

Pure Edge Fidelity Observation Form: Exploring its Reliability and Validity

Michael Corke, PhD, Director of Research

Pure Edge's organizational mission and commitment is to serve scholars and those who teach them. This is done through direct service, advocacy and active research partnerships that contribute to the education, health and wellness, school-based mindfulness and social and emotional learning (SEL) fields from which best practices are drawn.

This paper marks the first step in Pure Edge's sharing out of its fidelity of implementation (FOI) work. It discusses the role of the CORE process (Feagans-Gould, Dariotis, Greenberg, & Mendelson, 2015) as a guide and details the development and refinement of the Fidelity Observation Form (FOF). A study of the FOF's reliability and validity along with an invitation to the field to engage in further research into the FOF's characteristics and utility for the field.

Background

Education is increasingly looking to mindfulness, health and wellness, and SEL to help counteract the impacts of stress and trauma on learning and development (Shonkoff, Boyce & McEwen, 2009; Teicher et al., 2002). As visibility and demand increase, these fields have issued calls for further research on their application within youth and school settings (Argon, Berends, Ellis, Gonzalez 2010; Jones, Greenberg & Crowley, 2015; Mind and Life Education Research Network, 2012). They seek to advance through increased rigor (Greenberg & Harris, 2011; Khalsa & Butzer, 2016; Serwacki & Cook-Cottone, 2012), standards (Joint Committee on National Health Education Standards, 2007), and frameworks (Gard, Noggle, Park, Vago & Wilson, 2014; Lewallen, Hunt, Potts-Datema, Zaza & Giles, 2015). Fidelity of implementation, the degree to which a program is implemented as designed, is an area that promises to significantly strengthen each field (Feagans-Gould, Dariotis, Greenberg, & Mendelson, 2015; McLaughlin & Jordan, 2010; Rog, 2010) through improving program quality and supporting rigorous research (Century, Rudnick & Freeman, 2010).

In their work on assessing Fidelity of implementation (FOI) within school based mindfulness and yoga programs, Feagans-Gould et al. (2015) set forth five recommendations to help meet the need for additional rigor in the nascent field:

1. Clearly defining core program components
2. Clearly articulating core process components
3. Assess and report multiple dimensional aspects of FOI
4. Develop observational assessment systems and common FOI measures
5. Build common FOI language and frameworks

Pure Edge incorporated recommendations 1-4 into its core FOI instrument, the Fidelity Observation Form (FOF). The FOF documents classroom level program fidelity, addresses dosage, student engagement and can scale to multi-class, multi-site programs. This paper expands upon previously released FOF guidelines (Pure Edge, 2017) by offering background on its development and studying its reliability and validity.

Fidelity Observation Form Development

The development of the FOF occurred as the Pure Power¹ curriculum was undergoing a full revision. These simultaneous processes offered the opportunity to strengthen the alignment between the previous observation form (Hagins and Rundle, 2016) and the curriculum. Both Pure Power and FOF use the same organizational language. The curriculum includes lesson preparation, daily objectives, and visual agendas. It also provides feedback anchors and empowers students to connect their learning in the moment to the overarching objectives of the class (Hattie and Timperly, 2007). These core components should be observable in any Pure Power class implemented with fidelity.

The FOF is aligned to Pure Power and includes the same organizational features as the curriculum. Both reflect recognized common and recommended best practices for teaching and classroom observation instruments (Dean, Hubbel, Pitler & Stone, 2012; Hora, 2015; Marzano, 2007; Pianta, Paro & Hamre, 2008).

The FOF's development and refinement cycle included pilot observations with research and program team members across the Pure Edge network. These meetings, pilot observations and feedback sessions led to refinements of the form and its support documents (Appendices A and B). Extensive collaboration between curriculum writers, researchers and program implementers supports the case for viewing the FOF as a reliable and valid measure of the implementation of Pure Power. However, its reliability and validity have not been formally studied until now.

Working with the FOF: Form Structure

The FOF (Appendix A) is composed of 59 data elements organized in blocks of information that document various aspects of a Pure Power session. There are three overarching scales on the FOF. The Structural Fidelity scale focuses on the classroom environment and what is taught. Time Allocation documents the amount of time allotted to breathe, move, rest, and content components in each session. The Process Fidelity scale covers how the sessions are being taught. Structural Fidelity and Time Allocation also include theorized subscales. Within this paper, FOF items are referenced by their scale and item number within that scale (See Table 2). For example, the third item in the Structure Fidelity scale, item S3, focuses on visible posture objectives. The FOF guidelines (Pure Edge, 2017) provide additional detail on the FOF and how to use it.

