Evaluation of State and Program Implementation of the Pyramid Model: Suggested Data Elements

A necessary element of Pyramid Model implementation is data-based decision-making. All implementation sites within a state system are encouraged to collect data on an ongoing basis and summarize these data for decision-making at the program level. These program data are submitted to the state so that they can be summarized across all implementation sites and organized into different types of reports. The first report is a state level report that is used by the State Leadership Team to examine implementation efforts and outcomes. The second report is the program level report that is used to summarize program implementation progress. The last report is a stakeholder report that is used to report accomplishments and implementation efforts to the general public. By creating these reports, the state and program level teams ensure progress monitoring, outcome reporting, and sustainability.

The data elements listed below by report type (i.e., state level, program level, stakeholder), are not exhaustive. These are suggested elements that could be included if the data are available. These data might be collected using a Pyramid Model instrument, a survey created by the state or program, a focus group, or individual interview. The State Leadership Team in conjunction with the State Data Coordinator should review their Pyramid Model Implementation Evaluation Plan to review and establish a data collection schedule and process.

State Level Report

State level reports provide the State Leadership Team (SLT) with a summary of state and program data that are used for data decision-making and action planning. The list below identifies data elements the state might want to include in their report to understand the state's progress in implementation and the fidelity and progress of implementation sites. When creating these reports, we suggest that program implementation sites be identified, but that data relevant to individuals are de-identified (i.e., reported without identifying information).

The data elements in the list below will be collected over time as the state moves through implementation stages (i.e., installation, initial implementation). There are also data in the list that are better summarized and included in a report after several years of implementation. To show growth over time, it is recommended that there are at a minimum three data points. The Evaluator/State Data Coordinator alongside the SLT should review the list below and focus on the elements that provide the most useful information to tell the story about Pyramid Model implementation in their state.

This report should include:

1. **Pyramid Model implementation description**
2. **Description of state team**
    2.1. State team membership and agencies represented
    2.2. State team start date and years of operation
3. **Description of program implementation coaches**
    3.1. Include the total number (by year if multiple years of implementation)
    3.2. Other information: FTE, agencies represented, and other relevant information (e.g., race/ethnicity; gender; disability; professional and educational background; start date and number of years; responsibilities; number of assigned sites).

4. Implementation capacity-building

4.1. Number and types of programs

    4.1.1. Locations (e.g., state map)

    4.1.2. Locations by variables of interest (e.g., poverty, geographic region)

    4.1.3. Programs by years engaged in implementation

    4.1.4. Assigned program implementation coach and location

    4.1.5. Number of practitioner coaches

    4.1.6. Number of classrooms

4.2. Number of children served by programs

    4.2.1. Average number of children per classroom or served by the agency

    4.2.2. Demographic information of children at sites (e.g., race, ethnicity, IEP/IFSP status, SES level)

4.3. Number of teachers or early interventionists by program

    4.3.1. Demographic information of teachers or early interventionists (e.g., race, ethnicity, gender, educational background)

4.4. Pyramid Model Trainings

    4.4.1. Description of trainings

    4.4.2. Number of trainings offered

    4.4.3. Number of people trained by role (e.g., program implementation coach, practitioner coach, teacher, early interventionist, other professionals)

    4.4.4. Overall training satisfaction

    4.4.5. Overall knowledge increase

5. Evaluation Section

5.1. Evaluation table with information about measures collected

5.2. State team data - include descriptions of each measure and summary tables and/or charts

    5.2.1. State Leadership Team Benchmarks of Quality

    5.2.2. Implementation goals and number of goals met

    5.2.3. SLT member meeting participation consisting of attendance and evaluation

    5.2.4. Checklist of State Leadership Team Sustainability Features (summary)

    5.2.5. Exploring Equity Across the Four Essential Structures: State Leadership Team, Professional Development Network, Implementation Sites and Data Systems (summary)

5.3. Program Implementation Coach Contacts Summary

    5.3.1. Number of contacts (i.e., overall, monthly average, or average to sites by stage of implementation)

    5.3.2. Percent by format (i.e., email, face-to-face, phone, virtual), overall and by site

    5.3.3. Time spent coaching, overall and by site

5.4. Program level data - include descriptions of each measure and summary tables and/or charts

    5.4.1. Program-Wide Benchmarks of Quality

      5.4.1.1. Table of critical elements

      5.4.1.2. Highlight growth of critical elements over time

      5.4.1.3. Graph that shows the number of sites at different levels of overall fidelity (this might only be used in states that have multiple cohorts of implementation)

      5.4.1.4. Individual implementation site graphs showing data over time

5.5. Practitioner Coach Contacts Summary (These data can be summarized across implementation sites and by each individual site. As state implementation grows and the state has multiple cohorts, data might be analyzed by stage of implementation.)

