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Implementing Problem-Solving/Response to Intervention (PSM/RtI):
This Presentation and Your School

- Three Phases of Implementation
  - Consensus Building (Commitment)
  - Infrastructure Development
  - Implementation
Implementing Problem-Solving/Response to Intervention (PSM/RtI): This Workshop

- Phase 1: Consensus Building
  - Rationale and History
  - Statutes and Regulations
  - Research on existing programs/services
  - Looking at your data
  - Thinking differently
The significant problems we have cannot be solved at the same level of thinking with which we created them.

Albert Einstein (1879 – 1955)
Strategies for Building Consensus

- Study Groups – Read the literature and discuss
- Watch Introductory Videos
  http://www4.scoe.net/rti/programs.cfm?menuChoice=3
- Discussion of barriers to achieving better results for all students
- Examination of local data
- Three Consensus Building Tools listed next in this presentation
Thinking Differently: Your Data

- What percentage of students at each grade are proficient in mathematics?
- What percentage are proficient in reading?
- What are the trajectories required by NCLB?
- How long do you have until these two lines cross at the current rate of progress?
Consensus Building Tool 1: Thinking Differently

- Time for a Survey!
Consensus Building Tool 1: RtI Survey – Examining our old beliefs

- Examine the *RtI Survey ‘07.*
If we can really understand the problem, the answer will come out of it, because the answer is not separate from the problem.

-Krishnamurti
Consensus Building Tool 2: Thinking Differently and Facilitating Others to Do the Same

Summary

- AYP Applies to ALL Students
- Regardless of who or “what” you are, progress in the academic curriculum or interpersonal behavior is what matters most
- Being “disabled” is less likely than simply not having sufficient exposure to the curriculum or appropriate models for behavior
- Research supports that supplemental and intensive interventions, delivered with fidelity, are more likely than not to work
- Authentic assessment links to and informs interventions in the most direct way
Consensus Building Tool #2: School-Wide Systems Provide a Formula for Success

- BI + ii + 3a + si + iii = Achievement for all Students
  - Big Ideas in a Content Domain
  - Initial Instruction
  - 3 Assessments (Screening, Diagnostic, Progress Monitoring)
  - Strategic Instruction
  - Intensive Instruction/Intervention

Adapted from Florida Reading First (Torgesen, 2003)
“Big Ideas” in a Content Domain

- Research-derived components/skills within a content domain that are imperative to student success in the domain overall
- We have these for Reading (Phonemic Awareness, Phonics, Fluency, Vocabulary, Comprehension)
- Continuing research and synthesis is needed in Math, Social Behavior, Written language etc.
“Initial Instruction”

- Instruction provided to all students at a grade level
- Typically oriented to teach a set of standards and benchmarks
- Should be effective for a large majority of students (judged by student performance)
- 80% has been suggested by some as a target to shoot for
3 Types of Assessment

1. Screening Assessments – assessments used to determine if additional investigation is warranted
   - Focused on extremely important indicators
   - Typically short in duration
   - Typically few items
   - Typically overidentified persons for further assessment
   - Answers the question: is there a possible problem?
   - Examples: State CR tests, Nationally normed achievement tests, CBM tests, DI BELS etc.
3 Types of Assessment

2. Diagnostic Assessments: Assessment conducted at any time during the school year when more in-depth analysis of a student’s strengths and weaknesses is needed to guide instruction (Institute for the Development of Educational Achievement, 2003)

- Assessments conducted to pinpoint reasons why specific types of problems are occurring
- Typically many items in each sub-area related to the problem
- Yields testable hypotheses about problem etiology
- Leads directly to teaching recommendations with a good likelihood of success
- Examples: MASI, Curriculum-Based Evaluation, FBA, Gray Oral Reading Test IV (GORT-IV), Woodcock Reading Mastery Test - Revised (WRMT-R)
3. Progress Monitoring Assessments: Assessment conducted a minimum of three times a year or on a routine basis (i.e., weekly, monthly, or quarterly) using comparable and multiple test forms to (a) estimate rates of student improvement, (b) identify children who are not demonstrating adequate progress and therefore require additional or different forms of instruction, and/or (c) compare the efficacy of different forms of instruction for struggling readers and thereby design more effective, individualized instructional programs for those at-risk learners. (adapted from Institute for the Development of Educational Achievement, 2003)

