

**Tier 1: Universal Academic Features**  
Version 1.0

Feature	Possible Data Sources	Scoring Criteria
<b>Subscale: Teams</b>		
<p><b>1.1 Team Composition</b> Each team in the school includes staff with expertise to support the function of the team and represents the diversity of the building.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Meeting structure flow chart</li> <li>• Meeting agendas with team members</li> <li>• List of team members and their roles</li> </ul>	<p>0 = Membership of school team does not include appropriate expertise or represent the diversity of the building.</p> <p>1 = Teams have either expertise or diversity, but not both.</p> <p>2 = Teams have appropriate expertise and represent the diversity of the building.</p>
<p><b>1.2 a Team Alignment</b> Each school team (e.g., grade level, content, department, leadership) have (a) defined goals that support the strategic plan and/or continuous improvement plan; (b) defined communication loops among all teams and all faculty; and (c) regularly scheduled meetings.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Meeting structure flow chart with team goals</li> <li>• Team action plans</li> <li>• Meeting agenda</li> <li>• “Working Smarter Not Harder”</li> <li>• Communication plan</li> </ul>	<p>0 = Teams exist but do not meet feature criteria for goals, communication loops, or regular meetings.</p> <p>1 = Teams are able to document two of the three feature criteria for goals, communication loops, or regular meetings.</p> <p>2 = Teams are able to document goals, communication loops, and regular meetings.</p>
<p><b>1.2 b Team Operating Procedures</b> All school teams have operating procedures that include (a) agenda; (b) minutes; and (c) defined roles and responsibilities.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Meeting agendas and notes</li> <li>• Roles and responsibility documentation</li> </ul>	<p>0 = Meeting notes exist, but evidence of procedures is not present.</p> <p>1 = Teams are able to document two of the three feature criteria for agenda, minutes, and roles/responsibilities.</p> <p>2 = Teams are able to document agenda, minutes, and roles/responsibilities.</p>

Subscale: Implementation		
<p><b>1.3 Aligned Curricula</b> Evidence-based curricula are organized into clearly defined learning objectives and progressions that are aligned to state standards.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Curriculum maps</li> <li>● Pacing guides</li> <li>● Lesson plans</li> <li>● Curriculum guides</li> </ul>	<p>0 = Curricula are not evidence -based and have unclear descriptions or the objectives are not aligned.</p> <p>1 = Curricula at all grade levels are evidence-based AND <i>either</i> meet qualifications for defined learning objectives <i>or</i> are aligned to state standards.</p> <p>2 = Curricula at all grade levels are evidence-based and meet qualifications for defined learning objectives/progressions AND are aligned to state standards.</p>
<p><b>1.4a Evidence-Based Practices</b> Teachers strategically select and use evidence-based practices that are supported by the division/school and matched to learner needs.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Lesson plans</li> <li>● Initiative maps</li> <li>● Tier definition</li> <li>● Resource maps</li> <li>● Quality core instruction guides</li> <li>● Meeting minutes reflect use of a selection tool for evidence-based practices Walkthrough tool/document and/or data</li> </ul>	<p>0 = Division/school has not defined quality core instruction and/or inconsistent use of evidence-based practices as defined in quality core instruction.</p> <p>1 = Evidence-based practices are outlined in the definition of quality core instruction by division/school but are used inconsistently or not matched to student need.</p> <p>2 = Evidence-based practices are outlined in the definition of quality core instruction by division/school AND are used consistently AND matched to student needs.</p>
<p><b>1.4b Lesson Plans</b> A process for lesson plan development includes the knowledge, skills, and cognitive levels matched to the success criteria of the objectives in the curriculum.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Lesson plans reflect task analysis of criteria for success</li> <li>● Lesson plans indicate supports at each level of task</li> <li>● Minutes from collaborative planning sessions</li> </ul>	<p>0 = Inconsistent use of a process or structure for lesson planning or plans focused only on activities.</p> <p>1 = A clear process for developing lesson plans is used but matched to only two of the elements of knowledge, skills, and cognitive levels.</p> <p>2 = A process is used for developing lesson plans that include knowledge, skills, and cognitive levels and are matched to the success criteria of the objectives in the curriculum.</p>

