained constant at 3.3%.

![Figure 23. Dropout Rates (Nevada State Report Card Data)](image)

*Note: the state reported a dropout rate of “< 5” for 59 of the 323 schools with matched data across years. Rather than treating them as missing, these schools were included in the analyses with a rate of 2.25825 (5 minus a quarter standard deviation across schools).*

• **SCHOOL DISCIPLINE.**

Nevada state recently changed how discipline data are collected and reported; therefore, only 2022-23 results are presented in this section. Results show that higher-implementing schools outperformed lower-implementing schools on most measures, including the average number of incidents including Weapons, Violence, and Use/Possession of Use/Possession of Controlled Substances (Figure 24).
Figure 24. Trends in Disciplinary Incidents Related to Weapons, Violence, and Use/ Possession of Alcoholic Beverages and Controlled Substances (State Report Card Data)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>All Incidents Including Weapons</th>
<th>Higher-implementing schools (N=80)</th>
<th>Lower-implementing schools (N=120)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Higher-Implementing Schools</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower-Implementing Schools</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>All Incidents Including Violence</th>
<th>Higher-implementing Schools (N=80)</th>
<th>Lower-implementing schools (N=120)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Higher-Implementing Schools</td>
<td>29.3</td>
<td>36.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower-Implementing Schools</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>All Incidents Including Use of Alcoholic Beverages</th>
<th>Higher-implementing schools (N=80)</th>
<th>Lower-implementing schools (N=120)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Higher-Implementing Schools</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower-Implementing Schools</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>All Incidents Including Possession of Alcoholic Beverages</th>
<th>Higher-implementing schools (N=80)</th>
<th>Lower-implementing schools (N=120)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Higher-Implementing Schools</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower-Implementing Schools</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>All Incidents Including Use of Controlled Substances</th>
<th>Higher-implementing schools (N=80)</th>
<th>Lower-implementing schools (N=120)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Higher-Implementing Schools</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>12.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower-Implementing Schools</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>All Incidents Including Possession of Controlled Substances</th>
<th>Higher-implementing schools (N=80)</th>
<th>Lower-implementing schools (N=120)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Higher-Implementing Schools</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>13.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower-Implementing Schools</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Results also show that higher-implementing schools outperformed lower-implementing schools on all measures associated with bullying, cyberbullying, and race discrimination (Figure 25).

Figure 25. Trends in Incidents Related to Bullying, Cyberbullying, and Race Discrimination (State Report Card Data)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bullying</th>
<th>Incidents Reported</th>
<th>Incidents Confirmed</th>
<th>Suspensions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Higher-Implementing Schools</td>
<td>25.3</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower-Implementing Schools</td>
<td>33.8</td>
<td>16.5</td>
<td>9.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cyberbullying</th>
<th>Incidents Reported</th>
<th>Incidents Confirmed</th>
<th>Suspensions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Higher-Implementing Schools</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower-Implementing Schools</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race Discrimination</th>
<th>Incidents Reported</th>
<th>Incidents Confirmed</th>
<th>Suspensions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Higher-Implementing Schools</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower-Implementing Schools</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Pershing County School District (PCSD) is a small rural district in Lovelock, Nevada, with two elementary schools, a middle school, and a high school. PCSD was awarded both the Project AWARE and SCT grants in 2014, focusing on creating a multi-tiered system of supports for mental and behavioral support for students. Implementation began in 2015, with the two elementary schools joining the first implementation cohort, followed by the middle school in 2016 and the high school in 2017.

Results from the DSI revealed that, overall, PCSD has vastly increased their capacity to implement MTSS in recent years. As shown in Figure 26 below, from 2020 to 2023, PCSD experienced positive gains in all but one area assessed, with the largest gains observed for Policy (from 30% to 70%), Coaching (from 62% to 93%), and Funding & Alignment (from 68% to 93%).