- Directly related to the important skills being learned
- Brief in duration
- Multiple parallel forms
- Sensitive to small increments of growth
  - Examples include CBM, Time Series Analysis, Degrees of Reading Power, Texas Primary Reading Inventory
Consensus Building Tool #2

RtI Activity

- As a table, turn in your activity packet to RtI Activity
- As a group, examine the matrix
- Discuss, item by item, what the result of implementing a school wide model, missing any individual component, is likely to produce in practice. Have one person capture your responses line-by-line on their activity page
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Big Ideas</th>
<th>Initial Instruction</th>
<th>Strategic Instruction</th>
<th>Intensive Instruction/Intervention</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3 Assessments (Screening, diagnostic, progress)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Assessments (Screening, diagnostic, progress)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Assessments (Screening, diagnostic, progress)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Assessments (Screening, diagnostic, progress)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Assessments (Screening, diagnostic, progress)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Lack of focus and priority. There is not a focus on important priority skills for improvement.
- Overall low achievement. Student learning problems across all subgroup areas.
- Lack of direction to know what needs to be improved, which students need intervention, and whether or not interventions have been effective.
- Lack of resources due to attempts to provide intensive interventions for those students whose needs could be met through strategic interventions.
- Gap increases between average and "at risk" students. Continued low performance for some subgroups.
- NCLB Success
RtI Consensus Activity #3

- Number off from one to seven
- Everyone read pages 1 to 3 of the article “Beyond Islands of Excellence”
- Each person read corresponding numbered finding (persons number 1, read finding 1, etc...)
- Make notes on the top points from your section
RtI Consensus Activity #3

- Come back together as a group
- Begin with #1 sharing out the major points from their section
- Continue till all individuals have shared their content
- Given the findings from this study, what are the similarities/difference between the findings and Response to Instruction?
Phase 2
Building An RtI Infrastructure
Infrastructure Components

- Understanding of The Blueprint of Putting RtI In Place
- The Initial Structures to Put in Place Before Attacking the Questions (e.g., what teams do you need, what do they need to do etc.) and expectations for how long, how much, how fast
- Understand the 13 questions that need to be answered in order to build the infrastructure to implement

  Build (or find) the tools to answer each of the questions – these are your building materials

- Build skills in staff to implement a problem solving/data based decision making model
Infrastructure Component 1: Understanding the Blueprint

- **Timeframe**
  - Building the initial infrastructure will probably take 6 months to a year.
  - Getting it really up and running will take probably about a year to 18 months.
  - Business as usual comes in year 3 or 4.
  - Punch line, this is second-order change. Don’t expect it overnight.
Infrastructure Component 1: Understanding the Blueprint

- You build the RtI infrastructure in phases
  - Phase 1: Look at your core
  - Phase 2: Build/modify supplemental infrastructures
  - Phase 3: Build/modify intensive supports

- You also must build the process skills to run the infrastructure. This means learning about systematic problem solving or data based-decision making
Infrastructure Component 2: The Initial Structures to Put in Place Before Attacking the Questions
Infrastructure Component 2: Initial Structures

- RtI/Problem Solving Leadership Team
  - A team is present
  - Appropriate representation (incl. building principal)
    - Data mentor
    - Curriculum Expert
    - Facilitator
    - Representative Teachers
- Role of team is clear
- Clear processes to follow
Infrastructure Component 2: Initial Structures:

- RtI/Problem Solving Leadership Team Roles
  - Participate in ongoing learning
  - Work on building the RtI infrastructure
  - Communicate with school staff and parents about the process
  - Commit to learn the skills necessary to implement RtI once the infrastructure is put in place
Infrastructure Component 2: Initial Structures

