Tiered Onsite Evaluation Tool

Minnesota Person-Centered Positive Support Practices
November, 2020

Citation for this Publication
Freeman, R., Simacek, J., Kramme, J., Duchelle, N., Flicker, E., O'Nell, S., & Amado, A. (2020). *Tiered Onsite Evaluation Tool (TOET)*. Minneapolis, MN: Institute on Community Integration. University of Minnesota.

Funding for this tool was provided in part through Grant #90RT5019-01-01 to the Research Center on Community Living and in collaboration with the Minnesota Department of Human Services (MN DHS). The University of Minnesota undertaking projects under government sponsorship are encouraged to express freely their findings and conclusions. Points of view or opinions do not, therefore necessarily represent official NIDILRR or MN DHS policy.

Table of Contents

Freeman, R., Simacek, J., Kramme, J., Duchelle, N., Flicker, E., O'Nell, S., & Amado, A. (2020). *Tiered onsite evaluation tool*. Minneapolis, MN: Institute on Community Integration. University of Minnesota.

Purpose

The purpose of the Tiered Onsite Evaluation Tool (TOET) is to provide professionals with a tool for measuring fidelity of implementation at the team level for person-centered practices and positive behavior support. Fidelity of implementation is used to understand whether teams are implementing person-centered practices and positive behavior support using the key principles of those practices (Freeman et al., 2006; Rodgers, LePage, & Freeman, 2016; Smull, Bourne, Sanderson, 2009; Stirk & Sanderson, 2012; Timmons, Freeman, Benway, & Gulaid, 2016). The TOET is intended to be used within a framework of implementation science (Fixsen, Naoom, Blasé, Friedman, & Wallace, 2005). The TOET can be used to: a) improve quality of life for people receiving supports, b) encourage relationship building, c) learn and practice social and emotional wellness, d) respond to challenges using conflict resolution, empathy, and culturally responsive practices, and e) help teams to design settings where all people feel respected and experience positive recognition and feedback. The implementation of person-centered and positive behavior support practices is based on the research and technical assistance developed by positive behavioral interventions and supports (PBIS) in schools (Bradshaw, Mitchell, & Leaf, 2010; Horner, 2020; Horner et al, 2009; Sugai et al., 2005) funded by the Office of Special Education, and by research on implementation science (Fixsen, Blasé, & Van Dyke, 2019). The key features related to PBIS in schools were adapted to address the unique systems, contextual issues, and language associated with organizations who serve people receiving Home and Community-Based Services (Rodgers et al., 2016; Timmons et al., 2016).

Teams work on a continuum of strategies that address universal or Tier One strategies for promoting person-centered environments and encouraging positive social and communication skills among staff members and persons receiving services. Tier Two processes are used to monitor quality of life and social interaction patterns in order to address issues for people related to quality of life, wellness, and social interaction patterns as early as possible when challenges arise. Tier Three processes include developing the expertise internally (or via regional collaboration) including monitoring systems within organizations so that any person not benefiting from primary or secondary tiers can access intensive positive behavior support as well as other evidence-based practices that improve quality of life. For more information about three-tiered implementation of person-centered practices and PBS, please review the references and resources at the end of this document.

The TOET fidelity of implementation measure guides teams implementing *Tier One* universal person-centered and positive behavior support (PBS) practices. Tier One strategies involve using a team-based approach to implement person-centered strategies for relationship building across settings, establish strategies for promoting positive social skill development by staff members, people supported, family or guardians, and community members, creating opportunities to recognize and celebrate positive social interactions, and establish data-based decision making. A key component of Tier One includes developing a process for monitoring quality of life and social interactions on an ongoing basis in order to identify people who would benefit from targeted, group, and/or simple individualized strategies for improving quality of life and decreasing social interaction challenges. Although the current TOET focuses on the Tier One level, future versions of the TOET will focus on monitoring fidelity at the Tier Two and Tier Three.

Who should use the TOET?

While a number of human services systems can use the TOET for implementation purposes, this measure aligns best with organizations supporting people in residential and employment-based settings. However, the TOET has been used by a variety of human service organizations including:

- Organizations providing family-based supports,
- Mental health service provider organizations,
- State agencies,
- Public health organizations,

- Counties, and
- County collaboratives in rural settings.

Additional guidance for adapting the TOET for use by county teams, public health, mental health, and family-based supports are currently underway.

How was the TOET developed?

The TOET is based on similar fidelity of implementation tools designed in PBIS research and technical assistance (Algozzine et al., 2014; Kincaid, Childs, & George, 2005; Sugai, Lewis-Palmer, Todd, & Horner, 2001) with modifications made to address the types of organizations involved. Two fidelity of implementation tools in particular were used as a guide for the design of the TOET: 1) the School-wide Evaluation Tool (Sugai, et al., 2001) and 2) the Tiered Fidelity Inventory (Algozzine et al., 2014). These PBIS measures have been evaluated for psychometric effectiveness and are widely used in PBS to measure implementation (Horner et al., 2004; McIntosh et al., 2017). The TOET is in the process of being finalized and assessed for psychometric effectiveness with assistance from experts in the field of PBS and person-centered practices as well as state, regional, and local professionals who are piloting its use.

What is the cost and time involved to complete the TOET

There is no cost to access this tool for evaluation. However, it is recommended that teams use the TOET with guidance from someone with experience implementing person-centered practices and positive behavior support. Completing an onsite TOET can take 2-3 hours with the organization-wide team meeting together in order to complete the interviews and review products and documents. Direct observations vary depending upon how the team decides to collect the data and how large implementation efforts are within an organization. There are a number of ways in which the team can use the TOET to guide implementation.

