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Take Home Points

- RTI is about success for all kids
- RTI can apply to all grades (k-12)
- RTI is about bringing what works into schools and supporting it
# PS, RTI, School Wide Model

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What it is</th>
<th>What it is not</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Represents a way of: Using data to examine the system in relation to most important results.</td>
<td>A panacea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structuring thinking so that we don’t miss anything</td>
<td>A curriculum, an intervention, one theoretical orientation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identifying strategies with a high probability of improving student performance and knowing if they work</td>
<td>One size fits all</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keeping our attention focused on the most important things</td>
<td>Hoops to jump through</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Common sense into practice (cf. Fullan)</td>
<td>Easier than what came before</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
We have witnessed over the last 30 years numerous attempts at planned educational change. The benefits have not nearly equaled the costs, and all too often, the situation has seemed to worsen. We have, however, gained clearer and clearer insights over this period about the do’s and don’ts of bringing about change....One of the most promising features of this new knowledge about change is that successful examples of innovation are based on what might be most accurately labeled “organized common sense.” (Fullan, 1991, p. xi-xii)

Major Conceptual Shift (You Gotta Get This to Understand RTI)

- Old System was based on a Deficit Model of assessment and intervention
- An RTI System is based on a Risk Model
- They share some features
- They are different in significant ways
Deficit Model

Assumption: In every distribution of kids, some of them have specific deficits and therefore will fail to learn.

Historical Practice: The job of the assessor is to assess students to identify their deficits so we can provide services. We use the best tools available, matched to students’ presumed deficits.

We use these data to help identify what and how to teach.
Assumption:
All kids will learn basic skills to a basic level of proficiency. Some kids are at risk of not learning them.

Practice:
The job of the assessor is to identify students who are at risk of not learning basic skills to a minimum standard of proficiency. Also, the assessor identifies patterns of performance on instructionally relevant subskills.

We use these data to figure what and how to teach these students.
Our Job

To Go From Here

To Here
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A Smart System Structure

Enter a School-Wide Systems for Student Success

**Academic Systems**

**Intensive, Individual Interventions**
- Individual Students
- Assessment-based
- High Intensity
- Of longer duration

**Targeted Group Interventions**
- Some students (at-risk)
- High efficiency
- Rapid response

**Universal Interventions**
- All students
- Preventive, proactive

**Behavioral Systems**

**Intensive, Individual Interventions**
- Individual Students
- Assessment-based
- Intense, durable procedures

**Targeted Group Interventions**
- Some students (at-risk)
- High efficiency
- Rapid response

**Universal Interventions**
- All settings, all students
- Preventive, proactive
How Does it Fit Together? Group-Level Diagnostic Std. Treatment Protocol

**Step 1**
- All Students at a grade level
  - Universal Screening
  - Fall
  - Winter
  - Spring

**Step 2**
- Addl. Diagnostic Assessment
- Individual Diagnostic
- Group Diagnostic

**Step 3**
- Individualized Intensive
- Small Group Differentiated By Skill

**Step 4**
- Results Monitoring

- Weekly
- 2 times/month

- Grades Classroom Assessments
- Yearly ITBS/ITED

- 1-5%
- 5-10%
- 80-90%
- None
- Continue With Core Instruction
How Does it Fit Together? Uniform Standard Treatment Protocol

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

- Universal Screening
- Fall
- Winter
- Spring

**Step 2**
Addl. Diagnostic Assessment

- Individual Diagnostic
- 1-5%

**Step 3**
Instruction

- Individualized Intensive
- 5-10%

**Step 4**
Results Monitoring

- None
- 80-90%

- Core
- 2x weekly
- 2-4 times/month

- Supplemental
- Small Group, all less than proficient students get the same, balanced, research-validated instruction

- Intensive
- Grades Classroom Assessments Yearly ITBS/ITED

- Universal Screening
- Continue With Core Instruction
Big Ideas of RtI: For RtI to Be Effective We Must

- Use an instructionally relevant and efficient resource deployment system
- Use scientifically research-based practice to extent available
- Match instruction to individual student needs
- Make sure the instruction is sufficiently explicit and sufficiently intense
- Monitor implementation fidelity
- Monitor student response and change instruction as necessary
Large Group
Focus on CORE CURRICULUM

Enter a School-Wide Systems for Student Success

**Academic Systems**

**Intensive, Individual Interventions**
- Individual Students
- Assessment-based
- High Intensity
- Of longer duration

**Targeted Group Interventions**
- Some students (at-risk)
- High efficiency
- Rapid response

**Universal Interventions**
- All students
- Preventive, proactive

---

**Behavioral Systems**

**Intensive, Individual Interventions**
- Individual Students
- Assessment-based
- Intense, durable procedures

**Targeted Group Interventions**
- Some students (at-risk)
- High efficiency
- Rapid response

**Universal Interventions**
- All settings, all students
- Preventive, proactive
Is our initial instruction meeting the needs of enough students?