- Universal Screening measurement system
  - Screening Measures
  - Efficient Administration and scoring
  - Data management system to store/display data
Infrastructure Component 2: Initial Structures

- **Solid Core Curriculum**
  - Scientifically Research-Based Curriculum
  - Method for monitoring the effectiveness of the core curriculum
  - Process to augment the core as necessary based on student performance results
  - Teachers implement effective instructional practices uniformly
Infrastructure Component 2: Initial Structures

- **Supplemental Instruction**
  - Team has a way to identify which students need supplemental instruction in addition to the core
  - Team has systematic methods to identify what supplemental instruction is needed and a process to match students’ needs to this instruction
  - School has selected research-based strategies, aligned with critical components, to provide supplemental instruction
  - Sufficient teachers are trained to implement these supplemental instructional strategies
  - Logistics for providing supplemental instruction have been addressed and resolved (who will provide what, when, where, to whom?)
Infrastructure Component 2: Initial Structures

- Intensive Instruction
  - A method for identifying students who need intensive instruction has been identified
  - Systematic methods to identify what intensive instruction is needed and a process to match students’ needs to this instruction
  - School has selected research-based strategies, aligned with critical components, to provide supplemental instruction
  - Sufficient teachers are trained to implement these supplemental instructional strategies
  - Logistics for providing supplemental instruction have been addressed and resolved (who will provide what, when, where, to whom?)
Infrastructure Component 2: Initial Structures

- Framework to Guide the Work
  - This will look different in each building
  - The issues are similar everywhere
  - The principles for solving them are the same everywhere
  - However, every building is different, and these differences must be accounted for in implementation
  - RtI does not tell people what to think, it tells them what to think about!
  - Best way to do this is with QUESTIONS rather than ANSWERS
Infrastructure Component 3: 13 Question Activity (This is the Guts of It)

- Take out the handout titled "Heartland AEA - 13 Guiding Questions for RtI Implementation"
- Read through the first page (this is just the questions, without the steps)
The Process Side of RtI: Systematic Problem Solving

“MEMO: It has come to my attention that every time we solve one problem, we create two more. From now on, all problem solving is forbidden.”
Infrastructure Component 4: 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

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
“Stop asking me if we’re almost there; we’re Nomads, for crying out loud.”
Problem Solving: Strengths

- Can be applied to the student, classroom, building, district, and problem levels
  - *Student* - academic and/or behavior problem
  - *Classroom* - discipline, returning homework
  - *Building* - bullying, attendance
  - *District* - over-/under-representation
  - *Problem* - problem common to students in building
Problem Solving: Strengths

- Systematic
- Focused on outcomes
- Tailored to specific situations
  - “unlimited” range of hypotheses
- Evidence-based
Problem Solving and RtI

- I really just want to be able to use RtI without all of that problem-solving stuff--can I do that?
Implementation: What Does It Look Like?

- Thanks to Joe Kovaleski and Ed Shapiro for some case examples
- PA State-wide RtI Initiative
Implementation Basics

- Integrate with Core Instructional Programs and Activities in the District
  - Reading First, Early Intervention, Positive Behavior Support

- 3-4 Tiered Model of Service Delivery and Decision-Making
  - “Universal”--What all students get
  - “Supplemental”--additional focus and intensity
  - “Intensive”--modifying instructional strategies
  - “Extraordinary”-- highly specialized methods

- Problem-Solving
  - Can occur at any level
  - Increases in intensity across levels
Three Tiered Model of School Supports

Academic Systems

Tier 3: Intensive, Individual Interventions
- Individual Students
- Assessment-based
- High Intensity
- Of longer duration

Tier 2: Targeted Group Interventions
- Some students (at-risk)
- High efficiency
- Rapid response

Tier 1: Universal Interventions
- All students
- Preventive, proactive

Behavioral Systems

Tier 3: Intensive, Individual Interventions
- Individual Students
- Assessment-based
- Intense, durable procedures

Tier 2: Targeted Group Interventions
- Some students (at-risk)
- High efficiency
- Rapid response

