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RtI: The Model
Response to Intervention

• RtI is the practice of (1) providing high-quality instruction/intervention matched to student needs and (2) using learning rate over time and level of performance to (3) make important educational decisions.  
  (Batsche, et al., 2005)

• Problem-solving is the process that is used to develop effective instruction/interventions.
Three-Tiered Model of School Supports & the Problem-solving Process

**ACADEMIC SYSTEMS**

**Tier 3: Comprehensive & Intensive** Students who need individualized interventions.

**Tier 2: Strategic Interventions** Students who need more support in addition to the core curriculum.

**Tier 1: Core Curriculum** All students, including students who require curricular enhancements for acceleration.

**BEHAVIOR SYSTEMS**

**Tier 3: Intensive Interventions** Students who need individualized intervention.

**Tier 2: Targeted Group Interventions** Students who need more support in addition to school-wide positive behavior program.

**Tier 1: Universal Interventions** All students in all settings.
Model of Schooling

• All district instruction and intervention services have a “place” in this model.

• Critical Questions:
  – Where does it “fit” in the triangle?
  – How is it integrated with core instruction?
  – How will the impact on student performance be measured?
Problem-Solving/RtI
Resource Management

• Public Education Resource Deployment
  – Support staff cannot resource more than 20% of the students
  – Service vs Effectiveness--BIG ISSUE
RtI: Framing Issues and Key Concepts

• Academic Engaged Time (AET) is the best predictor of student achievement
  – 330 minutes in a day, 1650 in a week and 56,700 in a year
  – This is the “currency” of instruction/intervention
  – Its what we have to spend on students
  – How we use it determines student outcomes.

• MOST students who are behind will respond positively to additional CORE instruction.
  – Schools have more staff qualified to deliver core instruction than specialized instruction.
  – Issue is how to schedule in such a way as to provide more exposure to core.
RtI: Framing Issues and Key Concepts

• Managing the GAP between student current level of performance and expectation (benchmark, standards, goal) is what RtI is all about.

• The two critical pieces of information we need about students are:
  – How BIG is the GAP?
    • AND
  – How much time do we have to close it?

• The answers to these 2 questions defines our instructional mission.
RtI: RATE

• Rate is growth per week (month) necessary to close the GAP
• Rate becomes the statistic we need to define evidence-based intervention (EBI)
• EBI is any intervention that results in the desired RATE
RtI: 3 Priorities

1. **Prevention**: Identify students at-risk for literacy failure BEFORE they actually fail.
   - Kindergarten screening, intervention and progress monitoring is key.
   - No excuse for not identifying ALL at-risk students by November of the kindergarten year.
   - This strategy *prevents* the GAP.
   - Managing GAPs is more expensive and less likely to be successful.
RtI: 3 Priorities

2. Early Intervention
   - Purpose here is the manage the GAP.
   - Students who are more than 2 years behind have a 10% chance, or less, or catching up.
   - Benchmark, progress monitoring data, district-wide assessments are used to identify students that have a gap of 2 years or less.
   - Students bumping up against the 2 year level receive the most intensive services.
   - This more costly and requires more specialized instruction/personnel
3. **Intensive Intervention**
   - Reserved for those students who have a GAP of more than 2 years and the rate of growth to close the GAP is unrealistic. Too much growth—too little time remaining.
   - Problem-solving is used to develop instructional priorities.
   - This is truly a case of “you cannot do something different the same way.”
   - This is the most costly, staff intensive and least likely to result in goal attainment
How Does it Fit Together?  
Standard Treatment Protocol

**Step 1**
- All Students at a grade level
  - ODRs Monthly Bx Screening
  - Behavior Academics
  - Annual Testing

**Step 2**
Addl. Diagnostic Assessment
- Intensive
  - 1-5%
- Supplemental
  - 5-10%
- Standard Protocol
  - 80-90%

**Step 3**
Individualized Instruction
- Individual Diagnostic
- Standard Protocol
- None
- Continue With Core Instruction
- None

**Step 4**
Results Monitoring
- Small Group Differentiated By Skill
- Grades Classroom Assessments
- Yearly Assessments
- None
- Continue With Core Instruction
- None

Weekly
2 times/month
National Perspective

• 71% of districts are in some stage of implementing RTI – up from 60% in 2008 and 44% in 2007
• RTI is being increasingly implemented across all grade levels with a significant increase in high school implementation compared to 2008
• Of districts with enough data, 83% indicated RTI has reduced the number of referrals to special education
• Districts reported the three primary obstacles to implementing RTI as: Insufficient teacher training, Lack of intervention resources, Lack of data, knowledge, skills for tracking/charting

• www.spectrumk12.com
At what stage is your district in RTI implementation?

- Investigation: 11%
- Planning: 17%
- Piloting in a limited number of schools or grades: 31%
- In process of district-wide implementation: 28%
- District-wide use for more than 1 year: 12%
- Not considering: 2%
When do you anticipate RTI will be fully implemented and in daily use district wide?

- Currently in daily use district wide: 12%
- 2009-2010 school year: 17%
- 2010-2011 school year: 32%
- Don’t know: 30%
- Other (please specify): 9%
Does your district have a defined RTI process?

- Yes (54%)
- No (46%)
What percentage of your district staff has been trained on RTI?
Is your district using RTI for:

- Identification of students for early intervening services and supports: 88%
- Identification of students for special education services: 60%
- Identification of students for specialized services and supports in addition to special education: 51%
Is your district using RTI as part of the process to identify students for special education services?

