|  |
| --- |
| ***Evaluation and Monitoring Progress: Tips*** |

When looking at your system of data collection around your Tier 2 programming, consider these questions:

1. How are you collecting data for each intervention used at your school? Data should be focused on the skills being taught and the student being able to generalize them. There are many existing data collection strategies and tools to consider. For example:
	1. Look for and use data collection tools included in any structured, packaged Tier 2 intervention.
	2. Other common tools to collect data before, during-, and after a Tier 2 intervention:
		1. Daily point cards/progress reports
		2. Student and/or teachers surveys
		3. Office Discipline Referrals
		4. Goal Attainment Scale/ Individualized Behavior Rating Scale Tool (IBRST)
		5. Participation points in group activity
		6. Student completion of assigned tasks within/after Tier 2 lesson
		7. Observation of student(s) within/after Tier 2 lesson
2. How can technology be used to support your data collection system? Determine computer application to use to track student progress. For example, consider how you can use…
	1. Excel files
	2. I-tracker features
	3. Other programs like Google documents (see district policies)
3. What are your IN, ON, OUT decision rules for your interventions? They should be tied to the outcomes you want for your students and be data-based. For example, consider:
	1. Number or percentage of points earned on Daily Point Cards
	2. Number of total or certain ODRs student receives
	3. Number of points for engagement in intervention (e.g., PEERS®)
	4. Scores on pre and post surveys with student, staff, and/or families
4. How can you track the overall effectiveness of your Tier 2 programming? For example, consider:
	1. Having intervention coordinators provide intervention overviews monthly that include data summaries (or some statement like this. I worry that “overview” could be interpreted as “things are going well.”
	2. Utilizing the Intervention Tracking Tool (Delawarepbs.org)

|  |
| --- |
| Tier 2/Tier 3 (Secondary/Tertiary) Interventions Tracking Tool |

**School Name:**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Interventions | Check-in Check-out (CICO) | Social/Academic Instructional Groups | Simple Tier 2 Interventions with indiv. features (e.g. CnC) | Simple Function-based Interventions  | Complex/Multiple-life -domain FBA/BIP  | Wraparound Support |
| # Students Participating | # Students Responding | # Students Participating | # Students Responding | # Students Participating | # Students Responding | # Students Participating | # Students Responding | # Students Participating | # Students Responding | # Students Participating | # Students Responding |
| July |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| August |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| September |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| October |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| November |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| December |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| January |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| February |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| March |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| April |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| May |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| June |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

**Definition of response** (Please list below how your school defines ‘response’ at each of the six levels of intervention):

Responding to Check-in Check-out (CICO):

Responding to Social/Academic Instructional Groups:

Responding to Simple Tier 2 Interventions with individual features (Check-N-Connect, etc.):

Responding to Simple Function-based Interventions:

Responding to a Complex/Multiple-life -domain FBA/BIP:

Responding to Wraparound Support:

*Illinois PBIS Network: Tertiary Demo Document: Draft 05.19.08*

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Tier 2 Intervention Tracking Tool** | **School:** **SAMPLE SCHOOL** | **SY:****2014-15154201-15** |
|   |
| **Directions:** On a monthly basis, please track the # of students participating and positively responding to each intervention. Calculate the corresponding **% Responding** and **%Not Responding** and determine which interventions should be celebrated and/or examined more carefully. ***Please leave columns without data blank.*** |
| **Interventions:**  | **#1: Check In - Check Out (CICO)** | **#2: MENTORING PROGRAM A** | **#3: MENTORING PROGRAM B** | **#4: Academic Remediation – READING and PHONICS**  | **#5: CREDIT RECOVERY PROGRAM** |
| **Months** | # Students Participating | # Students Responding | **% Responding** | **% Not Responding** | # Students Participating | # Students Responding | **% Responding** | **% Not Responding** | # Students Participating | # Students Responding | **% Responding** | **% Not Responding** | # Students Participating | # Students Responding | **% Responding** | **% Not Responding** | # Students Participating | # Students Responding | **% Responding** | **% Not Responding** |
| September | 14 | 8 | **57%** | **43%** | 33 | 22 | **67%** | **33%** |  |  |  |  | 114 | 24 | **21%** | **79%** | 66 | 64 | **97%** | **3%** |
| October | 7 | 4 | **57%** | **43%** | 38 | 29 | **76%** | **24%** |  |  |  |  | 173 | 43 | **25%** | **75%** | 68 | 61 | **90%** | **10%** |
| November | 27 | 21 | **78%** | **22%** | 49 | 33 | **67%** | **33%** | 11 | 8 | **73%** | **27%** | 179 | 90 | **50%** | **50%** | 75 | 71 | **95%** | **5%** |
| December | 31 | 26 | **84%** | **16%** | 51 | 39 | **76%** | **24%** | 14 | 9 | **64%** | **36%** | 183 | 93 | **51%** | **49%** | 79 | 73 | **92%** | **8%** |
| January | 33 | 29 | **88%** | **12%** | 55 | 41 | **75%** | **25%** | 14 | 11 | **79%** | **21%** | 184 | 98 | **53%** | **47%** | 80 | 76 | **95%** | **5%** |
| February | 33 | 31 | **94%** | **6%** | 55 | 46 | **84%** | **16%** | 16 | 11 | **69%** | **31%** | 176 | 103 | **59%** | **41%** | 83 | 80 | **96%** | **4%** |
| March  | 25 | 22 | **88%** | **12%** | 55 | 51 | **93%** | **7%** | 17 | 14 | **82%** | **18%** | 189 | 107 | **57%** | **43%** | 83 | 80 | **96%** | **4%** |
| April | 35 | 30 | **86%** | **14%** | 49 | 44 | **90%** | **10%** | 17 | 16 | **94%** | **6%** | 193 | 111 | **58%** | **42%** | 83 | 82 | **99%** | **1%** |
| May | 27 | 21 | **78%** | **22%** | 45 | 39 | **87%** | **13%** | 15 | 11 | **73%** | **27%** | 181 | 119 | **66%** | **34%** | 75 | 70 | **93%** | **7%** |
| June | 27 | 24 | **89%** | **11%** | 40 | 37 | **93%** | **8%** | 12 | 11 | **92%** | **8%** | 170 | 103 | **61%** | **39%** | 74 | 72 | **97%** | **3%** |

**Team conversations per month:**

1. Which intervention(s) meet the criteria for an effective intervention (70% or more students are responding to the intervention)?
	* Next Steps: The team with administration may want to publicly acknowledge this positive trend and/or those involved.
2. Which intervention(s) do/es not meet the criteria for effective intervention (less than 70% students are responding to the intervention)?
	* Next Steps: The team with administration should problem-solve around these interventions. See list of possible problem-solving questions.