Tier 1: Universal Interventions
- All settings, all students
- Preventive, proactive
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.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tier One</th>
<th>Assessments</th>
<th>Interventions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>•Universal/Benchmarks</td>
<td>•Core Curriculum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>•AYP</td>
<td>•Evidence-Based</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>•District-Wide Assessments</td>
<td>•School-Wide PBS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>•DIBELS/CBM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>•ODRs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tier Two</th>
<th>Assessments</th>
<th>Interventions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>•DIBELS/CBM</td>
<td>•Supplemental</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>•Classroom Observations</td>
<td>•AET/Focused Instruction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>•Work Samples</td>
<td>•Social Skills Training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>•Rating Scales</td>
<td>•Behavior Plans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>•Frequent/Authentic</td>
<td>•AIPs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tier Three</th>
<th>Assessments</th>
<th>Interventions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>•Diagnostic</td>
<td>•Intense</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>•Comprehensive (RIOT)</td>
<td>•Limiting curriculum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>•Directly related to problem</td>
<td>•Specialized Instruction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>•Linked to Interventions</td>
<td>•Possible eligibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>•Evaluate intervention</td>
<td>•Frequency/Intensity are extraordinary</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Example of Tier Level Interventions

### Reading

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tier</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Curricular Focus</th>
<th>Curricular Breadth</th>
<th>Frequency of Progress Monitoring</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>5 areas</td>
<td>Core</td>
<td>Yearly or greater</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>Less than 5</td>
<td>Core + Supplemental</td>
<td>Monthly or greater</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>2 or less</td>
<td>Core + Supplemental+Intensive</td>
<td>Weekly</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Criteria for Evaluating Response to Intervention

- Is the gap between desired/current rate or gap between slopes of current and benchmark converging? If yes, this is a POSITIVE RtI
- Is the gap closing but not converging (e.g., parallel)? If yes, this is a QUESTIONABLE RtI
- If the rate/slope remains unchanged OR if there is improvement but shows no evidence of closing the gap, then this is a POOR RtI
Looking at Benchmark Data

- Benchmark is Top of Box
- Some Risk is inside the box
- At Risk is Below the box
Decision Model at Tier 1 - General Education Instruction

- **Step 1: Screening**
  - ORF = 50 wcpm, fall benchmark for some risk = 44 wcpm
  - Comprehension skills are judged as at levels equal to ORF by her teacher
  - Is this student at risk?

- Lisa
  - No: Continue Tier 1 Instruction
  - Yes: Move to Tier 2: Strategic Interventions

*Current Gen Ed Instruction is Working*
Decision Model at Tier 1- General Education Instruction

- **Step 1: Screening**
  - ORF at end of 2nd grade is 93 cwpm, end of 2nd benchmark for some risk is 90 cwpm
  - Reading comprehension skills are judged as adequate by her teacher.
  - Is this student at risk?

  - **Current Gen Ed Instruction is Working**

  - **Move to Tier 2: Strategic Interventions**
Rita

- Second grade student
- Beginning of school year
- Regular Education
- Scores at 20 wcpm in second grade material
- Teacher judges (based on in-class observation/evaluation) comprehension to not be substantially different from ORF
Decision Model at Tier 1- General Education Instruction

- **Step 1: Screening**
  - ORF = 20 wcpm, fall benchmark for some risk = 44 wcpm
  - Comprehension deficits in all 4 of 5 areas are noted
  - Is this student at risk?

- **Current Gen Ed Instruction is NOT Working**

  - [ ] No
  - [x] Yes

  [Move to Tier 2: Strategic Interventions]
Data-Based Determination of Expectations: Rita

- Benchmark Level: 54 WCPM
- Current Level: 20 WCPM
- Difference to Feb Benchmark (Gap): 34 WCPM
- Time to Benchmark: 20 Weeks
- Rate of Growth Required:
  - $\frac{34}{20} = 1.70$ WCPM for Rita
  - Peer Group Rate = 1.20 WCPM growth (at benchmark) / 1.40 WCPM (for “some risk” benchmark)