1. **Annual Evaluation:** Ideally, the TOET is completed annually using a facilitator who is external to the organization. This allows organizations to complete an objective evaluation of their team's implementation efforts. Facilitators can be recruited from other organizations within a region who are involved in similar implementation efforts, trainers may guide the

external evaluation, county, state, or others familiar with the TOET also may be recruited to assist an organization in completing an annual evaluation process. One way to decrease costs related to completing the TOET is to "trade" a facilitator with a nearby regional partner organization.

Preparation: The team decides who should attend the annual onsite assessment. Although the types of people participating may vary, full team members are encouraged to actively participate. Some organizations bring the entire team together for the annual onsite TOET. Other organizations choose a subset of the full team due to resource challenges. The TOET works best when organizations provide documentation as evidence to support their efforts in particular items. For this reason, planning ahead is essential to give teams optimal time to prepare for the TOET meeting.

The following timeline is used for scheduling the TOET administration:

- **Six to eight weeks in advance of TOET administration session:** Review documentation that has been created during the year and make sure it is organized for the upcoming onsite evaluation. The team and external facilitators schedule the onsite and consider what materials need to be organized (Appendix B).
  - Meeting date, time & location: __________________________

- **One to two weeks in advance of the TOET administration session:** Confirm the date and location with attendees and remind the team to collect and submit the applicable permanent products.

- **One Week before TOET onsite evaluation:** Team sends the permanent products to the facilitator for review prior to TOET administration session.

- **One to two weeks after the TOET onsite evaluation:** Facilitator summarizes and discusses the results with the team and updates the organization's graph showing fidelity of implementation by subscale.

2. **Self-Assessment:** The TOET can be used as a self-assessment measure that is conducted within the organization with no external facilitator guiding the process. For instance, teams can use the TOET 2-3 times a year during regularly scheduled meetings to guide action planning. Using the TOET as an ongoing self-assessment measure throughout the year can help a team celebrate success and focus on the areas in which additional action planning is necessary. It can be helpful to recruit a team member with more experience in person-centered and PBS practices to guide the team discussion and scoring of the TOET. This option is often used with an annual evaluation process to keep the team focused and moving forward and can be especially useful in the first year of implementation.

3. **Tele-Administration:** Teams can complete the TOET via tele-connection technology (e.g., video conferencing) with an external evaluator or informally with a colleague from another organization to reduce travel and onsite costs. This option can help support teams located in rural areas when there aren't other organizations nearby that would allow teams to exchange facilitators. During the first TOET events, onsite support is helpful for establishing a direct observation system. When this model is used, it can be helpful to have the team prepare de-identified data and supporting evidence documents in an electronic folder (e.g., BOX, Google Drive, etc.) and put documents in sub-folders that are labeled by the TOET item number.

How should our team prepare for the TOET?

TOET assessment is based on the team's ability to share evidence of Tier One implementation efforts. Examples of evidence at Tier One includes:

- Meeting agendas and meeting minutes,
- Policy and procedural documentation,
- Data collection strategies and summarized data
- Calendars for organizing training materials

- Training materials, board presentations, and
- Newsletters with information related to the process.

A complete list of these examples of evidence to collect is in Appendix A. Teams collect the documentation for the TOET in an electronic folder or with a team notebook (e.g., a three-ring binder with divider tabs separated by TOET number or a shared drive with separate sub-folders labeled by TOET item number). Keeping the information up-to-date makes it easier for the team since it decreases the need to prepare later.

How do I score the TOET?

Scoring the TOET involves totaling the score on each item by the total number of points possible. Facilitators score the TOET and calculate the percentage from the points awarded divided by the total points possible. A scoring system including criteria tailored for each item assists the facilitator in scoring a "0" (not in place), "1" (some evidence available), and "3" (fully implementing). Teams that score above 70% on each tier may be approaching full implementation although there is no evidence yet to confirm this theory and more research is needed in this area.

Additional data collection related to implementation

There are two sections in the Appendix that are used to collect evidence related to implementation. Teams that have been implementing for a longer period of time are encouraged to increase the type of evidence that demonstrates Tier 1 implementation. The tools in the Appendix include the Capacity Measurement Tool (Appendix B), Direct Observation (Appendix C), and Annual Informal Interviews (Appendix D).

The goal of direct observation is to confirm there are objective Tier One changes occurring within the organization. The plan for collecting these data need to be tailored to the unique context of the human service organization. Guidance from someone with expertise is helpful since each organization needs to tailor the direct observation process. A person with experience implementing person-centered and positive behavior support practices can guide the team in identifying how to: 1) create a plan for direct observation, 2) write or adapt definitions using tools and resources available on MNPSP.ORG, and 3) share examples of how to begin using direct observation.