Historically, there hasn’t been a target on acceptable success rates.

- Some kids were successful
- Some kids weren’t

Kids who were not successful got different programming through different programs

Screening was haphazard
We have a new assumption to start from: **All kids successful**

- A rate of 80% has been suggested by many researchers and policy makers nationally, as the rate needed for Initial Instruction

- The number of kids in strategic or intensive programs can vary based on available resources, 20% seems reasonable
If we are going to become more systematic, we need to become more data-based.

One way to do this is Universal Screening

- We do this already in vision and hearing
- Until recent years, we haven’t had the technologies to do this in academics and social-behavioral areas
- We have the technologies to do it in other areas
  - Reading
  - Math
  - Social Behavior
- Great advantages for teachers, for students and for the system
What is a Universal Screening?

- Given to everyone
- Critical Skills
- Brief
- Repeatable
- Cheap and easy to administer and score
- Tells us who needs more assessment
Activity #1

- With a colleague sitting near you, discuss the following question.
- If we were able to do universal screening across the grade levels in Academics and Social/Emotional development, what advantages would there be for:
  - Teachers?
  - Parents?
  - Kids?
The Illustration We’ll Look At

- Elementary School
- About 100 kids per grade level
- About 20% FRPL
- We’ll look at the area of Mathematics
- Some problems on accountability assessments in computation
- Question, is initial instruction across the grade levels as effective as we want it to be in the areas of computation?
Screening indicates math problem grades 3 to 5

Third Grade Math

About 81% Meeting minimum proficiency
Screening indicates math problem grades 3 to 5

Fourth Grade Math

4th Grade Math
Multiplication 0-9

About 32% Meeting Minimum Proficiency
Screening indicates math problem grades 3-5

Fifth Grade Math

About 42% Meeting Minimum Proficiency
Houston, We Have a Problem

- An opportunity to engage a team of persons with expertise from across the system
  - Data analyst
  - Curriculum Specialists
  - Teachers
  - Administrators
  - Parents
Activity #2

- Think for a minute, who are the persons in your school/district who can help with RTI in each of these roles?
  - Data analyst (specify assmt, help collect, summarize data)
  - Curriculum Specialists (folks with broad and deep knowledge of effective practice and can train it)
  - Teachers – folks with broad and deep knowledge of district Standards and Benchmarks, Curriculum/Instruction and of the students
  - Administrators – who can help lead and support
  - Parents – who will support the system that you put in place
Large Group

- Cross grade group focused on mathematics
- Conducted a diagnostic large group assessment (why is the problem happening?)
  - Curriculum – examine the extent to which computation was included across grades 1-5
  - Instruction – Collect data on how computation was instructed
  - The environment – examine expectations for computational proficiency
  - Learner characteristics – Conduct systematic error analysis and error categorization on student performance data from the screening and classroom data
### Causal Hypothesis vs. Prediction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Causal Hypothesis</th>
<th>Prediction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Our current curriculum emphasizes problem solving, very little emphasis is placed on computation. It is taught infrequently</td>
<td>If we add a computation component to our curriculum, more students will meet minimum proficiency standards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Most of our teacher allocate a majority of their math instructional time teaching problem solving (following the curriculum guides)</td>
<td>If we allocate 20 percent of our mathematics instructional time to teaching computation in each grade 1-5, more students will meet minimum proficiency standards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some of our new teachers do not have experience systematically teaching computation</td>
<td>If we provide systematic professional development, guided practice and coaching on teaching computation to any teacher who wants it, more students will meet minimum proficiency standards</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Growth Obtained (one way to look at your data)

4th Grade Class
Mult 0-9

Digits Correct Two Minutes

Goal

Average Scores for Grade Level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Month</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sep-02</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oct-02</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov-02</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec-02</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan-03</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Intervention Effectiveness:
Another way to look at your data
One group of kids at a time (these are Title 1 Kids)

5th Grade Class
Mult & Div 0-9

Still some kids not getting it!
Re-screening Indicates No Systemic Problem

Third Grade

About 84% meeting minimum performance
About 81% before

*Note: One classroom’s data are missing from this analysis
Re-screening Indicates No Systemic Problem

Fourth Grade

Multiplication and Division Mixed
About 94% meeting minimum performance Compared to 32% before.
Re-screening Indicates No Systemic Problem

Fifth Grade

About 70% meeting minimum performance
Compared to 42% before.
What do you need for universal screening?