REALISTIC? Not unless you increase AET
Decision Model at Tier 2 - Strategic Interventions & Instruction

- Supplemental, small group instruction (3-4 students with similar skill levels)
- Standard protocol intervention
- 3x per week, 30 minutes each
- Team selects PALS (Peer Tutoring Strategy)
- Implemented by 2 different available instructional personnel
- Implemented for 8 weeks
- Progress monitoring once every 2 weeks
Tier 2: Strategic - PALS

Aimline = 1.70 words/week

Trendline = 1.85 words/week

Good RtI
**Decision Model at Tier 2 - Strategic Intervention & Instruction**

- ORF = 34 wcpm, winter benchmark (still 8 weeks away) for some risk = 52 wcpm
- Target rate of gain over Tier 1 assessment is 1.70 words/week
- Actual attained rate of gain was 1.85 words/week
- Gains above benchmark in 4 of 5 comprehension areas
- Student on target to attain benchmark
- Step 2: Is student responsive to intervention?
  - **Student is Responsive to Intervention**

Continue monitoring or return to Tier 1

Rita

Yes  No

Move to Tier 3: Intensive Interventions
Elsie

- Second grade student
- End of School Year
- Regular Education
- Scores at 62 wcpm in second grade material
- Teacher judges (based on in-class observation/evaluation) comprehension to not be substantially different from ORF – not great, not terrible
Elsie Grade 2
Tier 1 Oral Reading Fluency

Benchmark

School Weeks

Words Correct
**Decision Model at Tier 1-General Education Instruction**

**Step 1: Screening**

- ORF = 62 wcpm, end of second grade benchmark for at risk is 70 wcpm (see bottom of box)
- Compared to other Heartland students, Elsie scores around the 12th percentile + or -
- Elsie’s teacher reports that she struggles with multisyllabic words and that she makes many decoding errors when she reads

**Is this student at risk?**

- This Student is at Risk, General Education Not Working

![Decision Model Diagram]

- Continue Tier 1 Instruction
- Move to Tier 2: Strategic Interventions

Elsie
Decision Model at Tier 2 - Supplemental Instruction

- Supplemental, small group instruction will be provided to Elsie.
- She will participate in two different supplemental groups, one focused on Decoding (Phonics for Reading; Archer) and one focused on fluency building (Read Naturally; Imholt).
- She will participate in small group instruction 3x per week, 30 minutes each – and she will also continue with her core instruction.
- Supplemental instruction implemented by certified teachers in her school (2 different teachers).
- Progress monitoring about every 2 weeks.
Elsie Tier 2 (Results 2)
End of Grade 2 and Grade 3

School Weeks

Words Correct

Note: Third Grade Msmt. Materials used at end of Second grade and through Third grade.

Aimline = .83 words per week
Data-Based Determination of Expectations: Elsie

- Benchmark Level: 90 WCPM
- Current Level: 47 WCPM
- Difference to June Benchmark (Gap): 34 WCPM
- Time to Benchmark: 41 Weeks
- Rate of Growth Required:
  - $\frac{34}{41} = 0.83$ WCPM for Elsie
  - NOT VERY AMBITIOUS!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!
- What would happen if we moved the target to the middle of the “some risk box?”
Elsie Tier 2 (Results 2)
End of Grade 2 and Grade 3

Note: Third Grade Msmt.
Materials used at end of Second grade and through Third grade

Aimline = 1.29 words per week
Data-Based Determination of Expectations: Elsie

- Benchmark Level: 100 WCPM
- Current Level: 47 WCPM
- Difference to June Benchmark (Gap): 53 WCPM
- Time to Benchmark: 41 Weeks
- Rate of Growth Required:
  - $\frac{53}{41} = 1.29$ WCPM for Elsie
  - Peer Group Rate = about 1.1 WCPM growth (at benchmark) 1.2 WCPM (for “some risk” benchmark)
  - REALISTIC? Not unless you increase AET
Elsie Tier 2 (Results 2)
End of Grade 2 and Grade 3

Tier 2: Supplemental -
Trendline = 1.07 words/week

Aimline = 1.29 words per week

Note: Third Grade Msmt.
Materials used at end of
Second grade and through
Third grade

Questionable RtI
The intervention appeared to be working. What the teachers thought was needed was increased time in supplemental instruction.

