



Early Warning Intervention & Monitoring System Implementation Fidelity Rubric



Michigan Department of Education (MDE) Early Warning Intervention System (EWIMS) – Implementation Fidelity Rubric

School Name: _____

Date Conducted: _____

The Early Warning Intervention and Monitoring System (EWIMS) is an evidence-based, data-driven, decision-making process that is often leveraged as part of a district's Multi-tiered System of Supports framework. Within the process, schools use a continuum of tiered supports for students (Tier 1, Tier 2, Tier 3), each with demonstrated evidence of effectiveness. At Tier 1, schools implement evidence-based practices to support attendance, positive social emotional and behavioral well-being, and high course performance for all learners. EWIMS also helps educators systematically identify students who are showing signs that they are at risk of dropping out of school. EWIMS examines the underlying causes of risk, matches student needs to interventions, and monitors student progress and the success of the interventions. Fundamentally EWIMS is an ongoing cycle of examining data and making decisions about supports and interventions to help students get back on track for graduation.

The EWIMS team should reflect on the EWIMS implementation process annually (at a minimum). Information gathered during this process is intended to be used formatively to discern what has worked, what should be maintained, what should be modified, and what should be replaced or eliminated. **Each decision should be supported by data and evidence and documented.**

Within this document, EWIMS implementation is defined as the cycle of:

- a) using Early Warning data and other data to identify students at risk of dropping out of school and to develop a hypothesis for the underlying root cause
- b) identifying and matching interventions and supports to address schoolwide needs, the needs of groups of students, or the needs of individual students
- c) monitoring student progress and making adaptations to interventions and supports as needed
- d) continuously reviewing and refining the implementation cycle to ensure that it is successfully supporting students

This implementation rubric is an adaptation of the North Carolina Department of Public Instruction's Implementation Rubric: Using Early Warning Systems to Identify and Support Students at Risk of Dropping Out of High School with permission from the American Institutes for Research.

[Microsoft Word - EWS Implementation Rubric02082016.docx \(nc.gov\)](#)

Structure

The rubric is based on the structure of the Center on Response to Intervention's Integrity Rubric (see www.rti4success.org). The rubric comprises seven sections that reflect key aspects of the Early Warning implementation cycle, as follows:

- 1. System Features to Support Readiness and Implementation** - Resources and organizational structures necessary to support, identify, and intervene to support students at risk of dropping out of high school.
- 2. Data Team and Structure** - Team structure and process in place to review Early Warning data and other data in order to assign and monitor interventions.
- 3. Early Warning Tool Capabilities** - Components and capabilities of the tool (e.g., indicators and thresholds, reports) and maintenance of the tool to support the identification of students at risk of dropping out.

4. **Review of Early Warning Data** - Data review process to identify at-risk students, groups of students, or schoolwide patterns, and to explore underlying root causes of risk and develop a hypothesis for intervention and support.
5. **Interventions and Supports** - Interventions and supports of varying focus (e.g., attendance, course performance, behavior) and intensity—aligned to address identified root causes of risk—provided to support dropout prevention efforts.
6. **Progress Monitoring** - Ongoing and frequent monitoring of student progress across levels of interventions to monitor responsiveness to interventions and supports and to adjust and make adaptations as needed.
7. **Continuous Improvement** - System for collecting and analyzing data to measure fidelity and effectiveness of Early Warning implementation

Each section of the *Implementation Rubric* includes specific items reflecting key pieces of implementation, a 5-point rating scale, and descriptions of practices for *Little or no implementation*, *Partial or inconsistent implementation*, or *Complete and consistent implementation*.

Use and Scoring

The Implementation Rubric provides a 5-point rating scale and descriptions of practices that would score a 1, 3, or 5 for each item. Interviewers (or teams conducting a self-assessment) may also assign the school a rating of 2 or 4 if the information collected suggests the school falls between the rubric descriptions. For example, if the school is performing at a level higher than the rubric describes for a 3 rating but not quite at the level described for a 5, the rating should be a 4 for that item. Refer to MDE EWIMS Fidelity Check Facilitator's Guide for further guidance.