FOF Dataset

The data in this analysis were collected in Ravenswood City School District (RCSD) where Pure Power was implemented over the course of three academic years. Because this study is focused on the validity and reliability of the instrument, not program implementation or outcome data, no further information about the school district is included in this paper.

¹Available at www.pureedgeinc.org/curriculum

The dataset, collected by three different observers from September through April of Pure Power's third academic year in RCSD, includes 140 observations and 21 different health and wellness instructors. The observations occurred across seven schools and included kindergarten through eighth grade students. **Table 1** details the observation dataset. Each observer conducted at least one observation at each school. Nine of the 21 instructors were observed by all three observers over the course of the data collection.

Table 1: RCSD Fidelity Observation Form Dataset

	Grade Levels Observed (shade indicates at least one valid observation)									Number of Instructors Observed	Observer Count	Observations		
												Invalid ¹	Valid	Total
School 1	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	3	3	0	24	24
School 2	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	2	3	0	13	13
School 3	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	3	3	7	14	21
School 4	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	3	3	2	17	19
School 5	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	2	3	6	10	16
School 6	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	3	3	1	14	15
School 7	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	5	3	5	27	32
SSD Total	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	21	3	21	119	140

¹ Observer coded the observation as unexpectedly cancelled or cut short.

Missing Value Treatment

Missing values can impact the outcomes of any study. Learning about their distribution, the options for handling them, and their costs and benefits is important as each study is unique (Hatry, 2010). **Table 2** displays the missing values within the FOF dataset by item. Overall about 3% of the items in the dataset were missing. There are 118 missing values distributed throughout the dataset. The items most frequently missing values were S5-Percent Exited, S4-Percent Entered and S10-Connect. Missing values were distributed across observations, not isolated within a few low quality observations. Because of the number of missing values, their distribution across observations and items and their potential impact on the dataset, both listwise deletion and imputation processes to replace the missing values were considered (Garson, 2015; Hatry 2010).

Listwise deletion, which removes any case that includes a single missing value, would reduce the number of observations by 39% on Structural Fidelity from 119 down to 72 and by 8% on Process Fidelity from 119 down to 109. The reduction of statistical power in subsequent analyses, specifically on Structural Fidelity, could support replacing missing variables through either expectation-maximization (EM) or multiple imputation (Graham, 2009).

Table 2: Item Descriptive Statistics and Missing Values

Item Number	Item Description	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Missing Values	
					Count	Percent
S1	Visual Outline Displayed	116	.83	.37	3	2.5
S2	Content Objective Visible	111	.79	.40	8	6.7
S3	Posture Objective Visible	112	.83	.37	7	5.9
S4	Percent Entered	107	3.18	.82	12	10.1
S5	Percent Exited	99	3.55	.78	20	16.8
S6	Class Arranged	119	.97	.18	0	0.0
S7	Environment Conducive	118	.99	.09	1	0.8
S8	Environment Distractions (recode)	117	.99	.09	2	1.7
S9	Content Objective Introduced	110	2.56	1.60	9	7.6
S10	Connect	107	2.52	1.59	12	10.1
S11	Content Objective Taught	112	2.68	1.43	7	5.9
S12	Posture Objective Taught	114	2.57	1.29	5	4.2
T1	Breath Total (time allocation)	117	2:67	2.62	2	1.7
T2	Posture Total (time allocation)	119	17:19	5.47	0	0.0
T3	Rest Total (time allocation)	116	5:44	3.19	3	2.5
T4	Content Total (time allocation)	119	2:68	3.12	0	0.0
T5	Breath Ticker (max 15)	118	12.10	4.90	1	0.8
T6	Mindful Ticker (max 15)	118	6.21	4.79	1	0.8
P1	Relationships	117	3.68	.51	2	1.7
P2	Management	117	3.07	1.08	2	1.7
P3	Teaching Strategies	117	3.30	.92	2	1.7
P4	Preparedness	116	3.35	.95	3	2.5
P5	Posture Instruction	113	3.38	.82	6	5.0
P6	Breath/Movement Connection	114	3.01	1.10	5	4.2
P7	Appropriateness	116	3.69	.76	3	2.5
P8	Engagement	117	3.31	.77	2	1.7

FOF Reliability

Table 3 displays the reliability, or internal consistency among the set of items, for the Structural and Process Fidelity scales. The Original Dataset and a process for replacing the missing values (EM) are displayed (Garson, 2015). Cronbach's Alpha and the items whose removal from each scale would improve its alpha level are included in the table.