- Data on all students in the district in the areas you are interested in screening
- An efficient way to administer and score tests
- Tests linked to standards and benchmarks
- Defined Criteria of Success
- Best case: do it two or three times per year
Small Group
Grade 11 ITED Proficiency

What Questions Would You Have?

Proficient

Not Proficient
Activity #3

- At your table consider
  - You are a High School Teacher
  - These are your school’s accountability Reading Comprehension data.
  - What questions would you have about this chart?
  - What questions would you have at a “program” level in your school?
  - How would you go about answering them?
Focus on SUPPLEMENTAL INSTRUCTION

Enter a School-Wide Systems for Student Success

**Academic Systems**

- **Intensive, Individual Interventions**
  - Individual Students
  - Assessment-based
  - High Intensity
  - Of longer duration

- **Targeted Group Interventions**
  - Some students (at-risk)
  - High efficiency
  - Rapid response

- **Universal Interventions**
  - All students
  - Preventive, proactive

**Behavioral Systems**

- **Intensive, Individual Interventions**
  - Individual Students
  - Assessment-based
  - Intense, durable procedures

- **Targeted Group Interventions**
  - Some students (at-risk)
  - High efficiency
  - Rapid response

- **Universal Interventions**
  - All settings, all students
  - Preventive, proactive
Small Group – Supplemental Instruction

- Two sets of options
  - When initial instruction is not sufficient to support the student’s ongoing proficiency in a content area
    - Small group interventions matched to individual student needs
    - Group-level standard treatment protocols (scientifically-based interventions)
Option 1: Small Group Interventions

- We have noted over the last 10 years or so, that there are strong patterns to the types of referrals we get.
- Often they are similar by teacher or by school.
- We have begun encouraging our professionals to ask if there are pockets of kids with similar problems when they begin problem solving cases.
Option 1: Small Group Interventions
Matched to Individualized Need

- We need to assess reading critical components
- Additional Assessment
  - □ Oral Reading Fluency
  - □ Accuracy
  - □ Comprehension - Maze and Retell
  - □ Add ITP Vocabulary
For Less Than Proficient Kids, Figure Out What They Need