Universal Primary Person-Centered Practices and Positive Behavior Support

Subscale: Team Action Planning and Stakeholder Involvement

Feature	Possible Data Sources	Scoring Criteria
1.1 Team Composition: Working team composition includes administration, key contact(s), universal person-centered (PC) coaches, and practice expertise, PBS expertise, human resources, management, and direct staff	• Organizational chart or documentation • Meeting Minutes • Interviews	0 = Team exists but roles are not represented 1 = Team exists but some key team members do not attend, or attend less than 80% of the meetings 2 = Team members representing key roles attend over 80% of meetings
1.2 Team Effectiveness: meets regularly and has at least four effective meeting processes that include: • Regular monthly meetings • Meeting minutes/agenda • Defined roles • Action plan in place	• Agendas, meeting minutes • Roles and people clearly documented • Action Plan • Observation	0 = Team does not have the four effective meeting processes in place 1 = Team meetings include at least two of the four effective meeting processes 2=Team includes all four meeting processes
1.3 Stakeholder Involvement: System in place for involving all stakeholders in the planning process (self-advocates, community members, other agency representation, family members)	• Meeting minutes from staff and team meetings • Email and correspondence • Action Plan • Opinion surveys • Feedback loop (newsletter, annual report with public comment option)	0 = No evidence that stakeholders are involved 1 = Some evidence that stakeholders are involved but in an informal manner with no formal ongoing process for involvement 2=Formal meetings are scheduled in advance and documentation is gathered by team to use in ongoing action planning
1.4 Consensus Building and Staff Decision Making: Strategies for staff member involvement are used to build consensus and involvement (regular agenda items in staff	• Meeting minutes from staff and team meetings • Results of voting documented • Staff meetings • Action Plan	0 = No evidence that readiness assessment was conducted or staff members are involved beyond team 1 = Some evidence that staff

meetings, surveys or other strategies for gathering information)		members are involved but this has occurred in an informal manner with no formal ongoing process for involvement 2=Formal meeting processes are scheduled in advance and documentation is gathered by team describing how staff members are involved in decision making

Subscale: Universal Person-Centered Practices

Feature	Possible Data Sources	Scoring Criteria
1.5 Organizational Alignment: Vision and mission for organization clearly states person-centered values and/or outcome statements are shared as link to person-centered values	• Vision and mission statements • Action planning tasks used to align vision and mission • Outcome statements and related documents • Units/departments/divisions one-page description to identify their own mission, vision and values statements. Includes everyone in the unit not just team. • Action statements indicating the process for mission and vision revisions organization wide.	0 = no clear alignment of vision or mission statements to person-centered practices and no plan for improvement 1 = Vision and mission do not refer to person-centered practices, but a plan is in place to establish person-centered mission/vision statements or outcomes statements are person-centered. 2 = Vision and mission statement include person-centered language and outcomes aligned with outcome statements and action plan
1.6 Policy Alignment: Policies and procedures addressing person-centered thinking and planning are in place	• Policies and procedures • Evidence that tools are used to support staff or coordinate effective supports • Action plan showing steps to adapt policies and procedures • Action statements indicating the process for mission and vision revisions organizational wide. • Members of team participate in organizational policy change workgroups/committees • Person centered values incorporated into supervisory role: 1:1 meetings, performance reviews, professional advancement and development.	0= No mention of person-centered practices mentioned in policy documents. 1=Some indirect references to person-centered practices are included in at least one document 2 = Policy examples clearly state how person-centered practices are implemented within the organization
1.7 Universal Person-Centered Strategies: Specific person-centered strategies and tools are actively used in at	• Direct Observation data • Coaching and mentoring schedules	0 = There is no evidence that staff members are actively using universal tools

least two observed settings (observations are completed in at least one setting, coaching and mentoring systems are outlined and monitored)	• Profiles are available for staff and people supported • Coach interviews • Examples used at Division/unit meetings; Case Manager meetings with people they support; Trainings/community outreach events; First contact (phone calls, intake, reception, assessment)	1 = Some evidence is available indicating that universal PC tools are used in at least one setting 2 = Universal tools are used across two settings and system is in place for mentoring and coaching staff members
1.8 Active Staff Support: Staff members indicate support for actively using universal person-centered strategies.	• Meeting Minutes • Action Plan • Voting Results	0 = No evidence that staff support person-centered practices 1 = At least two staff indicate support for organization-wide planning is in place 2= Documentation and interviews indicate all staff members in pilot area have had a chance to indicate level of support with 80% or more in favor of PC practices

Subscale: Universal Positive Behavior Support

Feature	Possible Data Sources	Scoring Criteria
1.9 Organizational Policy Alignment: Policies and procedures addressing positive behavior support and describing the importance of building positive social environments that promote higher quality of life for both people supported and staff members within the organization	• Policies and procedures documenting the use of social skills and issues related to improving the quality of the social and physical environment • Action plan showing efforts to adapt policies and procedures to include positive behavior support (PBS) • PBS values incorporated into supervisory role: 1:1 meetings, performance reviews, professional advancement and development. Supervisor documents meetings with staff that shows the use of different values and tools used. • Mission and vision statements include PBS values. • PBS team involved in leadership planning regarding organizational decisions reflected in meeting minutes. • Matrix used to implement positive social strategies and professional values.	0 = There is no evidence that the organization is addressing the need to promote positive social interactions 1 = Some evidence that policies and procedures align with the need for promoting positive social interactions 2 = Policy examples clearly state how PBS is used within the organization to promote quality of life for people supported and staff members
1.10 Positive Social Interactions & Skills: Specific universal PBS strategies are created with the direct involvement of everyone within the setting, and plan for practicing and teaching positive social skills is clearly described. Plan for expanding implementation across organizational settings is documented	• Interviews • Direct observations • Matrix describing important person-centered values and social interactions in specific settings • Written plan for teaching and practicing skills • Calendar schedule for prompting staff to focus on specific person-centered values • Using Matrix during unit/department meetings.	0 = There is no evidence that positive social interactions have been identified, taught, or practiced in any setting 1 = Some evidence shows that positive social interactions are being identified, taught, and practiced 2 = Interviews, observations, and written documentation clearly show that positive social interaction plans are being implemented in at least one setting within the

Freeman, R., Simacek, J., Kramme, J., Duchelle, N., Flicker, E., O'Nell, S., & Amado, A. (2020). *Tiered onsite evaluation tool*. Minneapolis, MN: Institute on Community Integration. University of Minnesota.