They worked together and found a way to give Elsie 30 minutes of supplemental instruction, on phonics and fluency, 5x per week.
Data-Based Determination of Expectations: Elsie

- Benchmark Level: 100 WCPM
- Current Level: 56 WCPM
- Difference to June Benchmark (Gap): 44 WCPM
- Time to Benchmark: 27 Weeks
- Rate of Growth Required:
  - $\frac{44}{27} = 1.62$ WCPM for Elsie
  - Peer Group Rate = 1.1 WCPM growth (at benchmark)
    - 1.2 WCPM (for “some risk” benchmark)
  - REALISTIC? Not unless you increase AET
Elsie Tier 2 (Results 2)
End of Grade 2 and Grade 3

Tier 2: Supplemental -

Trendline = 1.07 words/week

Note: Third Grade Msmt. Materials used at end of Second grade and through Third grade

Aimline = 1.62 words per week
Elsie Tier 2 (Results 2)
End of Grade 2 and Grade 3

Tier 2: Supplemental -
Trendline = 1.07 words/week

Supplemental Revised
Trendline = 1.51 words/week

Aimline = 1.62 words/week

Note: Third Grade Msmt. Materials used at end of Second grade and through Third grade

Good RtI
By the Spring of Third Grade

- Elsie’s reading accuracy had improved significantly. Her average % correct hovers around 95 percent.
- She still struggles with multisyllabic words.
- Normatively, at periodic and annual review time, she is now performing at about the 19th percentile compared to peers from Heartland AEA. She is catching up!
- Elsie is not a student with a disability.
Decision Model at Tier 1 - General Education Instruction

Step 1: Screening

- ORF = on track for 100 wcpm, end of third grade benchmark for some risk is 110 wcpm (see top of box)
- Compared to other Heartland students, Elsie scores around the 19th percentile + or -
- Is this student at risk?
- Still a bit of risk, maintain Tier II instruction for another benchmark period, if progress continues, move to tier 1

No  Yes

Elsie

Maintain Tier 2: Strategic Interventions
Steven

- Second grade student
- Beginning of school year
- Regular Education
- Scores at 20 wcpsm in second grade material
- Teacher judges (based on in-class observation/evaluation) comprehension to not be substantially different from ORF
Decision Model at Tier 1 - General Education Instruction

- **Step 1: Screening**
  - ORF = 20 wcpm, fall benchmark for some risk = 44 wcpm
  - Comprehension screen also shows deficits in all 5 areas
  - Current Gen Ed Instruction is **NOT** Working
  - Is this student at risk?

  **Diagram:**
  - **No**: Continue Tier 1 Instruction
  - **Yes**: Move to Tier 2: Strategic Interventions

  **Options:**
  - Steven
  - Rita
Decision Model at Tier 2 - Strategic Interventions & Instruction

- Supplemental, small group instruction in Rita’s group (3-4 students with similar skill levels)
- Standard protocol implementation
- 3x per week, 30 minutes each
- Team selects PALS (Peer Tutoring Strategy)
- Implemented by 2 different available instructional personnel
- Implemented for 8 weeks
- Progress monitoring once every 2 weeks
Tier 2: Strategic - PALS

Aimline = 1.50 words/week

Trendline = 0.55 words/week

Poor RtI
Decision Model at Tier 2 - Strategic Intervention & Instruction

- **Step 2:** Is student responsive to intervention?
  - **ORF = 24 wcpm,** winter benchmark (still 8 weeks away) for some risk = 52 wcpm
  - Target rate of gain over Tier 1 assessment is 1.5 words/week
  - Actual attained rate of gain was 0.55 words/week
  - Below comprehension benchmarks in 4 of 5 areas
  - Student **NOT** on target to attain benchmark
  - Is student responsive to intervention at Tier 2?