- Yes (73%)
- No (27%)
For which grades and areas have you already implemented RTI?
Please indicate the academic implementation level(s) for the following RTI components in your district.

![Bar chart showing implementation levels for various RTI components]

- General curriculum: 17% partially implemented, 72% fully implemented, 11% not implemented
- Common screening: 40% partially implemented, 36% fully implemented, 23% not implemented
- Academic interventions: 57% partially implemented, 26% fully implemented, 17% not implemented
- Monitoring progress: 52% partially implemented, 27% fully implemented, 21% not implemented
- Data collected: 53% partially implemented, 27% fully implemented, 20% not implemented
- Software to collect data: 39% partially implemented, 21% fully implemented, 40% not implemented
- RTI used for SpecEd ID: 40% partially implemented, 24% fully implemented, 36% not implemented
- Collaborative meetings: 50% partially implemented, 26% fully implemented, 25% not implemented
- Problem-solving approach: 50% partially implemented, 25% fully implemented, 25% not implemented
- Clearly defined process: 42% partially implemented, 17% fully implemented, 41% not implemented
Please indicate the behavior implementation level(s) for the following RTI components in your district.

- Common screening assessment: 20% partially implemented, 9% fully implemented, 72% not implemented
- Research-based interventions: 41% partially implemented, 8% fully implemented, 51% not implemented
- Assessments to monitor: 36% partially implemented, 7% fully implemented, 57% not implemented
- Data used to guide: 41% partially implemented, 11% fully implemented, 48% not implemented
- Software used for data: 25% partially implemented, 7% fully implemented, 68% not implemented
- Problem-solving approach: 45% partially implemented, 14% fully implemented, 41% not implemented
- Clearly-defined process: 28% partially implemented, 7% fully implemented, 65% not implemented
How significant an obstacle have the following been to implementing RTI in your districts? If you have not yet implemented, please indicate how much of an obstacle you anticipate each will be.
Please indicate how effective the following professional development solutions have been in mediating or eliminating RTI implementation obstacles?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Professional Development Solutions</th>
<th>Somewhat Effective</th>
<th>Very Effective</th>
<th>Not at all Effective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Initial training in RTI</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Establishment and use of collaborative teams</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of data to guide decisions for instruction and intervention</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interventions that address academic concerns</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interventions that address behavior concerns</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Progress monitoring</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identifying funding sources for RTI</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
What impact has the implementation of RTI had on building/district staffing (i.e. employing more or fewer FTE of staff)?

- No impact on staffing (72%)
- Increased staffing (24%)
- Reduced staffing (4%)
Has RTI been the focus of any of the following legal proceedings in your district?

- Complaint: 6%
- Mediation: 1%
- Due process hearings: 1%
- None of the above: 93%
Do you plan to use a portion of your district’s Title 1 stimulus money to support RTI?
Do you plan to use a portion of your district’s IDEA stimulus money to support RTI?
Have your State Education Agency regulations been revised to accommodate the RTI provisions?

- Yes (46%)
- Don't know (40%)
- No (14%)
Is your State Education Agency providing leadership and expanding support for local districts implementing RTI?

- Yes (46%)
- No (28%)
- Don't know (26%)
4. At what stage is your district in RTI implementation?

- Investigation: 11%
- Planning: 17%
- Piloting in a limited number of schools or grades: 31%
- In process of district-wide implementation: 28%
- District-wide use for more than 1 year: 12%
- Not considering: 2%
What Does the Research Say About RtI?
Effective Schools

• 30% or more of students at risk but who were at grade level at the end of the year.

• Characteristics
  – Strong Leadership
  – Positive Belief and Teacher Dedication
  – Data Utilization and Analysis
  – Effective Scheduling
  – Professional Development
  – Scientifically-Based Intervention Programs
  – Parent Involvement

• (Crawford and Torgeson)
## Data on the Top 10 Schools Meeting the Effective School Criteria

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>EI score</th>
<th>EI %ile</th>
<th>ECI score</th>
<th>ECI %ile</th>
<th>% free &amp; reduced lunch</th>
<th>% minority</th>
<th>% ELL</th>
<th># of children in K-3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>499</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>463</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>455</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>487</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>428</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>618</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>480</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>556</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>301</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>575</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
What is the impact of PSM/RtI on students from diverse backgrounds?

• VanDerHeyden, et al. report that students responded positively to the method and that African-American students responded more quickly than other ethnic groups.
• Marston reported a 50% decrease in EMH placements over a 6-year period of time.
• Marston reported a drop over a 3-year period in the percent of African-American students placed in special education from 67% to 55%, considering 45% of the student population was comprised of African-American Students.
• Batsche (2006) reported a significant decrease in the risk indices for ELL and African-American students
Percentage of African-American students at each stage of referral process at 41 schools

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage</th>
<th>1997-98</th>
<th>2000-01</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student Population</td>
<td>44.33%</td>
<td>45.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Referred to Support Team</td>
<td>64.4%</td>
<td>59.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluated for Sp. Ed.</td>
<td>69.00%</td>
<td>57.70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Placed in Sp. Ed.</td>
<td>68.9%</td>
<td>55.40%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N=9643, N=9170, N=348, N=416, N=200, N=154, N=184, N=124
Risk Indices by Year & Race/Ethnicity

- Reading First - White
- Reading First - Black
- Reading First - Hispanic
- Comparison - White
- Comparison - Black
- Comparison - Hispanic