	• Regular use of Positive Social Strategies resources (video clips, training tool demos, & practice activities) during unit meetings reflected in meeting minutes. • Sharepoint: "PBS Resource Folder" for all staff to access trainings, tools and other resources.	organization
1.11 Positive Feedback and Acknowledgement: Strategy for recognizing staff and people supported for positive social interactions is articulated and implemented in areas of organization where PBS is implemented	• Interviews • Written plan for recognizing and acknowledging positive social interactions • Action plan describing plan for feedback and acknowledgement • Other documentation is available (website, newsletter, etc.) • Employee of the Month specifically for person centered and positive support accomplishments • Performance review category created • Staff unit meetings acknowledging staff and person's served who exemplify positive support practices. • Thank you cards sent to service providers who exemplify positive supports.	0 = There is no evidence that feedback and acknowledgement is used to support implementation 1 = Some evidence shows that positive feedback and acknowledgements are provided but these strategies are not directly connected to a plan for increasing social interactions 2 = Interviews, observations, and written documentation clearly show that there is a clear plan for providing positive feedback and acknowledgement in areas where PBS is implemented
1.12 Consistent Response to Challenges That Occur: Definitions are in place that clearly outline behaviors that are considered incidents that need to be documented and minor issues that do not require documentation. Strategy for teaching staff members how to respond to minor problems is in place.	• Behavioral definitions • Training materials • Behavior definitions within the Matrix • Code of Conduct Policy • Onboarding training incorporates these definitions and strategies • Organizational process in place defining incidents, conflict and the positive	0 = There is no evidence that definitions and training materials are in place 1 = Some work has been completed to establish behavioral definitions and train staff 2 = The behavioral definitions and training materials are in place with a plan to train all staff members over time

	support response rooted in the culture of trust. • Systematic feedback loop process with positive regard and trust	

Subscale: Cultural Awareness and Competence Strategies

Feature	Possible Data Sources	Scoring Criteria
1.13 Active Recruitment: The organization actively seeks out staff members from diverse backgrounds and promotes cultural competency in hiring practices	• Marketing and recruitment tools • Action Plan	0 = There is no indication that the organization actively recruits people from diverse backgrounds or has an evaluative system for hiring demographics in place. 1 = Some strategies are used for marketing and/or evaluation of the hiring demographics. 2 = There are marketing strategies and ongoing evaluation of demographics of staff members hired.
1.14 Cultural Acceptance: People report that their cultural viewpoints are recognized and celebrated, and ongoing assessment is in place	• Interviews • Surveys • Incident report summaries	0 = There is no indication that the organization assesses perceptions of cultural acceptance 1 = Cultural viewpoints is assessed but the information gathered is informal or limited 2 = A systematic way to gather information about everyone's cultural viewpoints is used, and there are attempts to recognize and celebrate cultures
1.15 Cultural Awareness and Responsiveness: The team works with staff to create ways to recognize all people who make important contributions to the organization	• Interviews • Agenda and events scheduled with staff members • Curriculum for cultural responsiveness in place	0 = There is no indication that the organization has a plan to build cultural awareness and responsiveness 1=People interviewed report that cultural awareness and responsiveness training is addressed but no formal plan for expanding cultural competence is in place 2 = Increasing cultural awareness and responsiveness is

		a priority within the organization, with an action plan in place to increase cultural responsiveness and to promote skills in this area

Subscale: Monitoring Plans and Organization-wide Data for Decision Making

Feature	Possible Data Sources	Scoring Criteria
1.16 Organizational Workforce: Tenure, retention, staff satisfaction data and other related workforce measures are reviewed in team meetings to assess progress	• Meeting minutes • Data summaries • Interviews • Sample of staff satisfaction surveys	0 = There is no indication that the organization is using data related to tenure, retention, or other staffing patterns 1 = Interviews with team members indicate that retention/tenure data are reviewed during team meetings 2 = Meeting minutes, data summaries, and other evidence indicates the team regularly reviews data for decision making
1.17 Data-Based Decision Making: The organization-wide team reviews outcomes associated with effective planning (quality of life, changes in incident reports, 911 calls, injuries, restraint, etc.) on a regular basis to make data-based decisions	• Quality of life surveys, interviews • Incident report data, injuries, etc. • Fidelity data • Meeting minutes • Assessment dashboard • Human Resources hiring data collection process • File Review using regulatory guidelines with information contained in a dashboard to inform organizational decision making.	0 = There is no indication that the team is regularly reviewing data during meetings 1 = Interviews with team members indicate that at least one type of data are reviewed (incidents, county strategic evaluation data, attrition, etc.) 2 = Meeting minutes, data summaries, and other evidence indicates the team regularly reviews data for decision making
1.18 On-Going Monitoring of Fidelity Data: Team reviews fidelity data (self-assessment tools, tiered onsite data) during regular team meetings and makes adjustments according to the data.	• Meeting minutes • Summary of self-assessment and past onsite data	0 = There is no indication that the team is regularly reviewing fidelity data during meetings 1 = Interviews with team members indicate that fidelity data are reviewed during meetings 2 = Meeting minutes, data summaries, and other evidence indicates the team regularly reviews fidelity data for decision making

Freeman, R., Simacek, J., Kramme, J., Duchelle, N., Flicker, E., O'Nell, S., & Amado, A. (2020). *Tiered onsite evaluation tool*. Minneapolis, MN: Institute on Community Integration. University of Minnesota.