Critical Components of Reading

Additional Diagnostic Assessments
### Kids with Different Needs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITBS ID Number</th>
<th>Last Name</th>
<th>ITBS ID Number</th>
<th>Last Name</th>
<th>ITBS ID Number</th>
<th>Last Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2008006</td>
<td>Andrew Allison</td>
<td>2008074</td>
<td>Ashlee Runz</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3000484</td>
<td>Ryan Helman</td>
<td>3000673</td>
<td>Adam Torres</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008010</td>
<td>Christopher Kunz</td>
<td>3000093</td>
<td>Amisadai Runner</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008011</td>
<td>Laura Riley</td>
<td>2008191</td>
<td>Michael Runza</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008017</td>
<td>Michael Virginia</td>
<td>2008190</td>
<td>Merica Eduardo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008021</td>
<td>Megan Ibarra</td>
<td>2008187</td>
<td>Sam Raymond</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008047</td>
<td>Ian Garcia</td>
<td>2008025</td>
<td>Roy Jacob</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008038</td>
<td>Joella Todd</td>
<td>2008179</td>
<td>Jeff Lightweig</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008041</td>
<td>Abe Smallley</td>
<td>2008103</td>
<td>Kirk Arnolds</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3000467</td>
<td>Melody Warren</td>
<td>2008053</td>
<td>Tommy DeLeon</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008066</td>
<td>Ashley McGriff</td>
<td>2008096</td>
<td>Diana Torres</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008069</td>
<td>Daneal Seaman</td>
<td>2008085</td>
<td>Justin Danilson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008079</td>
<td>Michelle Boring</td>
<td>2008081</td>
<td>Danielle Narroman</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3000466</td>
<td>Hillary Michaels</td>
<td>2008125</td>
<td>Kara Nolan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008230</td>
<td>Joshua Kirkendoff</td>
<td>3000774</td>
<td>Ashlee Runz</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008087</td>
<td>Breck Holmgrem</td>
<td>3000673</td>
<td>Adam Torres</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008231</td>
<td>Sara Harrison</td>
<td>3000093</td>
<td>Amisadai Runner</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008220</td>
<td>Azariah Singer</td>
<td>2008191</td>
<td>Michael Runza</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008221</td>
<td>Nathan DeCruz</td>
<td>2008190</td>
<td>Merica Eduardo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008100</td>
<td>Andrew (Drew) Fox</td>
<td>2008187</td>
<td>Sam Raymond</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008217</td>
<td>Josh Elfman</td>
<td>2008025</td>
<td>Roy Jacob</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008106</td>
<td>Kelsey Medina</td>
<td>2008179</td>
<td>Jeff Lightweig</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008107</td>
<td>Ernesto Fusco</td>
<td>2008103</td>
<td>Kirk Arnolds</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008115</td>
<td>Beth Knapp</td>
<td>2008053</td>
<td>Tommy DeLeon</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008216</td>
<td>Mitchell Wundt</td>
<td>2008096</td>
<td>Diana Torres</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008118</td>
<td>Michelle Naito</td>
<td>2008085</td>
<td>Justin Danilson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008123</td>
<td>Sarah Henry</td>
<td>2008081</td>
<td>Danielle Narroman</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008197</td>
<td>Chris Renewitz</td>
<td>2008125</td>
<td>Kara Nolan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008127</td>
<td>Anthony (A.J.) Minott</td>
<td>3000774</td>
<td>Ashlee Runz</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008135</td>
<td>Brittany Donald</td>
<td>3000673</td>
<td>Adam Torres</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008142</td>
<td>Elizabeth Skipper</td>
<td>3000093</td>
<td>Amisadai Runner</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008149</td>
<td>Ryan Fernandez</td>
<td>2008191</td>
<td>Michael Runza</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008173</td>
<td>Nicholas Relex</td>
<td>2008187</td>
<td>Sam Raymond</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008176</td>
<td>Paula Kline</td>
<td>2008103</td>
<td>Kirk Arnolds</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008188</td>
<td>Derek Peter</td>
<td>2008053</td>
<td>Tommy DeLeon</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008183</td>
<td>David Warren</td>
<td>2008096</td>
<td>Diana Torres</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008125</td>
<td>Kara Nolan</td>
<td>2008085</td>
<td>Justin Danilson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITBS ID Number</th>
<th>Last Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2008198</td>
<td>Anna Rogers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008097</td>
<td>Joshua Dine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008093</td>
<td>Megan Manweis</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Often have **DIFFERENT NEEDS!!!**
Some General Observations About Tier 2 Interventions

- Need to differentiate for groups
- We need to group students with like needs together
- Our assessment logic should progress from the highest likelihood reasons that kids have reading problems to less likely reasons
- We must prioritize our instruction
Option 1: Small Group Interventions

- It is only within the past 3 or 4 years that we have begun looking systemically at how we can unify our small group intervention programs and processes beyond early literacy.

- Many issues
  - Funding
  - Silos
  - Political Issues
  - Logistics
  - Polymorphous Philosophies
Option 1: Our Successes

- We have been most successful when we can plan systemically within a building/district (e.g., HELP)
- Also, our most successful districts have gotten very proactive, systemic and prescriptive about their school wide programs
- An example program schematic from a middle-sized Heartland district
Elementary Reading Flow Chart

Classroom Instruction

Fluency & Accuracy Errors

Reading Problems

Decoding Fluency

More Serious Reading/Fluency & Comprehension

CTA (when available)

Decoding Fluency (4-5)

Reading Plus

Decoding & Comp. (K-3)

Corrective Reading

Reading Mastery

(Placed by Benchmark)

English Second Language

Summer School

Additional Intervention Needed

Special Education

Extreme Needs

Comp Difficulties

Soar to Success

Assessment Indicators:

Fluency and Accuracy – 3x per year (Fluency measure)
DIBELS – 3x per year K-1 (Early Literacy measure)
Gates-MacGinitie – Fall 2nd, Spring 2nd & 3rd (Comprehension and vocabulary measure)
STAR – 3x per year 4th & 5th (Comprehension and vocabulary measure)
AR – Continuously 4th & 5th (Comprehension measure)
ITBS – Annually 2nd-5th (Comprehension measure)
Classroom Assessment – Continuously (Benchmark achievement measure)

Early Literacy Mentoring Association (Birth to Age 5 Instruction)
Option 1: Set of Standard Interventions Matched to Student Need