As Table 3 indicates, the reliabilities for the Structural and Process Fidelity scales of the FOF meet the critical alpha .70 threshold for acceptable levels through either the Original Dataset or the

Expectation Maximization (EM) approach (Lavrakas, 2008). During the EM analysis Little's MCAR test was also run to ensure missing values were missing completely at random. The Structural Fidelity scale passed the Little's MCAR test, the Process Fidelity scale did not. This indicates the items on the Process Fidelity scale may or may not be missing at random. While both approaches indicate the two scales being tested are reliable, the original dataset yields both higher alpha levels and is not subject to the Little's MCAR assumption.

Table 3: Reliability for Original and Imputed Dataset

Scale	Original Dataset				Imputed EM Dataset			
	Items	Cases	Alpha	Item removal improves scale	Items	Cases	Alpha	Item removal improves scale
Structural Fidelity	10*	72	.789	S6	12	119	.744	S7, S8, S9
Process Fidelity	8	109	.892	P7	8	119	.885	P7
*two items in the Structural Fidelity scale (S7, S8) were omitted from the Original Dataset reliability run due to variances of zero. There are observations with variance on both items but due to listwise deletion they are dropped from the Original Dataset reliability run.								

This study focuses on reliability and validity, as opposed to hypothesis testing. Maximizing the number of observations is not critical in a reliability and validity study. Additionally, the internal consistency Alpha levels of both the Original and EM datasets are acceptable and fewer items in the Original version of the dataset detract from the scale consistency. Thus, the Original Dataset is used throughout the remainder of this paper.

The Structural Fidelity scale's alpha of .79 exceed the .70 critical value of Cronbach's Alpha (Lavrakas, 2008) indicating its items hold together "acceptably" bordering on "well". The Process Fidelity scale alpha of .89 indicates the items in the scale hold together "well." The alpha levels of both scales support the conclusion that they consistently measure related phenomena.

Inter-Rater Reliability

In addition to looking at the reliability of the FOF, the reliability within the team of observers who collected the data needs to be examined. The observation team that collected these data included three individuals from the Pure Edge team. Training for members of the observation team included review of the FOF, practice observations and debriefing sessions. Full team observations were followed by calibration observations that included combinations of the three team members. Training and inter-rater reliability sessions occurred over the course of year two and year three of the project.

Intra-class correlations (ICC) were run to examine inter-rater reliability because of its ability to accommodate more than two observers, incorporate multiple response types and generalize across items and raters to balance over repeated observations. In order to fit the data into the ICC parameters, dichotomous yes/no items were recoded to 0=no and 1=yes. Multiple choice items were recoded on a five point scale from 0 (Strongly Disagree) to 4 (Strongly Agree) and treated as interval level data. The ICC was a fully crossed design where all three observers conducted three formal observations for the purpose of the ICC analysis. Additional group observations were conducted but did not include all three members of the observation team.

A series of ICCs was run to build cautiously toward an understanding of agreement across the FOF. This was done to accommodate the different response types embedded within the Structural Fidelity scale. An ICC was run on each response type individually, then a fifth ICC was run on the values from the full set of Structural Fidelity items. This approach builds a case for inter-rater reliability across the full Structural Fidelity scale of the FOF and points out the areas where disagreement between the observers existed.

Table 4 displays Intra-class correlations (ICC 2,3) for the full form and the various proposed sub-scales. ICC average on the full form indicates inter-rater reliability was excellent (Cicchetti, 1994). Observers had a high degree of agreement. The ICC suggests that the independent observers introduced a minimal amount of measurement error and supports conclusions that their individual observations would be consistent if conducted as a team. The pooling of the three independent observers' FOF observations into a single dataset for analysis is thus supported by the ICC (Hallgren, 2012).