  Yes

  Continue monitoring or return to Tier 1

  No

  Move to Tier 3: Intensive Interventions
Decision Model at Tier 3- Intensive Interventions & Instruction

- Supplemental, 1:3, pull-out instruction
- Individualized Problem-Solving, Targeted Instruction
- Specific decoding and analysis strategies
- Emphasis on comprehension strategies
- 5x per week, 30 minutes each
- Implemented by 2 different available instructional personnel
- Implemented for 8 weeks
- Progress monitoring once every week
Tier 2: Strategic - PALS

Tier 3: Intensive - 1:1 instruction, 5x/week, Problem-solving Model to Target Key Decoding Strategies, Comprehension Strategies

Aimline = 1.50 words/week

Trendline = 2.32 words/week

Poor RtI

Good RtI
Decision Model at Tier 3 - Intensive Intervention & Instruction

- Step 3: Is student responsive to intervention at Tier 3?
  - ORF = 45 wcpm, winter benchmark (still 4 weeks away) for some risk = 52 wcpm
  - Target rate of gain over Tier 2 assessment is 1.5 words/week
  - Actual attained rate of gain was 2.32 words/week
  - At or above comprehension benchmarks in 4 of 5 areas
  - Student on target to attain benchmark
  - Step 3: Is student responsive to intervention?
  - Move student back to Strategic intervention

- Continue monitoring or return to Tier 2

- Steven
  - Yes
  - No
  - Move to Sp Ed Eligibility Determination
Criteria for Evaluating Response to Intervention: Dilemmas

- Currently, many educators “understand” the ability/achievement discrepancy concept.

- Unless this concept is replaced with another one that makes MORE sense to them, the old concept will prevail.

- We have to guard against the, “of course they do not have a good RtI…we cannot expect them to…that’s why I referred them.”

- A positive response IS WHAT WE EXPECT, we just have to problem-solve until we get it.
IMPLEMENTATION
Change is Hard for Some
Outline – Implementing An RtI System

- Tier 1 Decision Making
  - Collect and evaluate universal screening data against criterion for successful Core (many suggest 80% proficiency based on Core instruction)
  - If modification of the Core is needed
    - Conduct curriculum diagnostic assessment – compare core curriculum against a standard if available (e.g., Kame’enui & Simmons) or evaluate core using problem analysis procedures
    - Create hypotheses and predictions
    - Modify curriculum and instruction
    - Evaluate curriculum and instruction modifications
  - Monitor sufficiency of core each time universal screening is completed – modify as necessary
Outline – Implementing An RtI System

- Tier 2 Decision Making – Dx Assm’t Option
  - Identify less than proficient students
  - Administer additional brief assessments to examine performance profiles
  - Group students with like performance profiles for supplemental instruction
  - Provide supplemental instruction based on skill needs
  - Monitor progress
  - Review student progress monitoring data at scheduled intervals
  - Modify supplemental instruction as necessary
  - Move students across tiers as data warrant
Outline – Implementing An RtI System

- Tier 2 Decision Making – Standard Tx
  - Identify less than proficient students
  - Group students for supplemental instruction and provide supplemental instruction
  - Monitor progress about 1 time every 2 weeks
  - Review student progress monitoring data at scheduled intervals
  - Modify supplemental instruction as necessary based on progress monitoring data
  - Move students across tiers as data warrant
Outline – Implementing An RtI System

- Tier 3 Decision Making
  - Conduct additional, instructionally relevant diagnostic assessments to determine more precisely student performance profile
  - Create individual hypotheses and predictions based on student performance
  - Match intensive instruction to student performance needs (identify resources within the school to support intensive instruction, e.g., title 1, ELL, SPED)
  - Monitor progress at least once a week
  - Modify intensive instruction as necessary based on progress monitoring data
  - Move students across tiers as data warrant
RtI: Lynnville-Sully Elementary

Vision:
Meeting all kids’ needs in a timely, proactive manner.
All About Lynnville-Sully Elementary