Transfer each indicator's Total Points and Percent Complete Implementation to the **Scoring Summary Document**. Maintain this document for ongoing EWIMS implementation planning.

Indicator One: System Features to Support Readiness and Implementation

Resources and organizational structures necessary to support, identify, and intervene to support students at risk of dropping out of high school are in place.

Indicator One Description of Measures	1 (Little or no implementation)	3 (Partial or inconsistent implementation)	5 (Complete and consistent implementation)	Evidence	Consensus Rating
A. Leadership	Decisions and actions by the school and/or district leaders limit the feasibility or effectiveness of using Early Warning data to support dropout prevention efforts; there is a lack of leadership support for the use of Early Warning.	Decisions and actions by the school and/or district leaders are inconsistent and only somewhat supportive of using Early Warning data to support dropout prevention efforts; support for the use of Early Warning is somewhat evident.	Decisions and actions by the school and/or district leaders proactively reinforce using Early Warning data to support dropout prevention efforts; there is leadership support for the use of Early Warning.	In Place: Yet in Place:	
B. Resources	Resources (e.g., funds, programs, time available) are not allocated or monitored to support Early Warning implementation, including data review, interventions, and monitoring.	Resources (e.g., funds, programs, time available) necessary to ensure that some or most of the EWIMS process is implemented with fidelity are allocated and are minimally monitored annually to support Early Warning implementation, including data review, interventions, and monitoring.	Resources (e.g., funds, programs, time available) necessary to ensure the entire EWIMS process is implemented with fidelity are allocated to ensure the entire EWIMS process is implemented and are minimally monitored three times a year monitored to support Early Warning implementation, including data review, interventions, and monitoring.	In Place: Yet in Place:	
C. Communications with and Involvement of Families and Students	No conditions are met: a. A description of Early Warning and how it is being used to support dropout prevention is shared with families. b. A clear and effective process is used to update families on the progress of their child. c. Families and students are involved during decision-making regarding supports and interventions to help students stay in school and graduate.	At least one condition is met: a. A description of Early Warning and how it is being used to support dropout prevention is shared with families. b. A clear and effective process is used to update families on the progress of their child. c. Families and students are involved during decision-making regarding supports and interventions to help students stay in school and graduate.	All conditions are met: a. A description of Early Warning and how it is being used to support dropout prevention is shared with families. b. A clear and effective process is used to update families on the progress of their child. c. Families and students are involved during decision-making regarding supports and interventions to help students stay in school and graduate.	In Place: Yet in Place:	

Indicator One Description of Measures	1 (Little or no implementation)	3 (Partial or inconsistent implementation)	5 (Complete and consistent implementation)	Evidence	Consensus Rating
D. Communication with and Involvement of Staff	<p>No conditions are met:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. A description of the school's use of Early Warning to support dropout prevention is shared with staff. b. A system is in place to keep staff informed about student progress. c. Staff collaborate frequently to support students at risk of dropping out. 	<p>At least one condition is met:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. A description of the school's use of Early Warning to support dropout prevention is shared with staff. b. A system is in place to keep staff informed about student progress. c. Staff collaborate frequently to support students at risk of dropping out. 	<p>All conditions are met:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. A description of the school's use of Early Warning to support dropout prevention is shared with staff. b. A system is in place to keep staff informed about student progress. c. Staff collaborate frequently to support students at risk of dropping out. 	<p>In Place: Yet in Place:</p>	
E. Professional Development	<p>The school has no well-defined, school-based professional development mechanism to support continuous improvement of data-based decision-making and delivery of interventions as a means for preventing students from dropping out of high school.</p>	<p>Some form of school-based professional development are available, but most are not consistent or job-embedded to ensure continuous improvement of data-based decision-making and delivery of interventions as a means for preventing students from dropping out of high school.</p>	<p>School-based professional development is institutionalized and structured so that all teachers continuously examine, reflect upon, and improve data-based decision-making and delivery of interventions as a means for preventing students from dropping out of high school.</p>	<p>In Place: Yet in Place:</p>	
F. Community Partnerships	<p>No partnerships with community-based organizations are in place.</p>	<p>Partnerships with community-based organizations are in development to supplement services provided within the school, and/or some partnerships are in place, but they do not cover the range of student needs identified by Early Warning data and other data sources.</p>	<p>Partnerships with community-based organizations are in place to supplement services provided within the school and address the range of student needs identified by Early Warning data and other data sources.</p>	<p>In Place: Yet in Place:</p>	

Indicator One Total ____/30

Percent Complete Implementation ____%

Indicator Two: Data Team and Structure

Team structure and process is in place to review Early Warning data and other data in order to assign and monitor interventions.