1.19 Annual Evaluation: Team conducts an annual summary and review of overall progress each year documenting major accomplishments, data collected, and products developed and disseminated (e.g., summary report or presentation slide deck, newsletter summary and celebration, etc.).	• Meeting minutes • Summary of data collected • Documented changes in action plan linked to review • Evidence that review is shared (newsletter, handouts, awards and recognition, etc.) • Interviews	0 = There is no indication that the team reviews implementation progress annually 1 = Interviews suggest annual evaluation occurs 2 = A summary of annual evaluation data is available in presentations or report form.
1.20 Direct Observation: Team member collects direct observation data in at least two locations quarterly	• Summary of data • Completed observation forms	0 = There is no indication that the team is regularly reviewing observation data during meetings 1 = Interviews suggest observation data are collected 2 = Data collected are organized and available for review with summaries organized for meetings
1.21 Universal Quality of Life Assessment: Team summarizes existing quality of life data to assess universal status within the organization, or uses surveys or other methods to review quality of life across people as part of both ongoing monitoring and as an annual review	• Surveys, interviews, etc. • Other documentation • Quality of life surveys for staff and people supported through agency • Incorporate quality of life measures into current organization-wide data collection methods.	0 = There is no indication that the team is collecting quality of life data 1 = Interviews suggest quality of life data are collected 2 = Data collected are organized and available for review with summaries organized for meetings and summarized annually

Subscale: Support for Staff Learning New Skills

Feature	Possible Data Sources	Scoring Criteria
1.22 Staff Development and Competency-Based Training: Strategies for collecting, summarizing & reviewing data on staff performance across curriculum related to person-centered practices and PBS	• Monitoring systems for staff development • Data summarizing training efforts • Observation data • Case/file reviews or leadership/coach observation with staff • Performance review including survey feedback from peers, partners and person's served • Evidence of competencies being achieved	0 = There is no indication that staff development systems are in place to monitor person-centered thinking/planning and PBS 1= Interviews with staff/records indicate that some staff development is in place for PC practices and PBS 2 = Procedures, competency-based training schedules, and summaries of staff performance data show that both person-centered practices and PBS staff development efforts are in place
1.23 Universal Person-Centered Strategies: Evidence that person-centered strategies are actively used and coaches and other staff receive support learning to integrate strategies and tools into everyday routines and processes	• Schedule of coaching specific staff members • Number of coaches available • Survey results showing perception of coaches using tools • Interviews • Coaching support: coaches community of practice, coaches corner • Sharepoint coaches folders are actively used (use data as to the frequency of access of these resources) • Mentoring: onboarding training and ongoing learning	0 = There is no indication that universal person-centered strategies and tools are actively used 1 = Interviews suggest that staff are receiving active coaching for the use of universal person-centered strategies and tools 2 = Schedules for organizing and monitoring coaching/training of staff members are documented and coaches meet to problem solve and support each other
1.24 Universal Person-Centered Trainers: The organization can access universal person-centered trainers to provide training to staff and community members. Access may be to trainer(s) within organization, or in collaboration with regional partners	• Number of universal person-centered trainers available within organization or regionally • Number of staff receiving universal person-centered training	0 = There is no evidence that the organization can access universal person-centered trainers 1 = Interviews indicate sufficient trainers are available 2 = The organization maintains training for all staff members

		and addresses new staff training for introductory universal person-centered events with 50% of staff actively trained
1.25 Coach Trainers: The organization can access coach trainers (staff who help introduce key concepts and tools) to provide support staff members learning new skills. Access may be to trainer(s) within organization, or in collaboration with regional partners	• Number of coach trainers available within organization or regionally • Types of coaches are identified and defined (person-centered coaches, key contacts, etc.) • Number of coaches trained	0 = There is no evidence that the organization can access Coach Trainers 1 = Interviews indicate sufficient Coach Trainers are available for practices implemented (person-centered, positive behavior support, etc.) 2 = The organization maintains training for coaches and provides evidence that there is an adequate number of coaches available for implementation efforts
1.26 Person-Centered Planners: Organization has access to enough person-centered planners to support people in need of individualized planning processes.	• Number of person-centered plans completed within organization • Number of person-centered plans (either within organization or regionally) • Sharepoint contains list of person-centered planners available and how to access them. • Agency staff know where to find information on how to fund person centered planning services (CBSM, Sharepoint person centered planners folder, agency web based internal resource directory) • Tips and tricks on when a person-centered plan can be useful and how to write plans that are person centered (available on web based internal resource directory)	0 = There is no evidence that the organization can access person-centered planners 1 = Interviews indicate sufficient access to person-centered planners are available for the organization 2 = The organization can access person-centered planning trainers to maintain a sufficient number of planners for the need within the organization
1.27 Positive Behavior Support Facilitation: Organization has access to	• Number of PBS plans completed within organization	0 = There is no evidence that the organization can access PBS Facilitators

enough PBS facilitators to support people in need of individualized planning processes.	• Number of PBS Facilitators (either within organization or regionally) • Sharepoint (or web- based internal resource directory) contains list of PBS facilitators available and how to access • Agency staff know where to find information on how to fund PBS services (CBSM, Sharepoint person centered planners folder, agency web based internal resource directory) • Tips and tricks to identify when more intensive PBS strategies are needed and what those strategies are and where to find them. (available on web based internal resource directory) • File/case note review showing evidence of positive supports at universal level	1 = Interviews indicate sufficient access to PBS Facilitators are available for the organization 2 = The organization can access PBS Facilitator trainers to maintain a sufficient number of PBS Facilitators in the organization or region