School Year:
- 2002-03
- 2003-04
- 2004-05

Percentage:
- 0
- 0.1
- 0.2
- 0.3
- 0.4
- 0.5
- 0.6
- 0.7
- 0.8
Some Overall Referral Trends

Legend:
- Reading First Referred & Pending
- Reading First Ineligible
- Comparison Referred & Pending
- Comparison Ineligible

Graph shows trends in referral rates over the school years 2002-03 to 2004-05.
Pilot vs Comparison Schools
Level 3 or Higher on FCAT
2006/7-2008/9
1 Year of Baseline, 1 Year of Implementation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Pilot Schools (%)</th>
<th>Comparison Schools (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Improved</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Declined</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Change</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Change Model

Consensus

Infrastructure

Implementation
Stages of Implementing Problem-Solving/Rti

• **Consensus**
  – Belief is shared
  – Vision is agreed upon
  – Implementation requirements understood

• **Infrastructure Development**
  – Problem-Solving Process
  – Data System
  – Policies/Procedures
  – Training
  – Tier I and II intervention systems
    • E.g., K-3 Academic Support Plan
  – Technology support
  – Decision-making criteria established

• **Implementation**
Consensus: Essential Beliefs

- No child should be left behind
- It is OK to provide differential service across students
- Academic Engaged Time must be considered first
- Student performance is influenced most by the quality of the interventions we deliver and how well we deliver them—not preconceived notions about child characteristics
- Decisions are best made with data
- Our expectations for student performance should be dependent on a student’s response to intervention, not on the basis of a “score” that “predicts” what they are “capable” of doing.
Consensus Development: Data

• Are you happy with your data?

• Building/Grade Level Student Outcomes
  – Disaggregated
  – AYP
Percentage of Students At Proficient and Advanced on California Standards Test (CST) ELA, Grade 2

All Students  English Learners  Students with Disabilities  Afr American SEL
Most LD students achieve reading benchmarks
Most LD students achieve math benchmarks
Most EBD students achieve reading benchmarks
Most EBD students achieve math benchmarks
Students receiving SPED services are capable of achieving reading benchmarks
Students receiving SPED services are capable of achieving math benchmarks
PS/RtI Project Pilot Schools SBLT
Self-Assessment of Problem Solving Implementation (SAPSI)
Consensus

Goal 4 Indicator

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 = Not Started</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 = In Progress</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 = Achieved</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 = Maintaining</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District Commitment</td>
<td>Fall 07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SBLT support</td>
<td>Spr 08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty involvement</td>
<td>Win 09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SBLT present</td>
<td>Win 09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data to assess commitment</td>
<td>Spr 09</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: No data for Bear Creek, Woodlawn, or New Heights for Spr 09
The Infrastructure
School-Based Infrastructure

- School-based leadership team (SBLT)
- School-based coach
  - Process Technical Assistance
  - Interpretation and Use of Data
- Master Calendar
- Data Days
- Evaluation Model
Infrastructure

- School-Based Leadership Team (SBLT)
  - Communication, Data Sharing, Roles
- Problem-Solving Process
- Data Systems and Technology
- Decision-Rules
- Building the Tiers
- Intervention Development and Decisions
Roles and Responsibilities
Principal’s Role in Leading Implementation of RtI

• Models Problem-Solving Process
• Expectation for Data-Based Decision Making
• Scheduling “Data Days”
• Schedule driven by student needs
• Instructional/Intervention Support
• Intervention “Sufficiency”
• Communicating Student Outcomes
• Celebrating and Communicating Success
Role of the Facilitator

- Ensures pre-meeting preparation
- Reviews steps in process and desired outcomes
- Facilitates movement through steps
- Facilitates consensus building
- Sets follow-up schedule/communication
- Creates evaluation criteria/protocol
- Ensures parent involvement
Data Coach

• Gathers and Organizes Tier 1 and Tier 2 Data
• Supports staff for small group and individual data
• Provides coaching for data interpretation
• Facilitates regular data meetings for building and grade levels
Role of Participants

- Review Request for Assistance forms prior to meeting
- Complete individual problem-solving
- Attitude of consensus building
- Understand data
- Research interventions for problem area
Role of Parent

- Review Request for Assistance form prior to meeting
- Complete individual problem solving
- Prioritize concerns
- Attitude of consensus building
Student Involvement

• Increases motivation of student
• Reduces teacher load
• Teaches self-responsibility
Staff Support

• Risk-free or risky environment?
• Expectations may be most important factor
• “Alternative” not “Less”
Problem Solving Process

Define the Problem
Defining Problem/Directly Measuring Behavior

Evaluate
Response to Intervention (RtI)

Problem Analysis
Validating Problem
Ident Variables that Contribute to Problem
Develop Plan

Implement Plan
Implement As Intended
Progress Monitor
Modify as Necessary
Steps in the Problem-Solving Process

1. **PROBLEM IDENTIFICATION**
   - Identify replacement behavior
   - Data - current level of performance
   - Data - benchmark level(s)
   - Data - peer performance
   - Data - GAP analysis

2. **PROBLEM ANALYSIS**
   - Develop hypotheses (brainstorming)
   - Develop predictions/assessment

3. **INTERVENTION DEVELOPMENT**
   - Develop interventions in those areas for which data are available and hypotheses verified
   - Proximal/Distal
   - Implementation support

4. **Response to Intervention (RtI)**
   - Frequently collected data
   - Type of Response - good, questionable, poor
Decision Rules:
What Constitutes “Good” RtI?
Decision Rules

• Response to Intervention Rules

• Linking RtI to Intervention Decisions
Decision Rules: What is a “Good” Response to Intervention?