Table 4: Intra-Class Correlations

	ICC Average	ICC Lower	ICC Upper
ICC 1: Structure - Binary Sum (S1, S2, S3, S6, S7, S8)	.82	-.89	.99
ICC 2: Structure – Likert Sum (S4, S5, S9, S10, S11, S12)	.55	-3.78	.99
ICC3: Structure – Mindfulness and Breath Tickers Sum (T5, T6)	.90	-.09	.99
ICC4: Structure - Breath + Move Allocation (T1, T2 as a percentage)	.99	.84	1.0
ICC5: Structure – Structure1 + Structure2 + Structure 3 + Structure 4	.99	.91	1.0
ICC6: Process Fidelity	.64	-2.8	.99
ICC7: Full Form (Average)	.99	.88	1.0

As the FOF is broken down into its constituent parts the strength of the ICCs is inconsistent. It remains high on ICC1 which includes items from routines (S1, S2,S3) and environment (S6, S7, S8) but drops markedly on ICC2 which includes the Likert scale items (S4, S5, S9-S12). The Process Fidelity ICC is also low.

The ICCs displayed in Table 4 indicate the team of observers who collected these data operated with a high degree of reliability. The ICC averages on the Process and Fidelity Scales range from fair (ICC6 = .64) to excellent (ICC5 = .99) as is the Full Form ICC (ICC7). While the ICC confidence interval lower and upper bounds, are generally sound, the Process Fidelity confidence interval (ICC6) includes a negative lower bound and is large. Adding more observations to the ICC dataset would likely decrease its range, bringing it to a more acceptable level.

FOF Validity

Confirming the FOF as a valid measure of the implementation of the Pure Power program begins with revisiting its development and runs beyond the scope of this paper into future analyses. As previously noted, the FOF's development began with an observation form developed by Hagins and Rundle (2016) in partnership with the program's curriculum writers. When the Pure Power

curriculum was being revised, a parallel revision process for the FOF was undertaken. Both revision processes were designed to yield products aligned to one another.

The FOF development process included sessions with curriculum developers, program observers, program implementers and researchers. The process focused on establishing common understandings on goals and expected outcomes of the FOF and fidelity of implementation program. The primary tool for establishing these understandings was open dialogue and practice with the FOF in context.

Working within the CORE framework, the FOF development team piloted the FOF in Pure Power programs across the country. In each location, the two primary FOF developers were joined by two or three partners from the local Pure Power program and/or research teams. The pilot observation sessions included a minimum of two observations at two different sites. These pilot observations encouraged group reflection and reading of the data, checking data fit and form functionality within the observation team and across individual observations. These sessions were key parts of CORE Step 2, Operationalize & Measure.

Additional validity checks were conducted with Pure Power instructors and RCSD personnel during data collection. These were critical in helping the RCSD instructors understand what the program team was looking for during observations and opening dialogue about the utility of the FOF for documenting program implementation and driving program improvement. This assured the observation team the FOF was a valid documentation of what was actually happening in Pure Power class sessions. The series of discussions, working sessions and refinements over the course of the FOF's development, piloting and active administration led to the FOF and Pure Power being intertwined.

Conclusion and Invitation

The CORE process has been at the heart of Pure Edge's fidelity of implementation work. This paper has sought to move Pure Edge's FOI work from CORE Step two, Operationalize and Measure to CORE Step three, Run Analyses and Report/Review Findings. According to these analyses the FOF's internal consistency and interrater reliability are excellent. Its validity claim is supported by the roles of experts in its design and development as well as its refinement through the lens of the CORE process. Though much went into it as an instrument of program support, additional opportunities exist to improve what is known on how it performs as a measurement tool in research contexts. Further analysis into the FOF's properties and subscales is warranted. A traditional instrument development process would lead to a series of factor analyses to explore the relationships between items to confirm them, ideally in a separate sample.

The FOF's path to full-fledged psychometric validation is long but given its potential and the field's direction and promise (Felver, Celis de-Hoyos, Tezanos & Singh, 2016; Serwacki & Cook-Cottone, 2012; Zoogman, Goldberg, Hoyt & Miller, 2014) worth taking. The FOF is shared here in hopes that its continued refinement and use contributes to the field as it moves toward deeper understandings of the processes and circumstances that support student and educator well-being within school settings.

