



Individual TFI Results

School: Independence HS

Date of TFI: 3/12/2018

CLS Coach: Christine Fonseca

Date of Action Plan Meeting: 5/2/2018

Site Trends and Recommendations:

- Excellent work with Tiers 2-3
- Consistent with Tier 1
- Share maj/min with parents
- Focus on data problem solving at Tier 1

TIER I				
ITEM	2015-16 Score (0, 1, 2)	2016-17 Score (0, 1, 2)	2017-18 Score (0, 1, 2)	Notes
1.1 Team Composition	2	2	2	All team members required attend meeting 80% of the time!
1.2 Team Operating Procedures	1	1	2	Great job defining roles and using action plans!
1.3 Behavioral Expectations	2	1	2	RISE acronym; majority of staff can list expectations!
1.4 Teaching Expectations	2	2	2	Excellent job on student-led monthly themed lessons!
1.5 Problem Behavior Definitions	1	1	1	Great flowchart! Define minor behaviors more specifically and share with parents
1.6 Discipline Policies	2	2	2	Excellent job with preventative and restorative process including RP questions, informal circles and reflections!
1.7 Professional Development	1	2	2	Great job with 4 core feature process!

1.8 Classroom Procedures	2	1	1	The majority of classrooms have Evidence Based Practices in physical layout of classroom, routines, and supervision Culture and climate development is in progress
1.9 Feedback and Acknowledgment	2	2	2	Great job implementing your acknowledgement system!
1.10 Faculty Involvement	1	2	2	SAS is used; Great job sharing data monthly!
1.11 Student/Family/Community/ Involvement	2	2	2	Excellent job eliciting feedback from parent center and school site council
1.12 Discipline Data	2	2	2	SHAPE data is used
1.13 Data-based Decision Making	1	2	1	Data is used but not for action planning Minutes should include evidence of planning around data used in tier 1
1.14 Fidelity Data	2	2	2	Great job using TIC and TFI results to guide conversations
1.15 Annual Evaluation	2	2	1	Great job sharing TFI results with staff Share TFI results with parents
TOTAL SCORE TIER I -	83%	87%	87%	
TIER II				
ITEM	2015-16 Score (0, 1, 2)	2016-17 Score (0, 1, 2)	2017-18 Score (0, 1, 2)	Notes
2.1 Team Composition	2	2	2	Good team development and attendance
2.2 Team Operating Procedures	2	2	2	Good teaming structures in place
2.3 Screening	2	2	2	Good process in place for screening
2.4 Request for Assistance	1	2	2	request process in place
2.5 Options for Tier II Interventions	2	2	2	Good menu of options
2.6 Tier II Critical Features	2	2	2	all interventions have core features; increase feedback loop with students; consider formalizing CICO

2.7 Practices Matched to Student Need	1	2	2	matching to need process in place
2.8 Access to Tier I Supports	2	2	2	connected to SWPBIS
2.9 Professional Development	2	2	2	Good PD that include teaching relevant staff about interventions
2.10 Level of Use	2	1	1	need student response rates/decision rules
2.11 Student Performance Data	2	2	2	good data based decisions and progress monitoring in place
2.12 Fidelity Data	0	0	1	one formalized fidelity check process; need to develop self-eval process
2.13 Annual Evaluation	2	2	2	Shared with families/community
TOTAL SCORE TIER II –	86%	88%	92%	

TIER III				
ITEM	2015-16 Score (0, 1, 2)	2016-17 Score (0, 1, 2)	2017-18 Score (0, 1, 2)	Notes
3.1 Team Composition	n/a	n/a	2	Combined with T2; good attendance
3.2 Team Operating Procedures	n/a	n/a	2	Good procedures in place
3.3 Screening	n/a	n/a	2	Good process with multiple data sources
3.4 Student Support Team	n/a	n/a	1	Informal SST process; not yet developing plans consistently enough to evaluate correctly (need more than 4 plans developed through SST)
3.5 Staffing	n/a	n/a	2	SSW in place to support T3 development
3.6 Student/Family/Community Involvement	n/a	n/a	1	District SSW in place to assist with linkage; not yet developing plans consistently enough to evaluate correctly (need more than 4 plans developed through SST)
3.7 Professional Development	n/a	n/a	2	Training in place for SSW; training at site level for process (T2 and T3)

3.8 Quality of Life Indicators	n/a	n/a	0	not yet developing plans consistently enough to evaluate correctly (need more than 4 plans developed through SST).
3.9 Academic, Social, and Physical Indicators	n/a	n/a	0	not yet developing plans consistently enough to evaluate correctly (need more than 4 plans developed through SST).
3.10 Hypothesis Statement	n/a	n/a	0	not yet developing plans consistently enough to evaluate correctly (need more than 4 plans developed through SST).
3.11 Comprehensive Support	n/a	n/a	0	not yet developing plans consistently enough to evaluate correctly (need more than 4 plans developed through SST).
3.12 Formal and Natural Supports	n/a	n/a	0	not yet developing plans consistently enough to evaluate correctly (need more than 4 plans developed through SST).
3.13 Access to Tier I and Tier II Supports	n/a	n/a	0	not yet developing plans consistently enough to evaluate correctly (need more than 4 plans developed through SST).
3.14 Data Systems	n/a	n/a	1	Data is being collected, however structures not in place fully yet (including writing plans and holding fidelity meetings)
3.15 Data-Based Decision Making	n/a	n/a	0	very Informal process in place; need to solidify
3.16 Level of Use	n/a	n/a	0	Not currently writing plans universally; not servicing 1-5%
3.17 Annual Evaluation	n/a	n/a	1	Baseline year; not yet developing action plans or sharing results
TOTAL SCORE TIER II –	n/a	n/a	41%	