    5.5.1. Number and percent of teachers or early interventionists in the program receiving coaching

    5.5.2. Average (range) of cycles delivered

    5.5.3. Average (range) time spent in observation and debriefing

    5.5.4. Average (range) percent of action plan goals completed

5.6. Teaching Pyramid Observation Tool (TPOT) for Preschool Classrooms, Teaching Pyramid Infant Toddler Observation Scale (TPITOS), Early Interventionist Pyramid Practices Fidelity Instrument (EIPPFI)

    5.6.1. Program Summary of TPOT, TPITOS, or EIPPFI scores to include the average across key practices, the range of scores, and the number of teachers or early interventionists in different ranges of fidelity (e.g., low, high) or a specified fidelity level for each program

5.7. Behavior Incident Report System

    5.7.1. Number of suspensions and expulsions (total and by site), with demographic information by site, risk indices

5.8. Family survey data summary

5.9. Staff survey data summary

5.10. Sustainability/Scale-up Summary

    5.10.1. Include information from the written sustainability/scale-up plan

Program Level Report (Classroom Programs)

A program level report provides summaries of classroom and program level data. These data are used by the program-wide leadership team monthly for decision-making and action-planning and are summarized at the end of the year to examine implementation and outcomes. In addition to being reviewed by the program Leadership Team, some of these data are submitted to the state to be aggregated with other programs' data. This report should provide the details about the implementation year that accompanies data summaries so that the state has a better understanding of what occurred during the year. In this report, the program will be named but all data related to individuals (e.g., practitioner coaches, teachers, children) should be de-identified.

1. **Pyramid Model implementation description**

2. **Description of program and implementation site(s)**

    2.1. Location and general description of the program

    2.2. Number and type of implementation sites (if applicable)

      2.2.1. Locations by variables of interest (e.g., poverty, geographic region)

      2.2.2. Number of classrooms

    2.3. Number of children served by implementation site(s)

        2.3.1. Average number of children per classroom

        2.3.2. Demographic information (e.g., race, ethnicity, IEP/IFSP status, SES level)

    2.4. Number of teachers at implementation site(s)

        2.4.1. Demographic information for teachers (e.g., race, gender, ethnicity, educational background)

3. Pyramid Model trainings

    3.1. Description of trainings

    3.2. Number of trainings offered

    3.3. Number of people trained by role (e.g., practitioner coach, teacher, other professionals)

    3.4. Overall training satisfaction

    3.5. Overall knowledge increase

4. Evaluation Section

    4.1. Evaluation table with information about measures collected

    4.2. Program level data – include descriptions of each measure and summary tables and/or charts

        4.2.1. Program-Wide Benchmarks of Quality description and summary

        4.2.2. Practitioner Coach Contacts description and summaries (consider including a site summary followed by individual coach summaries across teachers)

            4.2.2.1. Number and percent of teachers receiving coaching

            4.2.2.2. Number of coaching cycles across teachers

            4.2.2.3. Time in observation and debriefing across teachers

            4.2.2.4. Number of goals written by number of goals accomplished across teachers

        4.2.3. Teaching Pyramid Observation Tool (TPOT) for Preschool Classrooms and/or Teaching Pyramid Infant Toddler Observation Scale (TPITOS), Early Interventionist Pyramid Practices Fidelity Instrument (EIPPFI)

            4.2.3.1. Summary of TPOT, TPITOS, or EIPPFI scores across all teachers (average and range of scores)

            4.2.3.2. Average (range) of red flags

            4.2.3.3. Number of teachers or early interventionists at fidelity or a specified level of fidelity

        4.2.4. TPOT, TPITOS, or EIPPFI summaries for each teacher

            4.2.4.1. Percent of indicators present by key practice

            4.2.4.2. Average across key practices

            4.2.4.3. Number of red flags

    4.3. Behavior Incident Report System (Note: If you have data prior to implementation on suspensions and expulsions, it would be appropriate to include them here.)

        4.3.1. Program Summary charts

        4.3.2. Average number of incidents per day

        4.3.3. Average number of children with BIRs

      4.3.4. Histogram

      4.3.5. Teacher responses

      4.3.6. Administrative actions

      4.3.7. Number of suspension/expulsions, with demographic information by site, select measures of disproportionality

   4.4. Family survey data summary

   4.5. Staff survey data summary

   4.6. Local sustainability plan

Program Level Report (Early Intervention Programs)

A program report provides summaries of program level data. These data are used by the program-wide Leadership Team monthly for decision-making and action-planning and summarized at the end of the year to examine implementation and outcomes. In addition to being reviewed by the program Leadership Team, some of these data are submitted to the state to be aggregated with other programs' data. This report should provide the details about the implementation year that accompanies data summaries so that the state has a better understanding of what occurred during the year. In this report, the program will be named but all data related to individuals (e.g., practitioner coaches and practitioners) should be de-identified