- **Comprehension**
  - □ Collaborative Strategic Reading (Vaughn)
  - □ Reading in the Content Area (Kinsella)

- **Fluency**
  - □ Six Minute Solution (Hiebert)
  - □ Read Naturally (Imhott)

- **Decoding**
  - □ Rewards (Archer)
  - □ Phonics for Reading (Archer)
  - □ Corrective Reading (SRA)

**Warning:**
This is just a sample from one of our middle schools. Your set may be very different!
Option 1: Monitor Student Performance

- For this group, we need to monitor progress probably weekly or once every couple weeks
- We need to use our data to determine the effectiveness of our instruction
- We need to change instructional programs that are not working
Tier 2: Gear Shift
Option 2: Standard Treatment Protocol Interventions

- Can be put in place for all kids who do not demonstrate proficiency in a skill area
- Individual/group diagnostics are limited if they occur at all at this point in time - $$$ saved
- These interventions will work for some group of less than proficient learners
Option 2: Standard Treatment
Protocol Interventions

- Examples of Standard Treatment Protocols can be found in the research of Sharon Vaughn, Frank Vellutino, Barbara Foorman, Debbie Speece, Rolanda O’Connor, Joe Torgeson among others
  - These are treatment protocols identified by researchers as being scientifically based and effective
  - They tend to be very structured
  - They tend to use explicit, systematic instruction
  - They tend to be multi-skill focused
  - They tend to be intensive
  - They tend to be multiple weeks long
  - Progress is monitored and instructional decisions are made
  - Most of them use scientifically validated measurement models (E.g. DIBELS, Curriculum-Based Measurement)
PUNCH LINE: We Moved From Diagnosing and Serving Disabilities to Serving the Learning Enabled

- Requires a shift in focus from measuring outputs to measuring inputs

- Requires diagnosing the conditions under which the learner’s learning is enabled, assessment for intervention planning.
What will we do when students don’t learn?

- Established RTI Team
- Each grade level structured time for supplemental and intensive instruction
- Determined personnel to provide instruction
  - Teachers from all areas supporting content teachers
- Selected set of “standard treatments”
- Developed “exit” criteria
Intensive Instruction for Individuals
Individual Intensive Intervention/Instruction
Roughly 5-10% of Our Kids

- We have nearly 15 years experience with this
- It works for all kinds of problems
- In our system, intensive intervention can occur in general education, special education or both
- Our special education system now operates substantially on these principles and practices
Focus on INTENSIVE INTERVENTIONS

Enter a School-Wide Systems for Student Success

**Academic Systems**

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

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

- Universal Interventions
  - All students
  - Preventive, proactive

**Behavioral Systems**

- Intensive, Individual Interventions
  - Individual Students
  - Assessment-based
  - Intense, durable procedures

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

- Universal Interventions
  - All settings, all students
  - Preventive, proactive
The Problem Solving Process

- **Define the Problem**
  (Screening and Diagnostic Assessments)
  What is the problem and why is it happening?

- **Develop a Plan**
  (Goal Setting and Planning)
  What are we going to do?

- **Evaluate**
  (Progress Monitoring Assessment)
  Did our plan work?

- **Implement Plan**
  (Treatment Integrity)
  Carry out the intervention
Let’s Look at a Case
Consultation with Extended Problem Solving Team

Start Here

- Define the Problem
  - Identify concern
  - Define behavior of concern
  - Problem validation
  - Problem analysis
  - Functional assessment
  - Write problem statement

- Evaluate
  - Data analyzed to determine effectiveness
  - Success determined by rate of progress & size of discrepancy
  - Recycle or determine need to consider entitlement for special education

- Implement Plan
  - Implement according to written plan
  - Ongoing systematic data collection
  - Follow-up as needed

- Develop a Plan
  - Generate possible solutions
  - Evaluate solutions
  - Select a solution
  - Collect baseline data
  - Set a goal
  - Write action plan
  - Select measurement strategy
  - Develop plan to evaluate effectiveness

Consultation with Extended Problem Solving Team

- Define the Problem
  - Identify concern
  - Define behavior of concern
  - Problem validation

- Evaluate
  - Data analyzed to determine effectiveness
  - Success determined by rate of progress & size of discrepancy
  - Recycle or determine need to consider entitlement for special education

- Implement Plan
  - Implement according to written plan
  - Ongoing systematic data collection
  - Follow-up as needed