Indicator Two Description of Measures	1 (Little or no implementation)	3 (Partial or inconsistent implementation)	5 (Complete and consistent implementation)	Evidence	Consensus Rating
A. Team or Appropriate Support Mechanism	There is no evidence that a team composed of staff with various areas of expertise and knowledge of students in the school has been formed to support the review of Early Warning data and intervention selection and monitoring.	There is some evidence that the following occur: a. A team composed of staff with various areas of expertise and knowledge of students in the school has been formed to support the review of Early Warning data and intervention selection and monitoring. b. Team members have a clear understanding of their roles and responsibilities. c. Additional staff, family members, and/or community members are invited to participate on the team as relevant.	There is evidence that all of the following consistently occur: a. A team composed of staff with various areas of expertise, including technical knowledge of the Early Warning, diverse knowledge of students in the school, and decision-making authority, has been formed to support the review of Early Warning data and intervention selection and monitoring. b. Team members have a clear understanding of their roles and responsibilities. c. Additional staff, family members, and/or community members are invited to participate on the team as relevant.	In Place: Yet in Place:	
B. Regular Meetings	There is no evidence of a meeting schedule for the team to monitor student intervention impact, review Early Warning data and/or conduct an implementation fidelity check.	There is evidence of a prioritized and completed meeting schedule occurring less than monthly to review Early Warning data and monitor student intervention impact, AND includes some of the following: a) a review of building-wide Early Warning data (20/30 Days of School, and at the end of each marking period), b) review established routines and agendas to facilitate meetings, and c) conduct an implementation fidelity check.	There is evidence of a prioritized and, at a minimum, completed monthly meeting schedule to review Early Warning data and monitor student intervention impact, AND includes all the following: a) a review of building-wide Early Warning data (20/30 Days of School, and at the end of each marking period), b) review established routines and agendas to facilitate meetings, and c) conduct an implementation fidelity check.	In Place: Yet in Place:	

Indicator Two Total ____/10

Percent Complete ____%

Indicator Three: Early Warning Tool Capabilities

Components and capabilities of the tool (e.g., indicators and thresholds, reports) and maintenance of the tool to support identification of students at risk of dropping out.

Indicator Three Description of Measures	1 (Little or no implementation)	3 (Partial or inconsistent implementation)	5 (Complete and consistent implementation)	Evidence	Consensus Rating
A. Understanding of Early Warning Indicators	There is insufficient evidence that staff involved in dropout prevention efforts understand how Early Warning indicators (e.g., attendance, behavior, academics) have been validated for predicting high school graduation by research or data analysis.	Some evidence indicates that staff involved in dropout prevention efforts understand how the Early Warning indicators (e.g., attendance, behavior, academics) have been validated for predicting high school graduation by research or data analysis.	All staff involved in dropout prevention efforts can articulate how the Early Warning indicators (e.g., attendance, behavior, academics) have been validated for predicting high school graduation by research or data analysis.	In Place: Yet in Place:	
B. Early Warning Tool Capabilities	One or none of the following conditions is met: a. The Early Warning tool includes all students (i.e., is universal). b. The Early Warning tool allows students to be grouped and sorted. c. The tool allows users to track and monitor student risk status throughout the school year. d. Reports are available to provide multiple ways of examining student-level and school-level information (i.e., groups of students, schoolwide).	Two of the following conditions are met: a. The Early Warning tool includes all students (i.e., is universal). b. The Early Warning tool allows students to be grouped and sorted. c. The tool allows users to track and monitor student risk status throughout the school year. d. Reports are available to provide multiple ways of examining student-level and school-level information (i.e., groups of students, schoolwide).	All the following conditions are met: a. The Early Warning tool includes all students (i.e., is universal). b. The Early Warning tool allows students to be grouped and sorted. c. The tool allows users to track and monitor student risk status throughout the school year. d. Interventions are incorporated. e. Reports are available to provide multiple ways of examining student-level and school-level information (i.e., groups of students, schoolwide).	In Place: Yet in Place:	
C. EWS Tool Maintenance	There is no established process to ensure that data are complete, accurate, and appears in the EWS tool.	Some staff are aware and follow an established process that may not be documented or effective to ensure that data are complete, accurate, and appears in the EWS tool.	All necessary staff are aware and follow a documented and effective process to ensure that data are complete, accurate, and appears in the EWS tool.	In Place: Yet in Place:	
D. Early Warning Tool Support	No team members are knowledgeable about the Early Warning tool, its technical capabilities, and the importing and maintenance of data incorporated within the tool.	At least one team member is knowledgeable about the Early Warning tool, its technical capabilities, and the accurate importing and maintenance of data incorporated within the tool.	Multiple team members are knowledgeable about the tool, its technical capabilities, the accurate importing of data, and the maintenance of data incorporated within the tool, and there is a process to teach new team members.	In Place: Yet in Place:	