Since the onset of the grant, the number of students being identified for Tier 2 and 3 interventions has increased considerably. In the 2015-16 school year, no interventions were available for students struggling with mental and/or behavioral health challenges. As the two elementary schools began implementing Tier 2, only 6% of students were identified for Tier 2, yet 9% were identified for Tier 3 interventions provided through Project AWARE. In the 2018-19 school year, students identified for Tier 2 interventions grew to 33% of students being identified for support, and students being identified for Tier 3 had decreased to 5% of students. In the 2022-23 school year, 10% of students were identified for Tier 2 services and 10% for Tier 3 services.
Pershing County School District has continued strengthening its mental health services for students. PCSD hosted three mental health awareness events in 2022-23 to increase parental engagement district-wide and to be culturally responsive to the needs of the Latinx community and the Native American community (separate events were held). The PCSD MTSS team presented at a statewide MTSS event (at the Governor’s mansion). The district continues to have strong partnerships with Rural Mental Health, Lovelock Physician’s Center, Juvenile Probation, the Lovelock Paiute Tribe, the Frontier Community Coalition, and the UNR PBIS-TA Center. PCSD also continued its partnership with Zephyr Wellness, in which ARP funding paid for two clinicians and an intern to provide Tier 2 and Tier 3 interventions. At Tier 3, 93% of students made short-term goal progress and 71% made long-term goal progress.

At the middle school and high school level, all students participate in an annual suicide prevention training, and parents can have students screened for depression. The number of students screened for depression has steadily increased. In 2016, 15% of students were screened for depression. In 2018, the number of students screened for depression rose to 38%, and since 2019, the number of students screened for depression hovers around 50%.

According to interviews with school personnel, Pershing County has made great strides in integrating mental health services into their schools. Interviewed staff expressed great satisfaction at being able to identify and meet the needs of their students and indicated that the stigma around mental health has decreased substantially. As noted by administrators who have lived in Pershing their whole lives, mental health services have become, “somewhat normalized and it has been a very healthy thing for our community.” And school employees were pleased to see the progress over the years, noting that “the system that has been put into place here has really changed the way things are done in this community.”

Overall, results indicate that students in Pershing County have improved in their Social and Emotional Learning (SEL) skills competencies in all categories measured. As shown in Figure 27, in 2022-23, the largest decreases in the percentage of students needing instruction from pre- to post were in composite scores (decrease of 31 percentage points), goal-directed behavior (decrease of 30 percentage points), and personal responsibility (26 percentage points).

![Figure 27. Change in Social & Emotional Competencies](image)
In 2022-23, the Nevada MTSS project completed its fourth year of the five-year grant cycle. During that year, the initiative offered 49 trainings and other coaching supports to 202 schools in eight participating districts across the state. The Nye school district began their trainings in the summer of 2023. Evaluation findings continue to show growth in many areas, both at the state and school/district levels.

Throughout the grant, state capacity for MTSS implementation has increased considerably. Nevada state scored the highest on Training and Local Implementation Demonstrations. The State Leadership Team (SLT) continued to meet throughout the school year, and all 100% of SLT members completing a spring survey reported better coordination and alignment at the state level due to this initiative. Several challenges were also identified, including needing more academic support, buy-in from district and school personnel, and educator shortages to conduct the work. Moving forward, the project and the SLT should continue to provide leadership and devise more opportunities to increase state capacity, particularly in areas rated lowest in the SSFI: Workforce Development and Stakeholder Engagement. Furthermore, as the grant nears the end of the cycle, the state should continue to secure funding to sustain these efforts in 2024-25 and beyond.

Participating districts also continued to build their capacity to implement MTSS in their schools. Over the grant, the most significant gains were observed in Training, Funding & Alignment, and Policy. Furthermore, district and school personnel participating in the trainings were very satisfied with all aspects of the PD and reported considerable gains in their content knowledge around MTSS and PBIS implementation; 96% of district and school staff participating in the trainings also noted that these opportunities positively impacted their knowledge, skills, and future practices. The District Leadership Teams indicated that the initiative had the greatest impact on districts and schools’ capacity and readiness to implement MTSS, using evidence-based practices and valid tools and processes to support MTSS implementation, and using data for decision-making. Moving forward, the MTSS initiative should continue to work closely with districts and provide additional supports, particularly in areas where districts are struggling, including Workforce Capacity and Local Implementation Demonstrations, secondary-level implementation, and opioid abuse prevention and mitigation strategies.

When looking at trends over the last few years in student outcomes, results show that schools across the board are still struggling to reach pre-pandemic levels concerning school attendance, academic performance, and dropout rates. Yet, higher-implementing schools had better trends than lower-implementing schools in key areas such as school attendance, chronic absenteeism, and discipline/behaviors. These results indicate a need for continued support and implementation of academic, social-emotional, and behavioral interventions in Nevada schools.