- **Students**
  - 203 students k-5
  - 2 sections per grade level

- **Additional Staff**
  - 1/2 time TAG/4-5th gr. Reading Support Teacher
  - 1/2 time K-3rd gr. Reading Support
  - Title One Teacher (k-3)
  - Two 1/2 time associates
  - 2 Special Ed. Associates
Needs Determined

- Core was not meeting needs of 30% of kids
- No time for teachers to collaborate
- Interventions lacked focus and documentation
- Many individual student referrals
- Teachers unclear on grade level expectations
Response to Needs

- Reading inventory completed
- Staff development provided
- Shifts in core instruction
- Revisions of reading standards and benchmarks and addition of indicators
- Daily schedule revised
  - Collaboration time planned
- Diagnostic assessments used
- Focus on group interventions with written plans and progress monitoring
Data: Role at Lynnville-Sully Elementary

- “Data Days” began in Fall 2006
  - 3 times a year
  - Grade level teams meet - 1 hour
    - Review all screening, diagnostic, and progress monitoring assessment data
    - Determine core needs (if any)
    - Determine group interventions, fill out forms, plan for progress monitoring, and set date to meet back
RtI Reading Process Sample

**Step 1**
All Students at a grade level

- Screening
- Fall
- Winter
- Spring

**Step 2**
Addl.
Diagnostic Assessment
Individual Diagnostic
Intensive
Supplemental
Core

- Intensive: 1-5%
- Supplemental: 5-10%
- Core: 80-90%
- None

**Step 3**
Instruction

- Individualized Intensive
- Group Diagnostic
- Continue With Core Instruction

**Step 4**
Results Monitoring

- 2 times/month
- Classroom Assessments Yearly ITBS/ITED
- Weekly

**Teacher will make sure:**
1. All students have been given the DIBELS assessment
2. All data has been entered
3. A copy of the class-wide data is printed
Questions/concerns: Contact Building Principal

**Teacher will:**
1. Calculate what percent of the class is at benchmark
2. If below 80%, determine “core” instructional needs (Beef-up based on data)
Questions/Concerns:
K-3 Contact Reading Teachers
4-6 Contact ___-building teacher w/reading background

**Teacher will:**
1. Place all non-proficient students into the 4-Boxes
2. Determine if there is a need for additional diagnostic assessment(s)
- see grade level sheet
3. Ensure diagnostic assessments are given
4. Bring all data to grade level meetings
Questions/Concerns:
K-3 Contact Reading Teachers
4-6 Contact ____-building Teacher with Rdg. Background

**Grade Level Data Meetings:**
1. Discuss briefly additions/changes made to core
2. Share 4-Box data and other diagnostic data results.
3. Group kids with similar instructional needs (COMPARE TO PRIOR GROUPING IF AVAILABLE)
4. Complete the group intervention Plan form (one per group)
   - Who, what, when, where of instruction
   - Who, what, when, where of monitoring
   - Who and when of parent notification
NOTE: if any changes are made during Intervention period, document on form.
5. Attach an implementation log and graphs
6. Set date to meet back for check-in (4-6 weeks)
Questions/Concerns: District Based Team & IDM Team, Content Specialist

Prior to Grade Level Data Meetings
Keys to Success: Tier 2 and 3 Interventions

- Screening, diagnostic, progress monitoring assessments
- Instruction/Materials matched to instructional needs of students
  - Examples: Read Naturally, Great Leaps, Quick Reads, REWARDS, Corrective Reading, Reading Mastery, Phonics for Reading, etc.
- Training for interventionists
- Flexibility of groups
# RESULTS: 1 Year of Implementation

Lynnville-Sully Elementary Proficiency Data

Target Assessment Chosen: DIBELS (At Benchmark)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>2005-06</th>
<th>2006-07</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st Grade</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>83%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd Grade</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>81%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd Grade</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>79%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4th Grade</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5th Grade</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Response to Intervention:

- A thinking process as well as a doing process.
- A systemic approach.
- Proactive rather than reactive.
- A journey of continuous improvement.