Indicator Three Total ____/10

Percent Complete ____%

Indicator Four: Review of Early Warning Data:

Data review process to identify at-risk students or schoolwide patterns, and to explore underlying root causes of risk, and develop a hypothesis for intervention and support.

Indicator Four Description of Measures	1 (Little or no implementation)	3 (Partial or inconsistent implementation)	5 (Complete and consistent implementation)	Evidence	Consensus Rating
A. Early Warning Data Review	No or limited review of Early Warning data is conducted.	A partial review of Early Warning data is undertaken, which may include at least two of the following actions: a. Review students identified as at risk for any indicator. b. Identify student risk patterns over time. c. Identify patterns for groups of students with similar risk factors over time. d. Identify school-level patterns over time. e. Disaggregate data based on specific subgroups of students (e.g., English language learners, students with disabilities, migrant students, Native American/ Alaskan Native students).	A comprehensive review of the Early Warning data is undertaken, which includes all the following actions: a. Review students identified as at risk for any indicator. b. Identify student risk patterns over time. c. Identify patterns for groups of students with similar risk factors over time. d. Identify school-level patterns over time. e. Disaggregate data based on specific subgroups of students (e.g., English language learners, students with disabilities, migrant students, Native American/Alaskan Native students).	In Place: Yet in Place:	
B. Data Points to Verify Risk	Early Warning data are not used or are used alone to verify decisions about whether a student is or is not at risk and to develop a hypothesis for the underlying root cause.	Early Warning data are used in concert with at least one other data source related to individual, classroom, school, family, and/or community factors to verify decisions about whether a student is or is not at risk and to develop a hypothesis for the underlying root cause.	Early Warning data are used in concert with at least two other data sources related to individual, classroom, school, family, and/or community factors to verify decisions about whether a student is or is not at risk and to develop a hypothesis for the underlying root cause.	In Place: Yet in Place:	

Indicator Four Total ____/10

Percent Complete ____%

Indicator Five: Intervention and Supports

Interventions and supports of varying focus (e.g., attendance, course performance, behavior) and intensity—aligned to address identified root causes of risk—are provided to support dropout prevention efforts.