References

- Argon P, Berends V, Ellis K, Gonzalez M., (2010). School wellness policies: Perceptions, barriers, and needs among school leaders and wellness advocates. *Journal of School Health*, 80(11), 527-535.
- Century, J., Rudnick, M., and Freeman, C. (2010). A framework for measuring fidelity of implementation: A foundation for shared language and accumulation of knowledge. *American Journal of Evaluation*, 31(2), 199-218.
- Cicchetti DV. Guidelines, criteria, and rules of thumb for evaluating normed and standardized assessment instruments in psychology. *Psychological Assessment*, 6(4), 284–290.
- Dean, C.B., Hubbell, E.R., Pitler, H., Stone, B. (2012). *Classroom Instruction that Works Research-Based Strategies for Increasing Student Achievement* (2nd Edition, E-Book). Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- Feagans-Gould, L., Mendelson, T., Dariotis, J. K., Ancona, M., Smith, A. S. R., Gonzalez, A. A., Smith, A. A., & Greenberg, M. T. (2014). Assessing fidelity of core components in a mindfulness and yoga intervention for urban youth: applying the CORE process. *New Directions for Youth Development*, 142, 59–81.
- Feagans-Gould, L., Dariotis, J. K., Greenberg, M. T. & Mendelson, T. (2015). Assessing fidelity of implementation (FOI) for school-based mindfulness and yoga interventions: a systematic review. *Mindfulness*, 7(1), 5-33.
- Felver, J.C., Celis de-Hoyos, C.E., Tezanos, K., & Singh, N.N. (2016). A systematic review of mindfulness-based interventions for youth in school settings. *Mindfulness*, 7, 34-45.
- Gard, T., Noggle, J.J., Park, C.L., Vago, D.L., & Wilson, A. (2014). Potential self-regulatory mechanisms of yoga for psychological health. *Frontiers in Human Neuroscience*. 8: 1–20.
- Garson, David (2015). *Missing Values Analysis and Data Imputation*. Asheboro, NC: Statistical Associates Publishing.
- Graham, J. W. (2009). Missing data analysis: Making it work in the real world. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 60.
- Greenberg, M. T., & Harris, A. R. (2012). Nurturing mindfulness in children and youth: current state of research. *Child Development Perspectives*, 6(2), 161–166.
- Hagins, M. and Rundle, A. (2016), Yoga Improves Academic Performance in Urban High School Students Compared to Physical Education: A Randomized Controlled Trial. *Mind, Brain, and Education*, 10, 105–116.

Hallgren, K. A. (2012). Computing Inter-Rater Reliability for Observational Data: An Overview and Tutorial. *Tutorials in Quantitative Methods for Psychology*, 8(1), 23–34.

Hatry, H.P. (2010). Using agency records. In J. S. Wholey, H. P. Hatry, & K. E. Newcomer, K. E. (Eds). *The handbook of practical program evaluation*. (pp. 55-80, 3rd Edition). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Hattie, J., & Timperley, H. (2007). The power of feedback. *Review of Educational Research*, 77(1), 81-112.

Hora, M. T. (2015), Toward a Descriptive Science of Teaching: How the TDOP Illuminates the Multidimensional Nature of Active Learning in Postsecondary Classrooms. *Science Education*, 99, 783–818.

Joint Committee on National Health Education Standards. (2007). *National Health Education Standards, Second Edition: Achieving Excellence*. Washington, D.C.: The American Cancer Society.

Jones, D.B., Greenberg, M., and Crowley, M. (2015). Early social-emotional functioning and public health: The relationship between kindergarten social competence and future wellness. *American Journal of Public Health*, 105(11), 2283-2290.

Khalsa, S. B. S. and Butzer, B. (2016), Yoga in school settings: a research review. *Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences*, 1373, 45–55.

Lavrakas, P. J. (2008). *Encyclopedia of Survey Research Methods*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Lewallen, T.C., Hunt, H., Potts-Datema, W., Zaza, S., Giles, W. (2015). The Whole School, Whole Community, Whole Child Model: a new approach for improving educational attainment and healthy development for students. *Journal of School Health*, 85, 729-739.

Marzano, R. J. (2007). *The Art and Science of Teaching: A Comprehensive Framework for Effective Instruction*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

McLaughlin, J. A. & Jordan, G. B. (2010). Using logic models. In J. S. Wholey, H. P. Hatry, & K. E. Newcomer, K. E. (Eds). *The handbook of practical program evaluation*. (pp. 55-80, 3rd Edition). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Pianta, R. C., La Paro, K. M., and Hamre, B. K. (2008). *Classroom Assessment Scoring System*. Baltimore, MD: Brookes.