• **Positive Response**
  – Gap is closing
  – Can extrapolate point at which target student(s) will “come in range” of target--even if this is long range
  – Level of “risk” lowers over time

• **Questionable Response**
  – Rate at which gap is widening slows considerably, but gap is still widening
  – Gap stops widening but closure does not occur

• **Poor Response**
  – Gap continues to widen with no change in rate.
Positive Response to Intervention

Performance

Expected Trajectory

Observed Trajectory

Time
Decision Rules: What is a “Questionable” Response to Intervention?

- **Positive Response**
  - Gap is closing
  - Can extrapolate point at which target student(s) will “come in range” of target—even if this is long range

- **Questionable Response**
  - Rate at which gap is widening slows considerably, but gap is still widening
  - Gap stops widening but closure does not occur
  - Level of “risk” remains the same over time

- **Poor Response**
  - Gap continues to widen with no change in rate.
Decision Rules: What is a “Poor” Response to Intervention?

• **Positive Response**
  – Gap is closing
  – Can extrapolate point at which target student(s) will “come in range” of target--even if this is long range

• **Questionable Response**
  – Rate at which gap is widening slows considerably, but gap is still widening
  – Gap stops widening but closure does not occur

• **Poor Response**
  – Gap continues to widen with no change in rate.
  – Level of “risk” worsens over time
Poor Response to Intervention

Performance vs. Time

Expected Trajectory

Observed Trajectory
Decision Rules: Linking RtI to Intervention Decisions

• Positive
  • Continue intervention with current goal
  • Continue intervention with goal increased
  • Fade intervention to determine if student(s) have acquired functional independence.
Decision Rules: Linking RtI to Intervention Decisions

• **Questionable**
  
  – Was intervention implemented as intended?
    
    • If no - employ strategies to increase implementation integrity
    
    • If yes -
      
      – Increase intensity of current intervention for a short period of time and assess impact. If rate improves, continue. If rate does not improve, return to problem solving.
Decision Rules: Linking RtI to Intervention Decisions

• *Poor*

  – Was intervention implemented as intended?

    • If no - employ strategies in increase implementation integrity

    • If yes -

      – Is intervention aligned with the verified hypothesis? (Intervention Design)

      – Are there other hypotheses to consider? (Problem Analysis)

      – Was the problem identified correctly? (Problem Identification)
Data is collected
Data used to make decisions
Data presented to staff
Data used to evaluate core acad programs
Data used to evaluate core beh programs
CBM data used to ID students needing interventions
ODR data used to ID students needing beh interventions
Data used to evaluate Tier 2 interventions
Data used to determine Tier 3 inter

PS/RtI Project Pilot Schools SBLT
Self-Assessment of Problem Solving Implementation (SAPSI)
Infrastructure Development- Data Collection

Note: No data for Bear Creek, Woodlawn, or New Heights for Spr 09

Status
3= Maintaining
2= Achieved
1= In Progress
0= Not Started

Fall 07
Spr 08
Win 09
Spr 09
CCC Demonstration District: Year 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1b</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6b</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6c</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7b</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7c</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## CCC Demonstration District: Year 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1b</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6b</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6c</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7b</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7c</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item</td>
<td>Score</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1a</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1b</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6a</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6b</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6c</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7a</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7b</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7c</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CCC Demonstration District: Year 4

The chart illustrates the scores for various items related to the demonstration district's effectiveness and decision-making processes.

- **Score**
  - 0.00
  - 1.00
  - 2.00
  - 3.00

- **Item**
  - 1a: Data to determine effectiveness of core or other data used
  - 1b: Data to determine effectiveness of core instruction
  - 2: Decisions made to modify core instruction
  - 3: Universal screening or other data used
  - 4: Team hypotheses to identify reasons for data used to determine modifications made to core instruction
  - 5: Data used to determine modifications made to core instruction
  - 6a: Modifications made to core instruction
  - 6b: Modifications made to core instruction
  - 6c: Modifications made to core instruction
  - 7a: Supp. instruction developed or criteria for positive RtI were defined
  - 7b: Supp. instruction developed or criteria for positive RtI were defined
  - 7c: Supp. instruction developed or criteria for positive RtI were defined
  - 8: Supp. instruction developed or criteria for positive RtI were defined
  - 9: Progress monitoring data
  - 10: Decision regarding student RtI was modified or
  - 11: Plan for continuing modifications or...
Tier I Problem-Solving: Data and Skills Needed

Tier I - Assessment
- Discipline Data (ODR)
- Benchmark Assessment
- School Climate Surveys
- Universal Screening
- FCAT
- Universal Screening
- District-Wide Assessments

Tier I - Core Interventions
- School-wide Discipline Positive Behavior Supports
- Whole-class Interventions
- Core Instruction

80 - 90%
Percentage of Students At Proficient and Advanced on California Standards Test (CST) ELA, Grade 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>All Students</th>
<th>English Learners</th>
<th>Students with Disabilities</th>
<th>Afr American SEL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2003-2004</td>
<td>25.7</td>
<td>18.7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004-2005</td>
<td>32.5</td>
<td>21.9</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005-2006</td>
<td>37.5</td>
<td>24.4</td>
<td>12.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006-2007</td>
<td>42.7</td>
<td>27.8</td>
<td>14.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007-2008</td>
<td>43.8</td>
<td>28.8</td>
<td>14.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CST English Language Arts