<p><b>1.4c Relevant Objectives</b> Learning objectives are matched to real world relevance and student experiences.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Lesson plans</li> <li>• Minutes from collaborative planning sessions</li> <li>• Walkthrough data</li> <li>• Student survey data</li> </ul>	<p>0 = Learning objectives are unclear in the link to real world relevance or consideration of student experiences.</p> <p>1 = Learning objectives are presented without either adjustment to real world relevance or student experiences.</p> <p>2 = Learning objectives are presented with a clear match to real world relevance and student experiences.</p>
<p><b>1.5 Performance Measures</b> Measures of student performance include goals with success feature criteria and are communicated to students.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Lesson goals include success feature criteria</li> <li>• Student rubrics and/or checklists</li> <li>• Minutes from collaborative planning sessions</li> <li>• Performance based assessment</li> </ul>	<p>0 = Goals do not include success feature criteria and are not communicated to students.</p> <p>1 = Goals with success feature criteria are defined but not communicated to students.</p> <p>2 = Clearly defined goals with success feature criteria are communicated to students.</p>
<p><b>1.6a Formative Assessment</b> Teachers utilize formative assessment to inform teaching, lesson plan adjustment, and remediation.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Examples of formative assessment</li> <li>• Examples of lesson plans with adjustments</li> <li>• Examples of plans for remediation</li> <li>• Walkthrough observations</li> </ul>	<p>0 = Evidence of formative assessment is not present.</p> <p>1 = Evidence of formative assessment is present but not utilized to impact instruction.</p> <p>2 = Evidence of formative assessment is present and utilized to impact teaching, lesson plan adjustment, and remediation.</p>
<p><b>1.6b Instructional Adjustment</b> A procedure is in place for teams to evaluate Tier 1 data that results in instructional adjustment.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Grade level/content team, professional learning community, and/or data meeting agendas</li> <li>• Unit plans</li> <li>• Lesson plans that reflect adjustment</li> <li>• Data meeting reflection sheets</li> <li>• Programmatic data</li> <li>• Documentation of a data meeting process used by teams</li> </ul>	<p>0 = Data evaluation and instructional decisions are made informally.</p> <p>1 = A procedure is in place for evaluating instructional data without a formal process for decisions around instructional changes or adjustments.</p> <p>2 = A procedure is in place for evaluating instructional data with resulting evidence of clear instructional changes or adjustments.</p>

<p><b>1.7a Professional Learning</b> A written process is used to provide high quality professional learning for faculty/staff on all quality core instructional and assessment practices.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Professional learning calendar</li> <li>• Teacher handbook</li> <li>• Embedded professional learning plan</li> </ul>	<p>0 = No written process for high quality professional learning.</p> <p>1 = A written process is in place for high quality professional learning but does not include opportunities related to quality core instruction and assessment practices as defined by the division.</p> <p>2 = A written process for high quality professional learning and includes both opportunities related to quality core instruction and assessment practices.</p>
<p><b>1.7b Coaching</b> Staff receive coaching in the planning, teaching, and assessment of the academic curricula.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Coaching plans</li> <li>• Coaching responsibility definition</li> <li>• Coaching schedule</li> <li>• Evidence of a division and/or school coaching process</li> <li>• Peer observation schedule</li> </ul>	<p>0 = Coaching does not occur.</p> <p>1 = Irregular opportunities for coaching exists.</p> <p>2 = Coaching follows a process to address planning, teaching, and assessment.</p>
<p><b>1.7c Collaborative Planning</b> Time for collaborative planning is in the schedule (including special education and resource staff) with accountability for the resulting instructional plan.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• School schedule</li> <li>• Meeting minutes or agenda from collaborative planning session</li> <li>• Collaborative planning session template</li> <li>• Lesson plan template/format</li> </ul>	<p>0 = Time for collaborative planning does not exist in the school schedule.</p> <p>1 = Common planning is scheduled but is inconsistently used or without necessary representation.</p> <p>2 = Consistent common planning time that results in an observable instructional plan.</p>
<p><b>1.8 Instructional Practices</b> Evidence-based practices and routines are implemented with fidelity and consistency across all classrooms (e.g., activating prior knowledge, explicit instruction, engagement, feedback, scaffolding).</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Walk through data</li> <li>• Data collection tools</li> <li>• Administrator observation data</li> <li>• Peer observation data</li> </ul>	<p>0 = Evidence-based practices and routines are implemented inconsistently.</p> <p>1 = Practices are implemented in lessons but are not implemented with fidelity across 80% of classrooms.</p> <p>2 = 80% of staff utilize documented routines and evidence-based practices with fidelity.</p>