Pure Edge (2017). *Pure Edge Fidelity Observation Form Introduction and Guidelines*. Retrieved from <http://pureedgeinc.org/wp-content/uploads/2017/03/Fidelity-Guidelines.pdf>

Rog, D. J. (2010). Designing, managing, and analyzing multisite evaluations. In J. S. Wholey, H. P. Hatry, & K. E. Newcomer, K. E. (Eds). *The handbook of practical program evaluation*. (pp. 208-236, 3rd Edition). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Serwacki, M.L. and Cook-Cottone, C. (2012). Yoga in the schools: a systematic review of the literature. *International Journal of Yoga Therapy*, 22, 101–109.

Shonkoff JP, Boyce T, McEwen BS (2009). Neuroscience, molecular biology, and the childhood roots of health disparities: Building a new framework for health promotion and disease prevention. *Journal of the American Medical Association*, 301(21), 2252-2259.

Teicher MH, Andersen SL, Polcari A, Anderson CM, Navalta CP (2002). Developmental neurobiology of childhood stress and trauma. *The Psychiatric Clinics of North America*, 25(2), 397-426.

Zoogman, S., Goldberg, S. B., Hoyt, W. T., & Miller, L. (2014). Mindfulness interventions with youth: a meta-analysis. *Mindfulness* 6(2), 290-302.

Pure Edge Fidelity Observation Form

Date:	Instructor:	Classroom/Homeroom Teacher	Observer	Grade Level	Actual Start time:											
Class Time Period	School:	Student Count	Class Composition: Males / Females / Mixed	Lesson Number	Actual End time:											
Section (General Activity)	Overall purpose	Fidelity Focus: Does the activity occur?			YES/NO											
1. Routines and procedures	Arrival and closing routines have been established	1. Visual outline displayed, with focus clearly stated, as students arrive.	YES	NO												
		2. Content objective is visible	YES	NO												
		3. Posture objective is visible	YES	NO												
		4. % (mark pct. at right) of students entered in an orderly way following instructor prompts/carrying out routine w/ little disruption.	0	25	50	75	100									
		5. % (mark pct. at right) of students exited in an orderly way following instructor prompts/carrying out routine w/ little disruption.	0	25	50	75	100									
1n. Routines Notes																
2. Environment	The space is conducive to H&W practice.	1. Classroom is arranged in an orderly fashion, all relevant materials well organized and accessible.	YES	NO												
		2. Environment: the physical environment is conducive to learning (e.g., temperature, lighting, floor conditions, etc.)	YES	NO												
		3. Environmental distractions interfere with lesson delivery (use notes to describe distraction)	YES	NO												
2n. Environment Notes																
3. Content Fidelity	The lesson objectives are introduced and included in the class.	1. Content objective is explicitly introduced in the first 15 minutes of class.	SD	D	N	A	SA									
		2. The content CONNECT is discussed with students. This may or may not be brief and may occur at any time in the lesson.	SD	D	N	A	SA									
		3. The content objective(s) were included in the lesson.	SD	D	N	A	SA									
		4. The posture objective(s) were included in the lesson.	SD	D	N	A	SA									
3n. Content Fidelity Notes																
4. Time Allocation & Breath/Mindfulness Tracking	Students are instructed in postures, rest and program (can happen in any order)	1. Students instructed in breath	Start time:	End time:	Total Mins:											
		2. Students instructed in postures	Start time:	End time:	Total Mins:											
		3. Students instructed in rest	Start time:	End time:	Total Mins:											
		4. Students instructed in program content	Start time:	End time:	Total Mins:											
5. Breath: DURING THE POSTURE AND REST PORTIONS OF THE CLASS - Mark a box each time students are prompted to focus on breath		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15
6. Mindfulness: Mark a box each time students are prompted to be mindful		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15