Subscale: Visibility

Feature	Possible Data Sources	Scoring Criteria
1.28 Celebration and Information Sharing: Team shares progress and summary data to stakeholders regularly	• Meeting minutes • Newsletters, Website, or other communications • Copies of presentations • Annual report to community. • Internal feedback loop process created to obtain information from stakeholders and community as well as share information with them	0 = No evidence indicates the team has organized opportunities to share information and celebrate successes 1 = Interviews indicate that the team has shared information with some stakeholders 2 = Evidence indicates that the team shares information and celebrates success with all stakeholders regularly
1.29 Introductory Training in Universal PBS Available for Key Stakeholders and Community Members: Staff as well as other stakeholders in the community are introduced to key elements of universal practices (online trainings, presentations, group action planning)	• Presentations • Schedule of PBS trainings • Summary of people trained • Community outreach • Onboarding training • Formal mentoring and consultation system in place • PBS facilitators as coaches	0 = No evidence is available to indicate that the team has organized introductory presentations for staff and other stakeholders 1 = Some evidence is available indicating that staff and other stakeholders have an opportunity to learn about practices 2 = There is a regular schedule or process for presenting information about universal practices to staff members and other stakeholders

Guidance Questions for the TOET Interview

Team Action Planning and Stakeholder Involvement

1.1 Team Composition: Tell us about the members that are currently on your team and who attends the meetings.

1.2 Team Effectiveness: Which meeting processes are in place for your team meetings?

1.3 Stakeholder Involvement: How do you communicate what is happening on your team with self-advocates, community members, staff, families, and others?

1.4 Consensus Building and Staff Decision Making: Tell us what your team has done to assess readiness and build consensus among people at your organization? (e.g., using the Person-Centered Organizational Development Tool)

Universal Person-Centered Practices

1.5 Organizational Alignment: Show us your vision and mission statement. How are they aligned with person-centered values? How are your team's outcome statements aligned with these?

1.6 Policy Alignment: How are person-centered practices evident in your policies and procedures?

1.7 Universal Person-Centered Strategies: How are person-centered strategies used in your organization, and in which settings are they used? Are systems in place for mentoring or coaching staff in these practices?

1.8 Active Staff Support: How have you assessed staff support of person-centered practices in the area(s) where you are implementing?

Universal Positive Behavior Support

1.9 Organizational Policy Alignment: Tell us about your policies and practices for building positive social environments.

1.10 Positive Social Interactions & Skills: Have you identified organizational values and behavioral expectations in any settings in your organization? How do you teach positive social skills, and what is your plan for expanding these skills across the organization?

1.11 Positive Feedback and Acknowledgement: How do you acknowledge the behaviors that you want to see in your organization?

1.12 Consistent Response to Problems That Occur: How do you respond to problems that occur in your organization?

Cultural Awareness and Competence Strategies

1.13 Active Recruitment: Tell us about how you recruit staff, and do you use any targeted marketing strategies to hire staff from diverse backgrounds? If so, tell us about them.

1.14 Cultural Acceptance: How do you assess people's perceptions of cultural acceptance, and how do you use the information you collect? In what ways do you recognize and celebrate cultural diversity?

1.15 Cultural Awareness and Responsiveness: What strategies or training materials do you use to increase cultural awareness and responsiveness?

Monitoring Plans and Organization-wide Data for Decision Making

1.16 Organizational Workforce: Which tenure, retention, and staff satisfaction data about your workforce do you collect and review? What do you do with the data?

1.17 Data-Based Decision Making: How do the data you collect inform your team's practices?

1.18 On-Going Monitoring of Fidelity Data: How does your team use fidelity data? How do these influence your team's practices?

1.19 Annual Evaluation: Tell us about your team's practices to evaluate your progress each year. How do you share this information with people?

1.20 Direct Observation: How does your team use observation data? How are these data summarized?

1.21 Universal Quality of Life Assessment: How does your team use quality of life data? How are these data summarized?

Support for Staff Learning New Skills

1.22 Staff Development and Competency-Based Training: What professional development opportunities are in place for your staff? How is instruction in person-centered practices and positive behavior supports included in these opportunities?

1.23 Universal Person-Centered Strategies: How are coaches involved in supporting learning to integrate person-centered strategies and tools into everyday routines and practices?

1.24 Universal Person-Centered Trainers: Can you access sufficient Person-Centered Trainers for your organization's needs? How many staff have attended universal person-centered training events?

1.25 Coach Trainers: Can you access sufficient Coach Trainers for your organization's needs?

1.26 Person-Centered Planners: Can you access sufficient Person-Centered Planners for your organization's needs?

1.27 Positive Behavior Support Facilitation: Can you access sufficient Positive Behavior Support Facilitators for your organization's needs?

Visibility

1.28 Celebration and Information Sharing: How do you celebrate and share information with stakeholders? When do you do this?

1.29 Introductory Training in Universal PBS Available for Key Stakeholders and Community

Members: What opportunities are there for people across the community to learn about positive support practices that your organization is implementing? What methods do you use for this, and what data do you have on who accesses/attends?

Appendix A: Complete List of Evidence to Collect in Tier 1: Universal Practices

Tier 1 Universal Practices: Products to Collect (consider if the items below applies to your organization's efforts)