Los Angeles Unified School District
California Standards Test - English Language Arts Grade 2-5
Percentage of Students Scoring at Each Performance Level
### Class Recommended Level of Instruction Report

**District:** Your District  
**School:** Your School  
**Teacher:** Teacher Name  
**Grade:** Kindergarten  
**Probe:** All  
**Student:** All  
**School Year:** 2004-2005  
**Date/Time:** 6/20/2005 8:40 AM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class List</th>
<th>Assessment 1</th>
<th>Assessment 2</th>
<th>Assessment 3</th>
<th>Assessment 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student A</td>
<td>Initial</td>
<td>Initial</td>
<td>Initial</td>
<td>Initial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student B</td>
<td>Strategic</td>
<td>Initial</td>
<td>Initial</td>
<td>Strategic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student C</td>
<td>No Level</td>
<td>No Level</td>
<td>Intensive</td>
<td>Intensive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student D</td>
<td>Initial</td>
<td>Initial</td>
<td>Initial</td>
<td>Strategic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student E</td>
<td>Initial</td>
<td>Initial</td>
<td>Initial</td>
<td>Strategic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student F</td>
<td>Strategic *</td>
<td>Initial</td>
<td>Initial</td>
<td>Initial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student G</td>
<td>Initial</td>
<td>Strategic</td>
<td>Initial</td>
<td>Strategic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student H</td>
<td>Initial</td>
<td>Strategic</td>
<td>Initial</td>
<td>Strategic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student I</td>
<td>Initial</td>
<td>Removed</td>
<td>Removed</td>
<td>Initial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student J</td>
<td>Initial</td>
<td>Initial</td>
<td>Initial</td>
<td>Initial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student K</td>
<td>Initial</td>
<td>Strategic</td>
<td>Initial</td>
<td>Initial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student L</td>
<td>Strategic</td>
<td>Strategic</td>
<td>Strategic</td>
<td>Strategic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student M</td>
<td>Initial *</td>
<td>Initial *</td>
<td>Initial</td>
<td>Initial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student N</td>
<td>Strategic</td>
<td>Initial</td>
<td>Initial</td>
<td>Strategic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student O</td>
<td>Initial</td>
<td>Initial</td>
<td>Initial</td>
<td>Strategic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student P</td>
<td>Initial</td>
<td>Initial</td>
<td>Initial</td>
<td>Strategic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Q</td>
<td>Strategic</td>
<td>Strategic</td>
<td>Strategic</td>
<td>Strategic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student R</td>
<td>Intensive</td>
<td>Strategic</td>
<td>Strategic</td>
<td>Strategic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student S</td>
<td>Intensive</td>
<td>Strategic</td>
<td>Strategic</td>
<td>Strategic</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Score was not achieved in this class. Student is not represented in pie graph.
Tier 1 Data Example

Letter Naming Fluency Risk Level Overview

Unit of Analysis
Middle/High School Data

- Skill or Content Assessment
  - Skill
    - Use existing reading/math skill assessments
  - Content
    - Use “Common Assessments”
    - Standards-based assessment
Common Assessments

• Based on State-Approved, Content Area Standards
• Syllabus expected to reflect those standards
• Common Syllabi
• Common assessment given every 3rd week
• Data aggregated and disaggregated
Referrals By Problem Behavior

Number of Referrals

www.swis.org
Referral Analysis

- 42% Noncompliance
- 30% Off-Task/Inattention
- 12% Physical/Verbal Aggression
- 6% Relational Aggression
- 10% Bullying
## Building-Level Behavior Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>% Building</th>
<th>% Referred</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low SES</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

![Behavior Referral Analysis Chart]

*Note: The chart shows the percentage of each demographic group referred for behavior issues.*
Tier 1 Data Days

• Typically, Tier 1 analyses done in the summer
• Based on:
  – High Stakes Assessment Data
  – District-Wide Assessments
  – Disaggregated Data
• Decisions used throughout year
• Core instruction changes decided at this time
What strategies are available to evaluate the fidelity of core instruction?

- Principal Reading Walk Through
  - “If it gets inspected, it gets respected”
- Effective instruction checklist
- Secondary core reading program checklists
Effective Instruction
(Foorman et al., 2003; Foorman & Torgesen, 2001; Arrasmith, 2003; & Rosenshine, 1986)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>Guiding Questions</th>
<th>Well Met</th>
<th>Somewhat Met</th>
<th>Not Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Goals and Objectives</td>
<td>Are the purpose and outcomes of instruction clearly evident in the lesson plans? Does the student understand the purpose for learning the skills and strategies taught?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explicit</td>
<td>Are directions clear, straightforward, unequivocal, without vagueness, need for implication, or ambiguity?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Systematic</td>
<td>Are skills introduced in a specific and logical order, easier to more complex? Do the lesson activities support the sequence of instruction? Is there frequent and cumulative review?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scaffolding</td>
<td>Is there explicit use of prompts, cues, examples and encouragements to support the student? Are skills broken down into manageable steps when necessary?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corrective Feedback</td>
<td>Does the teacher provide students with corrective instruction offered during instruction and practice as necessary?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modeling</td>
<td>Are the skills and strategies included in instruction clearly demonstrated for the student?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guided Practice</td>
<td>Do students have sufficient opportunities to practice new skills and strategies with teacher present to provide support?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent Application</td>
<td>Do students have sufficient opportunities to practice new skills independently?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacing</td>
<td>Is the teacher familiar enough with the lesson to present it in an engaging manner? Does the pace allow for frequent student response? Does the pace maximize instructional time, leaving no down-time?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructional Routine</td>
<td>Are the instructional formats consistent from lesson to lesson?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
How should instruction at Tier 1 align with Tier 2 and Tier 3 levels of instruction?