1. **Pyramid Model implementation description**

2. **Description of program**

   2.1. Location and general description of the type of program

   2.2. Number of children served by site

      2.2.1. Demographic information (race, ethnicity, SES level)

   2.3. Number of early interventionists by role

      2.3.1. Demographic information for early interventionists (race, ethnicity, educational background)

3. **Pyramid Model trainings**

   3.1. Description of trainings offered

   3.2. Number of trainings during time period

   3.3. Number of people trained (e.g., practitioner coach, early interventionists, other professionals)

   3.4. Overall training satisfaction

   3.5. Overall knowledge increase

4. **Evaluation section**

   4.1. Evaluation table with information about measures collected

   4.2. Program level data – include descriptions of each measure and summary tables and/or charts

      4.2.1. Program-Wide Benchmarks of Quality description and summary

      4.2.2. Practitioner Coach Contacts description and summaries

         4.2.2.1. Number and percent of early interventionists receiving coaching

         4.2.2.2. Number of coaching cycles by early interventionist

4.2.2.3. Time in observation and debriefing by early interventionist

4.2.2.4. Number of goals written by number of goals accomplished by early interventionist

4.2.3. Early Interventionist Pyramid Practices Fidelity Instrument (EIPPFI)

4.2.3.1. Summary across all early interventionists

4.2.3.2. Chart showing average percent of indicators present

4.2.3.3. Fidelity table showing who is at fidelity

4.2.4. EIPPFI summaries for each early interventionist

4.2.4.1. Percent indicators present for each item

4.2.4.2. Average across practice areas

4.2.5. Family survey data summary

4.2.6. Staff survey data summary

4.2.7. Local sustainability plan

Stakeholder Report

States will want to showcase Pyramid Model implementation by creating a report for the public and stakeholders. This annual report will describe the extent to which program- and community-wide high-fidelity adoption is being implemented, sustained, and scaled-up; the impact of program-wide implementation or community-wide implementation on child, provider, and program outcomes; and the impact of training and coaching. The elements in the list below should be a synthesis of the state level data. It should focus on the key details stakeholders are most interested in learning. In this report, it is important that the information being reported is contextualized so that the general public and stakeholders will be able to make proper conclusions.

1. **Description of the State Leadership Team**

    1.1. Information about the state team: purpose, membership and agencies, years of operation, vision and mission statement

    1.2. Funding level and growth in funding

    1.3. Policy or legislation that is relevant to your operation (e.g., brief highlight or call-out box)

    1.4. Quote from a state team member or state champion for the initiative

2. **Program implementation coaches**

    2.1. Description of program implementation coaches including description of their role, numbers, FTE, agencies, and other relevant information

    2.2. Quote from a program implementation coach

3. **Pyramid Model initiative description**

    3.1. Number and types of programs

    3.2. Number of classrooms

    3.3. Locations (e.g., state map)

    3.4. Locations by variables of interest (e.g., poverty, geographic region)

    3.5. Programs by years engaged in implementation

3.6. Number of children and families served by site

    3.6.1. Demographic information of children at sites (e.g., race, ethnicity, SES level, IEP/IFSP status)

3.7. Number of teachers or early interventionists by site

    3.7.1. Demographic information of teachers (e.g., race, ethnicity, educational background)

3.8. Quotes (administrator, staff, families)

4. Activities

4.1. Pyramid Model Trainings

    4.1.1. Description of trainings offered

    4.1.2. Number of trainings during time period

    4.1.3. Number of people trained by role (e.g., program implementation coach, practitioner coach, teacher, early interventionist)

    4.1.4. Overall training satisfaction

    4.1.5. Overall knowledge increase

4.2. Program coaching to leadership teams

    4.2.1. Hours and/or number of contacts to teams

5. Evaluation section

5.1. State systems change: Major accomplishments

    5.1.1. Summary of Benchmarks of Quality

    5.1.2. Policies implemented, influenced, or important to the state initiative

    5.1.3. Funding improvements

    5.1.4. Collaborative activities (e.g., QRIS, IECMH, collaborative PD/Training)

5.2. Site level change: Major accomplishments

    5.2.1. Summary of Benchmarks of Quality gains (could be focused on a specific item or summary of a critical element)

    5.2.2. Summary of TPOT, TPITOS, EIPPFI gains (could be focused on one or two items with the most change across all programs)

        5.2.2.1. Percent of teachers/early interventionists at high fidelity

        5.2.2.2. Percent of programs at high fidelity

    5.2.3. Summary of coaching intensity and frequency across all sites

    5.2.4. Summary of BIRs suspensions and expulsion data with comparison to pre-implementation data, programs not implementing the Pyramid Model, or national data