- ☐ Your organization's vision and/or mission statement
- ☐ Policies related to person-centered practices and positive behavior support
- ☐ Team action plan
- ☐ Team meeting agendas and meeting minutes from staff and/or team meetings
- ☐ Results of consensus documentation or voting practices
- ☐ Your team's outcome statements
- ☐ Organizational chart and/or documentation of team roles, names of team members documented
- ☐ Appendix B: Team Capacity Measurement Tool
- ☐ Annual informal interviews: Evidence of implementation efforts from interviews with people receiving supports, coaches, PBS facilitators, etc.
- ☐ Evidence of team members' participation in organizational policy change workgroups or committees
- ☐ Evidence of person-centered tools being used
- ☐ Coaching and/or mentoring schedules
- ☐ Person-centered profiles from staff and/or people receiving supports (de-identified, as needed)
- ☐ Training materials used for new staff or ongoing staff development
- ☐ Your organization's matrix (positive behavior support)
- ☐ Units/departments/divisions one-page description to identify their own mission, vision and values statements. Includes everyone in the unit not just the team.
- ☐ Appendix C: Direct Universal Observation Data from Matrix Observations and Trainings (e.g., from telePBS, observations, interviews with employees and/or people served)
- ☐ Onboarding training materials and/or professional development for teaching person-centered positive support practices
- ☐ Written plans for teaching and practices positive social skills; calendar for prompting focus on specific positive support practices
- ☐ Direct support professional (DSP) position descriptions and/or supervisor position descriptions to show person-centered positive support values and practices
- ☐ Marketing and recruitment tools (indicating person-centered practices and/or cultural awareness)
- ☐ Training curricula, agendas, minutes from teaching cultural awareness and competence
- ☐ Cultural awareness and/or diversity data
- ☐ Newsletters, website, presentations, annual or quarterly reports or other communications demonstrating attempts to increase visibility
- ☐ Sharepoint, shared folder(s) or resources on tools and resources related to person-centered positive support practices
- ☐ Behavioral definitions used or evaluation measures; PBS Plans (examples, as well as number of plans created and used)
- ☐ Peer file reviews for person-centered language and/or positive supports
- ☐ Feedback loop for stakeholder engagement (e.g., newsletter, annual report with public comment option)
- ☐ Incident report data by month for the previous year since the last TOET (e.g., number of incidents per month by organization or site, number of people served by organization or site)

- Organizational policies for defining incident, conflict, positive support practices and resolution strategies
- Restraint data (BIRF) for the previous year (since the last TOET)
- Quality of life data (e.g., summarized surveys, interviews, etc.)
- Retention and/or tenure data for the previous year (since the last TOET)
- Plans or practices for acknowledging and recognizing positive social interactions (employee of the month, performance reviews, recognition cards or tickets)
- Code of Conduct policies
- Sample of staff satisfaction surveys, employee engagement data
- Examples of data collected and summarized and then used for decision making
- Evidence of monitoring systems for staff development and/or summaries of training efforts
- Case/file reviews or coach observation

Appendix B: Team Capacity Measurement Tool

How many total staff are currently employed in your organization (number of employees, not FTE)?

Total Staff in Organization (Number of People, not FTE)	

How many staff in your organization are involved in the following roles?

Number of staff trained = The total number of staff trained since you began work in TIPPS. Include all staff who have discontinued working on your organization's team and those who have left your organization.

Number of staff currently active on your team = The total number of staff who are currently participating in your organization's team efforts.

	Number of Staff Trained	Number of staff Currently Active on Team
Person-Centered Coaches		
Person-Centered Coach Trainers		
Person-Centered Thinking Trainers		
Person-Centered Planners		
Key Contacts		
Positive Behavior Support Facilitators		

How many trainers or contractors have provided these services for staff or people in your organization **<u>since the last TOET</u>**?

Number of trainers of contractors = People who provide these services but are not on your organization's regular payroll (i.e., they are not a regular weekly employee in your organization).

	Number of trainers or contactors
Person-Centered Thinking Trainers	
Universal Person-Centered Coach Trainers	
Person-Centered Planners	
Positive Behavior Support Facilitators	

Appendix C: Direct Observation Tool

Date and Time of Observation: ______________________ **Number of People in the Setting:** __________

Setting Observed: ____

Instructions: For more information about the definitions and how to create a plan for direct observation, please visit the Training Materials page on Organizational Evaluation.

Part 1

Observe up two staff while they are working or observe up to two people who are being supported using the list below.

A. Promoting Social Engagement and Interactions

Item Observed	Minutes 0-5	Minutes 5-10	Minutes 10-15	Minutes 15-20
Encouraging Others to Interact	☐	☐	☐	☐
Supporting Choices	☐	☐	☐	☐
Reinforcing Others	☐	☐	☐	☐
Subtotal Person-Centered Behaviors Observed				______/12 ______%

Part 2

Observe up two staff while they are working or observe up to two people who are being supported using the list below.

A. Opportunities to Participate in Positive Social Interaction

Item Observed	Minutes 0-5	Minutes 5-10	Minutes 10-15	Minutes 15-20
Active Involvement in Conversations/Meetings/Activities	☐	☐	☐	☐
Engaging in Identified social Behaviors:				
Person Centered Value 1	☐	☐	☐	☐
Person Centered Value 2	☐	☐	☐	☐
Person Centered Value 3	☐	☐	☐	☐
Person Centered Value 4	☐	☐	☐	☐
Subtotal Person-Centered Behaviors Observed				______/24 ______%

Appendix D: Annual Informal Interviews

Informal interviews can be used on the day of the onsite or during a designated time period soon after to collect information from staff members and people supported. The goal of the annual informal observation is to gather evidence that Tier 1 implementation is occurring by contacting a random selection of people and asking them 2-3 simple questions.

The manner in which these data are collected need to be adjusted for the type of organization receiving services. The external evaluator will need to come up with a plan to gather information prior to the onsite visit. The goal is to randomly select staff members and people supported and interview them to better understand the impact of Tier 1 implementation.
Appropriate questions for the interview may include:

1) What are our values at our organization (or in this setting)?
2) What training have you received to date on the matrix? Have you found this helpful?
3) What things has our team/organization done that are person-centered?
4) What things has our organization done that promote a positive universal level?
5) How do we address quality of life?