Indicator Five Description of Measures	1 (Little or no implementation)	3 (Partial or inconsistent implementation)	5 (Complete and consistent implementation)	Evidence	Consensus Rating
A. Schedules	School schedules do not : a. align to support multiple levels of intervention and support based on student need; b. provide adequate time for interventions; c. provide flexibility or support changes based on student need.	School schedules partially : a. align to support multiple levels of intervention and high-quality instruction based on student need; b. provide additional time allocated for interventions; c. provide flexibility and may support some changes based on student need.	School schedules fully : a. align to support multiple levels of intervention and high-quality instruction based on student need; b. have adequate additional time built in for interventions; c. flexible and can support changes to student groupings as needed.	In Place: Yet in Place:	
B. Intervention and Support Selection	There is no evidence that selection of dropout prevention interventions and supports is driven by student data including Early Warning data and other data sources, and no identified decision-making approach is used.	There is partial evidence that selection of dropout prevention interventions and supports is driven by student data including Early Warning data and other data sources, and that the decision making is guided by a consistent approach and decision rules.	There is strong and consistent evidence that selection of dropout prevention interventions and supports is driven by student data including Early Warning data and other data, and that the decision making is guided by a consistent approach and decision rules.	In Place: Yet in Place:	
C. Universal Interventions (Tier I)	Schoolwide interventions are not provided to support dropout prevention efforts, or the interventions do not meet any of the following: a. Research based, b. Delivered by trained staff, c. Aligned to the needs of the school, and d. Delivered consistently by all staff.	Schoolwide interventions are provided to some students, or schoolwide interventions may be provided to all students, but meet only two of the following: a. Research based, b. Delivered by trained staff, c. Aligned to the needs of the school, and d. Delivered consistently by all staff.	Schoolwide interventions are provided to all students to support dropout prevention efforts, and meet all the following: a. Research based, b. Delivered by trained staff, c. Aligned to the needs of the school, and d. Delivered consistently by all staff.	In Place: Yet in Place:	

Indicator Five Description of Measures	1 (Little or no implementation)	3 (Partial or inconsistent implementation)	5 (Complete and consistent implementation)	Evidence	Consensus Rating
D. Targeted Interventions (Tier II)	<p>Targeted interventions are not provided to groups of students with similar needs, or the interventions do not meet any of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Research based, b. Aligned to the needs of a group of students, c. Delivered by trained staff, and d. Delivered in a group size and dosage that are optimal (according to research) for the age and needs of the students. 	<p>Targeted interventions are provided to groups of students with similar needs, but the interventions meet only two of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Research based, b. Aligned to the needs of a group of students, c. Delivered by trained staff, and d. Delivered in a group size and dosage that are optimal (according to research) for the age and needs of the students. 	<p>Targeted interventions are provided to groups of students with similar needs, and the interventions meet all the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Research based, b. Aligned to the needs of a group of students, c. Delivered by trained staff, and d. Delivered in a group size and dosage that are optimal (according to research) for the age and needs of the students. 	<p>In Place:</p> <p>Yet in Place:</p>	
E. Intensive Intervention (Tier III)	<p>Intensive interventions are not provided, or the intensive intervention does not meet any of the following criteria for all students in need:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Research based. b. Aligned to individual student needs. c. Intensified appropriately (more intensive than targeted interventions) d. Delivered by trained staff. e. Delivered in a group size and dosage that are optimal (according to research) for the age and needs of the students. 	<p>There is some evidence that intensive intervention is provided, but intensive interventions meet only two of the following criteria for all students in need:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Research based. b. Aligned to individual student needs. c. Intensified appropriately (more intensive than targeted interventions) d. Delivered by trained staff. e. Delivered in a group size and dosage that are optimal (according to research) for the age and needs of the students. 	<p>There is evidence that intensive intervention is consistently provided and meets all the following criteria for all students in need:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Research based. b. Aligned to individual student needs. c. Intensified appropriately (more intensive than targeted interventions). d. Delivered by trained staff. e. Delivered in a group size and dosage that are optimal (according to research) for the age and needs of the students. 	<p>In Place:</p> <p>Yet in Place:</p>	

Indicator Five Description of Measures	1 (Little or no implementation)	3 (Partial or inconsistent implementation)	5 (Complete and consistent implementation)	Evidence	Consensus Rating
F. Student Groups	There is little or no evidence that staff can articulate information and factors that they consider when adopting and implementing interventions and supports to address targeted student groups including students with disabilities, homeless or neglected/delinquent students, migrant students, English language learners, Native American/Alaskan Native students.	There is evidence that some staff can articulate information and factors that they consider when adopting and implementing interventions and supports to address targeted student groups including students with disabilities, homeless or neglected/delinquent students, migrant students, English language learners, Native American/Alaskan Native students.	There is strong and consistent evidence that all staff can articulate information and factors that they consider when adopting and implementing interventions and supports to address targeted student groups including students with disabilities, homeless or neglected/delinquent students, migrant students, English language learners, Native American/Alaskan Native students.	In Place: Yet in Place:	

Indicator Five Total ____/10

Percent Complete ____%

Indicator Six: Progress Monitoring

The EWIMS Team conducts ongoing and frequent monitoring of student progress across levels of intervention to monitor responsiveness to interventions and supports, and to make adjustments and adaptations as needed.