• Teachers should communicate about the following topics in order to align instruction:
  – the scope and sequence of the instruction as well as the scope and sequence of Tier 2 and 3 instruction
  – student progress
  – information about upcoming lessons to help facilitate pre-teaching
  – common vocabulary to determine if there are discrepancies with the instruction at the different tiers
Tier II Problem-Solving
Data and Skills Needed

**Tier II - Assessment**
- Behavioral Observations
- Intervention Data
- Group Diagnostic
- Universal Screening
- Progress Monitoring

**Tier II - Targeted Interventions**
- Targeted Group Interventions
- Increased Intensity
- Narrow Focus
- Linked to Tier I

**Tier I - Core Interventions**

**Tier I Assessment**

80 - 90%

10 - 15%
Data Infrastructure: Using Existing Data to Predict Intervention Needs for Tier 2

- Previous referral history predicts future referral history
- Benchmark and Progress Monitoring Data
- Common Assessments in Middle and High School
- Middle and High School
  - Student data history prior to entering
How the Tiers Work

• Goal: Student is successful with Tier 1 level of support-academic or behavioral
• Greater the tier, greater support and “severity”
• Increase level of support (Tier level) until you identify an intervention that results in a positive response to intervention
• Continue until student strengthens response significantly
• Systematically reduce support (Lower Tier Level)
• Determine the relationship between sustained growth and sustained support.
What do we know about the characteristics of effective interventions?

- They always increase the **intensity** of instruction - they **accelerate** learning

- They always provide many more opportunities for re-teaching, review, and practice

- They are focused carefully on the most essential learning needs of the students.
Interventions: Tier 2

• **First** resource is TIME (AET)
  – HOW much more time is needed?

• **Second** resource is curriculum
  – WHAT does the student need?

• **Third** resource is personnel
  – WHO or WHERE will it be provided?
## Example of Grade Level Schedule

**Fourth Grade Schedule**

**2008-09**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TIME</th>
<th>SUBJECT</th>
<th>Course Code</th>
<th>Minutes</th>
<th>TIME</th>
<th>SUBJECT</th>
<th>Course Code</th>
<th>Minutes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8:35-8:40</td>
<td>Morning Routine (attendance, lunch, etc.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8:35-8:40</td>
<td>Morning Routine (attendance, lunch, etc.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:40-8:45</td>
<td>Morning News</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8:40-8:45</td>
<td>Morning News</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:45-10:15</td>
<td>Reading</td>
<td>5010050</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>8:45-10:15</td>
<td>Reading</td>
<td>5010050</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:15-10:45</td>
<td>PE</td>
<td>5015010</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>10:15-10:45</td>
<td>PE</td>
<td>5015010</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:45-10:55</td>
<td>Reading Enrichment</td>
<td>5010050E</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10:45-10:55</td>
<td>Reading Enrichment</td>
<td>5010050E</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Music 5013000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Music 5013000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Literacy 5010050</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Literacy 5010050</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Guidance 5022000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Guidance 5022000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:25-12:00</td>
<td>Science</td>
<td>5020000</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>11:25-12:00</td>
<td>Language Arts OR Language Arts ESOL*</td>
<td>5010040</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:00-12:30</td>
<td>Lunch</td>
<td>**********</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>12:00-12:30</td>
<td>Lunch</td>
<td>**********</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:30-1:00</td>
<td>Reading Intervention</td>
<td>5010020</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>12:30-1:00</td>
<td>Reading Intervention</td>
<td>5010020</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:00-2:00</td>
<td>Math</td>
<td>5012060</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>1:00-2:00</td>
<td>Math</td>
<td>5012060</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:00-3:00</td>
<td>Language Arts OR Language Arts ESOL*</td>
<td>5010040</td>
<td>60</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5010040</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Total Minutes | 375 | Total Minutes | 315 |
| Total Instructional Minutes | 345 | Total Instructional Minutes | 285 |

* = Sheltered
Resources to Assist with Scheduling Reading Intervention

Found at www.fcrr.org/Interventions

- Teaching All Students to Read: Practices from Reading First Schools with Strong Intervention Outcomes: Summary and Complete Documents available
  - Principal’s Action Plan Outline for Building a Successful School-Wide Intervention Program

- Intensive Reading Interventions for Struggling Readers in Early Elementary School: A Principal’s Guide
  - A Principal’s Guide to Intensive Reading Interventions for Struggling Readings in Reading First Schools: A Brochure
Tier 2: Getting TIME

• “Free” time--does not require additional personnel
  – Staggering instruction
  – Differentiating instruction
  – Cross grade instruction
  – Skill-based instruction
• Standard Protocol Grouping
• Reduced range of “standard” curriculum
• After-School
• Home-Based
Tier 2: Curriculum

- Standard protocol approach
- Focus on *essential* skills
- Most likely, more EXPOSURE and more FOCUS of core instruction
- Linked directly to core instruction materials and benchmarks
- Criterion for effectiveness is 70% of students receiving Tier 2 will reach benchmarks
3 Fs + 1 S + Data + PD = Effective & Powerful Instruction