Questions should be modified as needed to include discussions with people across the organization, including people receiving support, family members, direct support staff, supervisory staff, etc.

Appendix E: Matrix Template

List Person-Centered Values and Social Behaviors Identified by Organization

		Setting				
Person-Centered Value						
		.				

Freeman, R., Simacek, J., Kramme, J., Duchelle, N., Flicker, E., O'Nell, S., & Amado, A. (2020). *Tiered onsite evaluation tool*. Minneapolis, MN: Institute on Community Integration. University of Minnesota.

Appendix F: References

Bradshaw, C. P., Mitchell, M. M., & Leaf, P. J. (2010). Examining the effects of schoolwide positive behavioral interventions and supports on student outcomes: Results from a randomized controlled effectiveness trial in elementary schools. *Journal of Positive Behavior Interventions, 12*, 133–148. doi:10.1177/1098300709334798

Fixsen, D. L., Blasé, K. A., & Van Dyke, M. K. (2019). *Implementation practice and science*. Chapel Hill, NC: Active Implementation Research Network:

Fixsen, D. L., Naoom, S. F., Blase, K. A., Friedman, R. M., & Wallace, F. (2005). Implementation research: A synthesis of the literature (FMHI Publication No. 231). Tampa, FL: University of South Florida, Louis de la Parte Florida Mental Health Institute, National Implementation Research Network.

Fox, L., & Hemmeter, M. L. (2008). A programwide model for supporting social emotional development and addressing challenging behavior in early childhood settings. In W. Sailor, G. Dunlap, G. Sugai, & R.H. Horner (Eds.), Handbook of positive behavior support (pp.177-202). New York, NY: Springer.

Horner, R. H. (2020). The marriage of policy, practices, and data to achieve educational reform. *American Journal on Intellectual and Developmental Disabilities, 125*(5), 340-344.

Horner, R. H., Sugai, G., Smolkowski, K., Eber, L., Nakasato, J., Todd, A., & Esperanza, J. (2009). A randomized, waitlist-controlled effectiveness trial assessing school-wide positive behavior support in elementary schools. *Journal of Positive Behavior Interventions, 11(3*), 133-144.

Horner, R. H., Todd, A.W., Lewis-Palmer, T., Irvin, L. K., Sugai, G. & Boland, J. B. (2004). The school-wide evaluation tool (SET): A research instrument for assessing school-wide positive behavior support. *Journal of Positive Behavior Interventions, 6(1*), 3-12.

Jolivetter, K., (2016). Multi-tiered systems of support in residential juvenile facilities. The National Technical Asisstance Center for the Education of Neglected or Delinquent Children and Youth. Washington DC.

Kincaid, D., Childs, K., & George, H. (2005). School-wide benchmarks of quality. Unpublished instrument, University of South Florida.

McIntosh, K., Masssar, M. M., Algozzine, R. F., George, H. P., Horner, R. H., Lewis, T. J., & Swain-Bradway, J. (2017). Technical adequacy of the SWPBS Tiered Fidelity Inventory. *Journal of Positive Behavior Interventions, 19(1*), 3-13.

Sugai, G., Horner, R. H., Algozzine, R., Barrett, S., Lewis, T., Anderson, C., Bradley, R., . . . Simonsen, B. (2010). School-wide positive behavior support: Implementers' blueprint and self-assessment. Eugene: University of Oregon.

Sugai, G., Lewis-Palmer, T., Todd, A., & Horner, R.H. (2001). *School-wide evaluation tool*. Eugene: University of Oregon.

Walker, H. M., Horner, R. H., Sugai, G., Bullis, M., Sprague, J. R., Bricker, D., & Kaufman, M. J. (1996). Integrated approaches to preventing antisocial behavior patterns among school-age children and youth. *Journal of Emotional and Behavioral Disorders, 4*, 193-256.

Resources to Learn More About Organization-Wide Person-Centered Practices and Positive Behavior Support

Fixsen, D. L., Naoom, S. F., Blasé, K. A., Friedman, R. M., & Wallace, F. (2005). *Implementation research: A synthesis of the literature*. University of South Florida. Tampa, Florida. https://nirn.fpg.unc.edu/sites/nirn.fpg.unc.edu/files/resources/NIRN-MonographFull-01-2005.pdf

Minnesota positive support practices. (2020). Person-centered practices. Available: https://mnpsp.org/pcp/

Minnesota positive support practices. (2020). Positive behavior support. Available: https://mnpsp.org/pbs/

Rodgers, T., LePage, J., & Freeman, R. (2016). Improving quality of life outcomes using a statewide tiered implementation approach. *Impact, 29*(2), 30-33. https://ici.umn.edu/products/876

Smull, M. W., Bourne, M. L., & Sanderson, H. (2009). *Becoming a person-centered system*. National Association of State Directors of Developmental Disability Services, Alexandria, VA. Retrieved July 7, 2017 from:

http://www.nasddds.org/resource-library/person-centered-practices/becoming-a-person-centered-system-a-brief-overview-smull-bourne-and-sanderson/

Stirk, S., & Sanderson, H. (2012). *Creating person-centered organisations: Strategies and tools for managing change in health, social care, and the voluntary sector*. London: Jessica Kinglsey Publishers. http://helensandersonassociates.co.uk

Timmons, J., Freeman, R., Benway, C., Gulaid, A. (2016). A model for building a statewide infrastructure for person-centered practices and positive supports. *Impact, 29*(2), 34-37. https://ici.umn.edu/products/876

World Health Organization (2004). *Prevention of mental disorders: Effective interventions and policy options.* Who: Geneva. https://www.who.int/mental_health/evidence/en/prevention_of_mental_disorders_sr.pdf