Process Fidelity: Use the SD to SA scale (Right) to indicate the degree to which you agree with the following statements.															
SD (Strongly disagree)	D (Disagree)	N (Neither agree nor disagree)	A (Agree)	SA (Strongly agree)											
1. Instructor models human compassion by treating themselves and others kindly and empathically (e.g., greets students by name, is clearly engaged with students, is willing to explain, is attuned to student's affective state, etc.).					<table border="1"> <tr><td>SD</td><td>D</td><td>N</td><td>A</td><td>SA</td></tr> <tr><td>SD</td><td>D</td><td>N</td><td>A</td><td>SA</td></tr> </table>	SD	D	N	A	SA	SD	D	N	A	SA
SD	D	N	A	SA											
SD	D	N	A	SA											
Notes:															
2. Instructor maintains classroom order, redirects negative behaviors, and reinforces on-task behavior as needed.					<table border="1"> <tr><td>SD</td><td>D</td><td>N</td><td>A</td><td>SA</td></tr> </table>	SD	D	N	A	SA					
SD	D	N	A	SA											
Notes:															
3. Instructor introduces topics in an age-appropriate manner, leads discussion effectively, engages students via question and response, and uses a variety of teaching strategies and classroom resources to meet needs of all learners.					<table border="1"> <tr><td>SD</td><td>D</td><td>N</td><td>A</td><td>SA</td></tr> </table>	SD	D	N	A	SA					
SD	D	N	A	SA											
Notes:															
4. Instructor demonstrates preparedness for the lesson: Appears fluent in the lesson plan for the day, is prepared to support student understanding, and is able to answer questions on the lesson.					<table border="1"> <tr><td>SD</td><td>D</td><td>N</td><td>A</td><td>SA</td></tr> </table>	SD	D	N	A	SA					
SD	D	N	A	SA											
Notes:															
5. Instructor teaches postures clearly, using both instructor and student demonstration, and offers modifications as needed. Does not use physical touch to instruct students in postures.					<table border="1"> <tr><td>SD</td><td>D</td><td>N</td><td>A</td><td>SA</td></tr> </table>	SD	D	N	A	SA					
SD	D	N	A	SA											
Notes:															
6. Instructor draws attention to the breath and movement connection throughout the class including: transitions between poses, while holding poses and transition into rest.					<table border="1"> <tr><td>SD</td><td>D</td><td>N</td><td>A</td><td>SA</td></tr> </table>	SD	D	N	A	SA					
SD	D	N	A	SA											
Notes:															
7. Instructor avoids inappropriate behaviors such as: verbal use of Sanskrit or use of Sanskrit on clothing; verbal description of program as yoga program and not a health & wellness program; unnecessary elaboration/lack of discretion in relating personal thoughts, ideas, and experiences.					<table border="1"> <tr><td>SD</td><td>D</td><td>N</td><td>A</td><td>SA</td></tr> </table>	SD	D	N	A	SA					
SD	D	N	A	SA											
Notes:															
8. ____% (mark at right) of students are engaged in class activities (e.g., body posture/movements/attentional focus suggest a motivation or intent to participate in the activities; absence of talking or disrupting nearby students)					<table border="1"> <tr><td>0</td><td>25</td><td>50</td><td>75</td><td>100</td></tr> </table>	0	25	50	75	100					
0	25	50	75	100											
Notes:															
9. What worked well:															
10. To consider:															

Pure Edge Fidelity Observation Form: Support Document

General Activity	Does the activity occur?	Observation Operational Definitions/Notes
1. Routines and procedures	<p>1. <u>Visual outline displayed, with focus clearly stated, as students arrive.</u></p> <p>2. <u>Content objective(s) are visible</u></p> <p>3. <u>Posture objective(s) are visible</u></p> <p>4. Students entered the space, got to their mats, and were ready to begin.</p> <p>5. Students exited the space in a calm and self-managed manner</p>	<p><u>Visual outline:</u> can take any form (i.e., Projected, on board, easel) <u>Focus:</u> student centric language taken from one of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Unit Enduring Understanding • Unit Essential Question • Unit Overarching Objective • Lesson Guiding Question
2. Environment	<p>1. Classroom is arranged in an orderly fashion, all relevant materials well organized and accessible.</p> <p>2. Environment: the physical environment is conducive to learning (e.g., temperature, lighting, floor conditions, etc.).</p> <p>3. <u>Environmental distractions interfere with delivery of lesson (use notes to describe distraction and impact on lesson).</u></p>	<p>If no, use notes to explain</p> <p><u>Environmental Distractions:</u> smells, sounds, bugs, interruptions, events. Ex: fire drill, thunder, construction noise, interruptions because of shared classroom. Note: address student behavior related distractions in Section 6 under process fidelity.</p>
3. Content Fidelity	<p>1. The content objective is introduced explicitly in the first 15 minutes of class.</p> <p>2. The content <u>CONNECT</u> is discussed using interaction with students (questions/ answers). This may or may not be brief and may occur at any time in the lesson.</p> <p>3. The content objective(s) were included in the lesson.</p> <p>4. The posture objective(s) were included in the lesson.</p>	<p>See 1.2 focus</p> <p><u>Connect:</u> instructor addresses the specific "Connect" from the lesson plan in class. This section connects today's lesson content to prior learning.</p> <p><u>Lesson content objectives from curriculum</u> If all content objectives detailed in the session are taught, indicate "SA" shifting toward disagreement as objectives are omitted from the class session. If no content is taught 3.3 should be coded "SD"</p> <p><u>Lesson posture sequence from curriculum</u> To be coded "SA" the entire posture sequence* from the session must be delivered with student understanding and engagement. As scripted postures are omitted from the session, the level of agreement should drop accordingly.</p>
4. Time allocation & Breath/Mindfulness Tracking	1. Students instructed in breath.	<p>*Modification of postures for simplification as would be appropriate in teaching a complex posture or for safety are not omissions from the posture sequence.</p> <p>Breath instruction is timed separately from postural instruction. Generally occurs at start of class but can occur at any point. Example: use of breathing ball, alternate nostril breathing, belly breathing, etc.</p>