- **Frequency** and duration of meeting in small groups – every day, etc.
- **Focus** of instruction (*the What*) – work in vocabulary, phonics, comprehension, etc.
- **Format** of lesson (*the How*) – determining the lesson structure and the level of scaffolding, modeling, explicitness, etc.
- **Size** of instructional group – 3, 6, or 8 students, etc.
- Use **data** to help determine the 3 Fs and 1 S (*the Why*)
- Provide **professional development** in the use of data and in the 3 Fs and 1 S
Intervention Support

• Intervention plans should be developed based on student need and skills of staff
• All intervention plans should have intervention support
• Principals should ensure that intervention plans have intervention support
• Teachers should not be expected to implement plans for which there is no support
Intervention Support

• Pre-meeting
  – Review data
  – Review steps to intervention
  – Determine logistics

• First 2 weeks
  – 2-3 meetings/week
  – Review data
  – Review steps to intervention
  – Revise, if necessary
Intervention Support

• Second Two Weeks
  – Meet twice each week

• Following weeks
  – Meet at least weekly
  – Review data
  – Review steps
  – Discuss Revisions

• Approaching benchmark
  – Review data
  – Schedule for intervention fading
  – Review data
## Intervention Documentation Worksheet

**Week of ___________________________**

**Teacher: __________________________**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student</th>
<th>Monday</th>
<th>Tuesday</th>
<th>Wednesday</th>
<th>Thursday</th>
<th>Friday</th>
<th>Total # of Minutes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>T</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Legend

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>T</th>
<th>Time (# of minutes)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>Focus</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Focus

- **L** = Language
- **PA** = Phonemic Awareness
- **P** = Phonics
- **F** = Fluency
- **V** = Vocabulary
- **C** = Comprehension
- **MC** = Math Computations
- **MA** = Math Applications
- **B** = Behavior

### Programming

(Create your own key. For example, *W* = Wilson Fundations, *SST* = Social Skills Training, *CCC* = Cover/Copy/Compare)

- ____________________________
- ____________________________
- ____________________________
- ____________________________
- ____________________________
- ____________________________
- ____________________________
- ____________________________
- ____________________________
Tier 3 Decisions

• GAP?

• Rate??

• Independent Functioning?
  – Fade Intervention to Supplemental Level
  – Evaluate Rate
Tier 3

• Individual and Very Small Group
• Individual Diagnostic Procedures
• Intensive Interventions
• Goal is to determine interventions that close the GAP
• Pre-requisite for consideration for any special education program
Ways that instruction must be made more powerful for students “at-risk” for reading difficulties.

More powerful instruction involves:

- More instructional time
- Smaller instructional groups
- More precisely targeted at right level
- Clearer and more detailed explanations
- More systematic instructional sequences
- More extensive opportunities for guided practice
- More opportunities for error correction and feedback
What are the logistics of Tier 3 instruction?

- Specific place and time set aside on the schedule (daily)
- Who will provide it? (classroom teacher or outside support
  - Reading specialist, ESE, SLP, etc.)
- Materials/how will the provider access them?
- Common planning time established between the two providers, if applicable
- Establishing guidelines for when to evaluate the effectiveness of instruction and guidelines to determine what is a “good” response
What strategies are available to evaluate the fidelity of Tier 3 instruction?

- Checklists following the scope and sequence of the intervention/program or the learning objectives of the intervention/program
- Reading Walk Throughs
- Principal/Teacher Conferences
- Schedule reflects that intervention is implemented daily
- Observation
RtI and Behavior
Data Sources

• Office Discipline Referrals
• Teacher Nominations
• Teacher Incident Reports
• Dean of Students Reports
Use of Data

• Aggregate By:
  – Type
  – Time
  – Location
  – Content

• Monthly Compilations

• Building Patterns
Tier I (Universal) and Tier II (Supplemental) Interventions

Victor D. 7

= Peer Group  = Target Student  = Aimline  = Trendline

*Rate of change required each week for target student to reach benchmark is (+3 %)
A VISION IS OF LITTLE USE WITHOUT A PLAN: ITS ALL ABOUT “HOW” DO WE GET THERE
Scaling Up: Critical Elements

• State Infrastructure and Plan
• District Infrastructure and Plan
• Building Infrastructure and Plan
• Professional Development
• Technical Assistance
• Implementation Monitoring and Integrity
• Program Evaluation
State-level Infrastructure Development for RtI

- State Management Group
- State Transformation Team
- Regional RtI Coordinators
- DA Regional RtI Specialists
- District Based Leadership Teams
- School Based Leadership Teams
- School-Based Coaches
- Advisory Committee
District Infrastructure
How Do We “Do” RtI At the District Level?