Indicator Six Description of Measures	1 (Little or no implementation)	3 (Partial or inconsistent implementation)	5 (Complete and consistent implementation)	Evidence	Consensus Rating
A. Monitoring Progress	Progress is not monitored for students identified as at risk and participating in interventions.	Progress is monitored for some students identified as at risk and participating in interventions, or progress monitoring occurs infrequently or inconsistently for all identified students.	Progress is monitored across all levels including students identified as at risk and participating in interventions and monitored at regular intervals (determined on basis of student need) with a consistent approach.	In Place: Yet in Place:	
B. Progress Monitoring Data	One or none of the following occurs. Progress monitoring data are used to: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Make decisions about continuing, reassigning, or terminating interventions for flagged students. Identify gaps in the available supports and interventions for students, select new intervention strategies, or adapt interventions as needed. Provide information about the general effectiveness of interventions, based on data from monitoring students participating in each program. Share information with appropriate stakeholders about student needs, the impact of existing interventions, and the need for additional interventions, if applicable. 	There is some evidence that at least two of the following occurs. Progress monitoring data are used to: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Make decisions about continuing, reassigning, or terminating interventions for flagged students. Identify gaps in the available supports and interventions for students, select new intervention strategies, or adapt interventions as needed. Provide information about the general effectiveness of interventions, based on data from monitoring students participating in each program. Share information with appropriate stakeholders about student needs, the impact of existing interventions, and the need for additional interventions, if applicable. 	There is evidence that all the following occurs. Progress monitoring data are used to: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Make decisions about continuing, reassigning, or terminating interventions for flagged students. Identify gaps in the available supports and interventions for students, select new intervention strategies, or adapt interventions as needed. Provide information about the general effectiveness of interventions, based on data from monitoring students participating in each program. Share information with appropriate stakeholders about student needs, the impact of existing interventions, and the need for additional interventions, if applicable. 	In Place: Yet in Place:	

Indicator Six Total ____/10

Percent Complete ____%

Indicator Seven: Continuous Improvement

System for collecting and analyzing data to measure fidelity and effectiveness of Early Warning implementation is in place.

Indicator Seven Description of Measures	1 (Little or no implementation)	3 (Partial or inconsistent implementation)	5 (Complete and consistent implementation)	Evidence	Consensus Rating
A. Assess and Improve	<p>None of the following criteria are met:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Specific goals are set, and there is a process for monitoring the school's Early Warning implementation using an EWIMS Implementation Rubric to identify and intervene to support students at risk of dropping out of school. b. Relevant staff have and use dedicated time to effectively review the school's Early Warning implementation to identify and intervene to support students at risk of dropping out of school. c. Relevant staff generate, document, and follow through with implementation revision. 	<p>At least one of the following criteria is met:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Specific goals are set, and there is a process for monitoring the school's Early Warning implementation using an EWIMS Implementation Rubric to identify and intervene to support students at risk of dropping out of school. b. Relevant staff have and use dedicated time to effectively review the school's Early Warning implementation to identify and intervene to support students at risk of dropping out of school. c. Relevant staff generate, document, and follow through with implementation revision. 	<p>All the following criteria are met:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Specific goals are set, and there is a process for monitoring the school's Early Warning implementation using an EWIMS Implementation Rubric to identify and intervene to support students at risk of dropping out of school. b. Relevant staff have and use dedicated time to effectively review the school's Early Warning implementation to identify and intervene to support students at risk of dropping out of school. c. Relevant staff generate, document, and follow through with implementation revision. 	<p>In Place:</p> <p>Yet in Place:</p>	

Indicator Five Total ____/5

Percent Complete ____%