	2. Students instructed in postures	Postures begin when students first stand in Mountain pose or other opening posture, and end when they are asked to lay down for rest. If posture and content instruction overlap, time should be allocated to postures, not content.
	3. Students instructed in rest	Rest begins when students lay down for rest and ends when the last student arises out of resting pose.
	4. Students instructed in program content	Program content begins when instructor begins dialogue or direct instruction aligned to program content objective – classroom management instructions should not be counted here.
	5. Breath (DURING THE POSTURE AND REST PORTIONS OF THE LESSON mark a box each time students are prompted to focus on their breath.)	Could include direct mention of breath such as during transitions or "hold for three breaths", other terms that draw student attention to breath such as: inhale, exhale, blow, OR breath modifiers such as lion or ocean when called for during movement portion of the class. Also possible cues could be visual such as arm movement or breathing ball movement.
	6. Mindfulness (Mark a box each time students are prompted to be mindful)	Instruction that encourages students to notice/observe/recognize where, what, how they are doing without judgement or reaction. Examples: "It doesn't matter how far forward you fold, just notice where your body feels a stretch;" "Notice how your legs feel;" "Do you feel the difference?" (after alignment instruction); "Put your attention on your shoulders/legs/arms," etc.

A note on process fidelity - Use the notes sections under each element to indicate reasoning behind scoring, document noteworthy aspects of the observation or indicate "NA" and an explanation of why this element of process fidelity is not applicable (NA).

Process Fidelity: Use the SD to SA scale (Right) to indicate the degree to which you agree with the following statements.					
SD (Strongly disagree)	D (Disagree)	N (Neither agree nor disagree)	A (Agree)	SA (Strongly agree)	
1. Instructor models human compassion by treating themselves and others kindly and empathically (e.g., greets students by name, is clearly engaged with students, is willing to explain, is attuned to student's affective state, etc.).					
					SD D N A SA
Notes:					
2. Instructor maintains classroom order, redirects negative behaviors, and reinforces on-task behavior as needed.					
					SD D N A SA
3. Instructor introduces topics in an age-appropriate manner, leads discussion effectively, and engages students via question and response, and uses a variety of teaching strategies and classroom resources to meet needs of all learners.					
					SD D N A SA
4. Instructor demonstrates preparedness for the lesson: Appears fluent in the lesson plan for the day, is prepared to support student understanding and is able to answer questions on the lesson.					
					SD D N A SA
5. Instructor teaches postures clearly, using both instructor and student demonstration, and offers modifications as needed. Does not use physical touch to instruct students in postures.					
					SD D N A SA

6. Instructor draws attention to the breath and movement connection throughout the class including transitions between poses, while holding poses and transition into rest.	SD	D	N	A	SA
7. Instructor avoids inappropriate behaviors such as verbal use of Sanskrit or use of Sanskrit on clothing; verbal description of program as yoga program and not a health & wellness program; unnecessary elaboration/lack of discretion in relating personal thoughts, ideas, and experiences.	SD	D	N	A	SA
8. ____% (mark at right) of students are engaged in class activities (e.g., body posture/movements/attentional focus suggest a motivation or intent to participate in the activities; absence of talking or disrupting nearby students)	0	25	50	75	100