• Organized by a District PLAN

• Driven by Professional Development

• Supported by Coaching and Technical Assistance

• Informed by DATA
District Responsibilities

• Based on self-assessment results, develop an RtI implementation plan organized around building consensus, infrastructure, and implementation. Plans should also address:
  – How current resources will be used to implement RtI and identify additional resources needed
  – How stakeholders will be educated
  – How stakeholders will be involved
District Infrastructure

• District Plan Requirements
  – Consensus, Infrastructure, Implementation
  – District Policies
  – Professional Development and Technical Assistance
  – Implementation Monitoring
  – Implementation Fidelity
  – Evaluation Plan
Key Points

• Unit of implementation is the building level.
• Implementation process takes 4-6 years.
• Implementation progress must be monitored.
• Must be guided by data indicating implementation level and integrity.
• Must be supported by professional development and technical assistance.
• Drive by a strategic plan.
• It is a journey, not a sprint.
Are You Ready for PD?
Professional Development: Process

• Direct Instruction
• Modeling
• Practice
• Feedback
• Application
• Technical Assistance
Personnel Needed

• Trainers
• Coaches
• Evaluators
**Problem Solving - Response to Instruction/Intervention Training Outline**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Day 1</th>
<th><strong>Curriculum</strong></th>
<th><strong>Year One</strong></th>
<th><strong>Year Two</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Change Model - Consensus, Infrastructure, Implementation Big ideas of Problem Solving Four Problem Solving Steps – Overview</td>
<td></td>
<td>Review of Year 1 Training Consensus Focus on Tier One Four Problem Solving Step State RtI Plan National RtI Data Review Data from Year One SAPSI Data Survey Data Skill Assessment Data Strategies for Consensus Roles for Team Members <strong>Data Collection</strong> Perception of Practices School Personnel Satisfaction Skill Assessment Training Evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Three Tiered Model of Service Delivery Law – NCLB, IDEA, Federal and State Rule/Statute Formation, Function and Purpose of Problem Solving Teams</td>
<td></td>
<td>Technical Assistance Session(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Beliefs Survey Perception of Practices School Personnel Satisfaction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Days 1 &amp; 2 back to back</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Day 2</td>
<td><strong>Curriculum</strong></td>
<td><strong>Year One</strong></td>
<td><strong>Year Two</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Perception of Skills Beliefs Survey Skill Assessment Training Evaluation</td>
<td></td>
<td>Technical Assistance Session(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Technical Assistance Session(s)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Technical Assistance Session(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Day</td>
<td>Curriculum</td>
<td>Data Collection</td>
<td>Technical Assistance Session (s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td><strong>Curriculum</strong>&lt;br&gt;Step II – Problem Analysis&lt;br&gt;Data Feedback Activity&lt;br&gt;Review: Problem Identification&lt;br&gt;Big Ideas/Concepts of Problem Analysis&lt;br&gt;Hypothesis/Prediction Statement&lt;br&gt;Assessment &amp; Hypothesis Validation&lt;br&gt;Examples of Hypothesis Generation and Evaluation</td>
<td><strong>Data Collection</strong>&lt;br&gt;Skill Assessment&lt;br&gt;Training Evaluation</td>
<td>Technical Assistance Session (s)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Data Collection | **Curriculum**<br>Data Feedback Activity<br>Intervention Evaluation Protocol<br>Resource Maps<br>Intervention Evaluation Plan<br>Goal Setting<br>Resource Mapping Activity<br>Intervention Integrity Types<br>Barriers<br>Improving<br>Assessing<br>**Data Collection**<br>Skill Assessment<br>Training Evaluation |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Day 4</th>
<th>Curriculum</th>
<th>Data Collection</th>
<th>Technical Assistance Session (s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td><strong>Curriculum</strong>&lt;br&gt;Step III – Intervention Design and Implementation&lt;br&gt;Data Feedback Activity&lt;br&gt;Review: Consensus, Infrastructure, Implementation&lt;br&gt;Linking Problem Analysis to Intervention&lt;br&gt;Intervention Design&lt;br&gt;Intervention Content&lt;br&gt;Intervention Plan&lt;br&gt;Intervention Integrity, Support, Documentation&lt;br&gt;Integrating Tiers of Intervention</td>
<td><strong>Data Collection</strong>&lt;br&gt;Skill Assessment&lt;br&gt;Training Evaluation</td>
<td>Technical Assistance Session (s)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Curriculum | Data Feedback Activity<br>State Board of Education Rules<br>Ed Code– General Education<br>Intervention<br>Ed Code – SLD<br>Ed Code – ED<br>Procedural Safeguards<br>Effectiveness of Tier One<br>Effectiveness of Tier Two<br>Tier Three Decisions<br>**Data Collection**<br>Beliefs Survey<br>Perception of Skills<br>Skill Assessment<br>Training Evaluation |

<p>| Data Collection | <strong>Curriculum</strong>&lt;br&gt;Data Feedback Activity&lt;br&gt;Intervention Evaluation Protocol&lt;br&gt;Resource Maps&lt;br&gt;Intervention Evaluation Plan&lt;br&gt;Goal Setting&lt;br&gt;Resource Mapping Activity&lt;br&gt;Intervention Integrity Types&lt;br&gt;Barriers&lt;br&gt;Improving&lt;br&gt;Assessing&lt;br&gt;<strong>Data Collection</strong>&lt;br&gt;Skill Assessment&lt;br&gt;Training Evaluation |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Day 5</th>
<th>Curriculum</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Step IV – Response to Intervention</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rationale for Progress Monitoring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Graphing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Goal Setting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Interpreting Graphs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Decision Making</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Positive Response to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Instruction/Intervention</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Questionable Response to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Instruction/Intervention</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Poor Response to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Instruction/Intervention</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Review of Problem-Solving Steps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Data Collection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Beliefs Survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Perception of Skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Skill Assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Training Evaluation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Technical Assistance

• General
  – Follow-Up to Training Sessions

• Targeted
  – Based on Needs Assessment
  – Can Be Group Based
  – Focused, Fewer Topics
  – Based on Data From Sites
    • Critical Components
    • Direct Observations