<p><b>1.9 Student Involvement</b> Instruction includes opportunities for students to participate in (a) the process of setting learning goals; (b) tracking of progress towards the learning goals; and (c) metacognitive reflection on learning.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Self-monitoring performance charts</li> <li>● Student goal statements</li> <li>● Aim lines</li> <li>● Lesson plans</li> <li>● Instructional observation data</li> </ul>	<p>0 = Inconsistent use of opportunities for student self-monitoring.</p> <p>1 = Instruction includes two of the three feature criteria for process, tracking progress, and metacognition.</p> <p>2 = Instruction includes opportunities for process, tracking progress, and metacognition.</p>
<p><b>1.10 Collective Teacher Efficacy</b> Leaders and staff support a system of collective teacher efficacy around effective practices including (a) teacher voice; (b) goal consensus around student achievement; and (c) knowledge of each other's work.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Team meeting minutes</li> <li>● Collaborative planning schedule</li> <li>● Faculty meeting agendas</li> <li>● PLC minutes</li> <li>● Staff surveys</li> </ul>	<p>0 = Unclear if the three feature criteria exist.</p> <p>1 = Evidence of two of the feature criteria of voice, goal consensus, and knowledge of work.</p> <p>2 = Evidence of the three feature criteria of voice, goal consensus, and knowledge of work.</p>
<p><b>1.11 Family and Community Engagement</b> School provides a system for diverse opportunities to authentically engage family and community stakeholders in instruction.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Resource map</li> <li>● Family surveys</li> <li>● Communication plan</li> <li>● Written description of family/community engagement</li> <li>● Documentation of stakeholder input</li> <li>● Guidance document</li> </ul>	<p>0 = Family engagement limited to primarily communication.</p> <p>1 = Engagement occurs but not systematically or in a written plan.</p> <p>2 = A documented system exists for authentic engagement with family and community stakeholders.</p>
<b>Subscale: Evaluation</b>		
<p><b>1.12a Data Alignment</b> Team(s) have access to a consistent and integrated data dashboard (e.g. attendance, academics, behavior, emotional wellness) that allows for disaggregation by demographics and skills for Tier 1 instructional effectiveness.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● School data dashboard</li> <li>● Team meeting agendas and meeting notes</li> <li>● Quarterly data reports</li> </ul>	<p>0 = No integrated dashboard.</p> <p>1 = Dashboard available and meets feature criteria for either disaggregation capability or integrated to reflect all aspects of the student profile.</p> <p>2 = Integrated dashboard with disaggregation capabilities exists.</p>

<p><b>1.12b Universal Screening</b>  Schoolwide universal screening for all students is conducted for literacy and mathematics.  <i>Secondary: Early warning system utilized for screening.</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Universal screening tool</li> <li>• Early warning system data</li> <li>• Team meeting agendas and meeting notes</li> </ul>	<p>0 = No universal screening.</p> <p>1 = Universal screening is conducted with some students but not all students <i>or</i> in either literacy or mathematics but not both.</p> <p>2 = Universal screening exists for all students in literacy and mathematics.</p>
<p><b>1.13 Data-Informed Decision Making</b>  The team has adopted and utilizes a schoolwide problem solving process inclusive of data, systems, and practices.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Schoolwide problem solving process template</li> <li>• Team meeting notes</li> <li>• Professional learning plan</li> </ul>	<p>0 = Uniform schoolwide problem solving process not adopted.</p> <p>1 = Adequate schoolwide problem solving process adopted but not utilized consistently.</p> <p>2 = Schoolwide problem solving process adopted and used consistently with data, systems, and practices.</p>
<p><b>1.14 Fidelity Data</b>  A system is in place to monitor fidelity of Tier 1 including (1) assessments; (2) instruction; and (3) implementation.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Walkthrough data</li> <li>• Fidelity tools</li> <li>• Tier definition</li> <li>• Assessment schedule</li> </ul>	<p>0 = Zero or one of three feature criteria of assessments, instruction, or implementation are met.</p> <p>1 = Two of three feature criteria of assessments, instruction, or implementation are met.</p> <p>2 = System in place which meets feature criteria in assessments, instruction, and implementation.</p>
<p><b>1.15a Outcome Data</b>  Schoolwide data indicate improved outcomes in reading, math, behavior and attendance that lead to at least 80% proficiency in core.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Student outcome data (e.g., attendance, discipline, math, behavior, PALS, universal screening data)</li> </ul>	<p>0 = Zero or one of the four areas for improved outcomes meet 80% core proficiency.</p> <p>1 = Two or three of the four areas for improved outcomes meet 80% core proficiency.</p> <p>2 = Student outcome data indicate 80% core proficiency in all four areas.</p>

<p><b>1.15b Annual Evaluation</b>  Schoolwide data are shared at least annually with all stakeholders in a usable format and inclusive of trend data across years.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Stakeholder reports</li> <li>● Stakeholder surveys</li> <li>● Faculty meeting notes</li> <li>● School website</li> <li>● Family meeting notes</li> <li>● School Board meeting notes</li> </ul>	<p>0 = Inconsistent data sharing practices.</p> <p>1 = One or two of feature criteria met for sharing annually, usable format, and trend data.</p> <p>2 = Data are shared annually, usable, and inclusive of trends across years.</p>
--	---	---