Guiding Questions for Data-Based Decision Making (DBDM): System-Level

Purpose: This resource is designed to assist facilitators of data-based decision-making (DBDM) teams as they apply the problem-solving process to school-level data. This resource is provided as a supplement to existing Tennessee Tiered Support Center (Tennessee TSC) resources containing more specific examples and/or summaries of the DBDM process. These resources, available on the Tennessee TSC website, include the:

- Program Monitoring Toolkit,
- Data-Based Decision Making Using an Early Warning System in High Schools, and
- Tier I Training Problem-Solving Process and Questions to Consider Handouts.

The guiding questions should <u>not</u> be used as a checklist. Within each step of the four-step DBDM process, facilitators have flexibility to pull from the guiding questions *as needed* to provide structure to their team's drill-down process, encourage team members to think critically about multiple types of data, and enhance team discussions about school-level data and student supports.

Application of the Guiding Questions:

- The guiding questions may be applied to academic (English language arts, math, written expression) and non-academic (discipline, attendance, climate, personal competency, mental wellness) domains. The questions are broad enough to be used across grade levels.

- The guiding questions contained in this document focus on "**system-level**" data analysis and decision making. DBDM teams can use these questions with *aggregated* data to evaluate and enhance the overall effectiveness of Tier I, Tier II and Tier III support. *Aggregated data refers to student information that has been compiled to evaluate outcomes and trends within and across broad groupings of students and supports.* Data may be aggregated by tier of support, domain, grade level, intervention, and/or different student groups.

- DBDM teams are encouraged to complete the full series of questions for system-level decision-making prior to completing the student-level guiding questions (separate document). The system-level guiding questions help to establish a context for student performance that is useful to consider when identifying student-level needs.

Step 1: Problem Definition

	Guiding Question
DEFINE	**1.** What do we want students to know and do?
	2. How are students currently performing relative to those expectations?
	3. How are students <u>from different student groups currently performing</u> relative to those expectations? *Student groups can include but aren't limited to student race, socioeconomic status, special education status, English learner status, etc.*
	4. What are the shared needs across students at our school?
	5. What are the shared needs at our school for students <u>from different student groups</u>?
	6. What relationships and/or patterns exist across our school's different areas of shared need?
	7. What else does our team need to know to accurately define our team's focus for system-level problem solving?
	8. *Problem Definition*: Which area of shared need will our team focus on first?

Step 2: Problem Analysis

	Guiding Question
ANALYZE	**1.** To what extent do factors related to the **curriculum** play a role in the shared needs of our students?
	2. To what extent do factors related to **instruction** play a role in the shared needs of our students?
	3. To what extent do factors related to our school and/or classroom **environments** play a role in the shared needs of our students?
	4. To what degree do **policies, practices, and resources** account for the shared needs of our students?
	5. What other factors could have prevented students from demonstrating expectations? Are there factors that are unique for students who are from different student groups?
	6. What relationships exist between different factors identified by the team? Are there variables that suggest a common root cause?
	7. What other information does the team need to identify, understand, and validate the presence of potential factors that prevent students from demonstrating relevant expectations?
	8. Whose perspectives are missing from the team's analysis?
	9. *Likely Root Causes*: What themes were identified in the analysis?
	10. *Validated Root Causes:* What evidence does the team have to support the final themes from our analysis?

Step 3: Implementation Planning

	Guiding Question
IMPLEMENT	**1.** Which validated root cause will the team address first?
	2. What resources already exist that could help address this root cause?
	3. What new actions could the team take to reduce this root cause, if needed?
	4. What do other key collaborators suggest as potential actions to address the root cause? Which actions do other key collaborators wish to prioritize?
	5. Which action will our team accomplish first?
	6. What is the expected (short-term) outcome of the team's action(s), and how quickly would the actions reduce or remove the validated barrier? When can the team expect to see change in the (long-term) defined problem?
	7. How will the team monitor the short-term impact on the shared need? How will our team monitor the longer-term impact on the defined problem?
	8. How will the team monitor fidelity to the action plan? How often will fidelity be measured?
	9. What existing responsibilities can be reduced or eliminated to support staff with implementation?
	10. What resources are available to implement this action? What resources are needed?
	11. Who will lead the implementation of this action? Who will serve as a support and/or backup?

Step 4: Evaluation

	Guiding Question
EVALUATE	**1.** What patterns do the data reveal?
	2. What do other data sources tell us? How are results across different data sources similar or different?
	3. Will short- and/or longer-term benchmarks and goals be met within the expected timeline? a. If <u>yes</u>, should our team create a plan to fade the action and plan for longer-term sustainability? b. If <u>no</u>, how might data and assessment issues be responsible for the lack of progress? c. If <u>no</u>, how might dosage and **fidelity** issues be responsible for the lack of progress? d. If <u>no</u>, how might content and intensity issues be responsible for the lack of progress? e. If <u>no</u>, should we intensify or change our actions?
	4. What feedback have other key collaborators provided about the current actions or outcomes?
	5. When will we reconvene to discuss progress?