

Monitoring MTSS Implementation Progress and Outcomes Q&A

Brian Gaunt

University of South Florida, MTSS Inter-Project Coordinator

Question:

When I think about the involvement of threat assessment teams at higher tiers - does it make sense to involve, for example, school security at a tier one level with certain data so there aren't as many kids moving to those higher levels? We often think of these individuals for responding to negative situations rather than mitigating them, or am I not understanding tiers? If you wait to look at discipline data, is it really too late? (Tiffany C.)

Answer:

When thinking of where to assign responsibilities for personnel on campus, I recommend thinking of what "category" of service they provide. In your example, you're highlighting safety/school climate in my opinion. For any categories of services that your school(s) provide, think about how each service type can exist in all three tiers. Tier 1 being about prevention, then yes, I do think having security personnel and relevant stakeholders (those who provide security and those who receive security) have a voice to talk about (a) what prevention measures should be used in the school; (b) how fidelity of the safety (or school climate) practices will be measured and monitored; (c) what data sources will be used to know that the majority of students (i.e., ~80%+) are behaving safely or acting in a manner in alignment with school-wide behavioral/social-emotional expectations.

By the way, your view on this is "spot-on" ...Tier 1 should involve all personnel in my opinion. Just note that sometimes personnel may act as consultants to other adults rather than work directly with students at Tier 1 (e.g., speech-language teacher working with KG PLC to infuse language-based instruction within early reading lesson plans for general education students).

Also, your last comment about looking at discipline data...you may indeed want to look at other (earlier perhaps) forms of data (e.g., classroom minors, referrals to school nurse, school climate surveys, emotional screeners, etc.).



Question:

Please address how MTSS can address the needs of advanced learners who are not learning in the Tier 1 general education instructional program. (Jody H.)

Answer:

I'll try to answer your question here in two parts: (1) ensuring high performing students are matched to rigorous instructional experiences to promote learning growth (i.e., links to your school's efforts to meet school grade criteria based on "growth-estimates"; and (2) going beyond the "learning standards". I'll start with the second one.

- (regarding the 2nd point above) High performing students often, by name, will perform sufficiently to demonstrate learning the grade level learning standards, and perform adequately enough to demonstrate proficiency on your benchmark and state assessments. So, if this is the case for your high-performing students, what "other" data will you look to for pushing "growth"? Consider learning theory here – students who are already highly accurate (and fluent) in performing on tests, can be pushed by having to teach those skills/knowledge areas to other students. PALs is an example of evidence-based peer-peer instructional models that (a) pushes growth with high-performing students because they have to teach to their peers, and (b) lower performing peers receive maximum ratio of attention, mentoring, and coaching to boost engagement and higher learning. Win-win, right?
- (regarding the first point above) Many schools within a school district may have Baccalaureate curricula (IB schools) which could serve as a model for how you might provide individualized instructional supports to these students. Working with higher performing students at Tier 2 and Tier 3 could be seen as moving from class-wide instructional planning to a smaller group and individualized learning. You could also characterize Tier 2 and Tier 3 for these students has increasing the amount of independent learning and accountability for learning that students are given. Finally, think about larger applied projects (involving multiple learning standards) for demonstration of learning rather than paper-pencil tests.

Question:

How was implementation fidelity measured? Learning Walk data or??? (Jeanie B.)

Answer:

I'm assuming you are referring to the case study that was used in the presentation. For measuring PBIS Tier 1 implementation fidelity, the Benchmarks of Quality BOQ, & school walk-through observations were primarily used. For measuring fidelity of implementing their actions that the school took to improve their PBIS system, different methods were used but basically involved monitoring that actions in their plan were completed (i.e., % of action items completed).