- Develop a Plan
  - Generate possible solutions
  - Evaluate solutions
  - Select a solution
  - Collect baseline data
  - Set a goal
  - Write action plan
  - Select measurement strategy
  - Develop plan to evaluate effectiveness
Illustration: Carlos

- Second grader, Winter
- Referred identified in universal screening as at risk
- This is an example of a screening assessment
- Other classroom data were available to validate the problem
Consultation with Extended Problem Solving Team

- Define the Problem
  - Identify concern
  - Define behavior of concern
  - Problem validation
  - Problem analysis
  - Functional assessment
  - Write problem statement

- Evaluate
  - Data analyzed to determine effectiveness
  - Success determined by rate of progress & size of discrepancy
  - Recycle or determine need to consider entitlement for special education

- Develop a Plan
  - Generate possible solutions
  - Evaluate solutions
  - Select a solution
  - Collect baseline data
  - Set a goal
  - Write action plan
  - Select measurement strategy
  - Develop plan to evaluate effectiveness

- Implement Plan
  - Implement according to written plan
  - Ongoing systematic data collection
  - Follow-up as needed

- Parent
- Teacher
- BAT
- AEA

Next Here
Problem Analysis (Summary)

- Phonics (ORF is circa 10 words per minute in second grade passages)
  - Decoding is very labored, slow, halted and inaccurate (fluency and accuracy)
  - A majority of his correct words are high frequency sight words
  - There are many letter-sound correspondences and letter combinations (digraphs and vowel teams) Carlos consistently struggles with (phonics)
  - Carlos' phonemic awareness skills have some critical deficits
  - Carlos is using a number of “partial strategies” to attack unfamiliar, phonetically regular words
  - Carlos' oral language vocabulary is significantly limited compared to typical peers (vocabulary)
  - All of which make very difficult for Carlos to comprehend what he reads (comprehension)

- Task-related behavior – Carlos has a many topographies of escape behavior. He whines, wiggles, asks for breaks and attempts to redirect his teacher into conversations unrelated to the lesson.
Consultation with Extended Problem Solving Team

• Define the Problem
  - Identify concern
  - Define behavior of concern
  - Problem validation
  - Problem analysis
  - Functional assessment
  - Write problem statement

• Evaluate
  - Data analyzed to determine effectiveness
  - Success determined by rate of progress & size of discrepancy
  - Recycle or determine need to consider entitlement for special education

• Develop a Plan
  - Generate possible solutions
  - Evaluate solutions
  - Select a solution
  - Collect baseline data
  - Set a goal
  - Write action plan
  - Select measurement strategy
  - Develop plan to evaluate effectiveness

• Implement Plan
  - Implement according to written plan
  - Ongoing systematic data collection
  - Follow-up as needed
**Carlos’ Initial Problem Analysis**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Causal Hypothesis</th>
<th>Prediction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Phonemic segmentation fluency is around 28 phonemes per minute which hinders Carlos ability to read fluently and comprehend what he reads</td>
<td>If we teach Carlos to segment words, this preskill will help him become a better reader</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carlos has not been taught high probability word attack skills but has been taught partial strategies, which cause him to be an inaccurate reader</td>
<td>If we teach Carlos effective, generalizable word attack strategies (phonics), his reading will become more accurate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carlos has not read enough to become a fluent, accurate reader with comprehension (miles on his tongue)</td>
<td>If we provide Carlos with additional reading instruction and opportunities to read, his overall reading skills will improve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carlos' task related behaviors have been successful in allowing him to escape sustained reading.</td>
<td>If we provide incentives for Carlos' efforts in reading and do not let him escape the reading tasks by “squirreling”, he will be able to sustain his reading for longer periods of time.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Looking at Benchmark Data

- Benchmark is at the top of the box.
- Some risk is inside the box.
- At risk is below the box.

Words Correct

School Weeks

- September (Sept)
- October (Oct)
- November (Nov)
- December (Dec)
- January (Jan)
- February (Feb)
- March (Mar)
- April (Apr)
- May
- June
Setting Up a Progress Monitoring Chart

### Student Improvement is Job #1 Goal Area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Carlos</th>
<th>District</th>
<th>South Iowa</th>
<th>School</th>
<th>East Elementary</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Teacher</th>
<th>Vanderburgh</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Goal Statement</td>
<td>Parent will provide extra oral reading time at home. They would like graph sent home biweekly.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expected Level of Performance</td>
<td>#1 ———— #2 ———— #3 ———— #4 ————</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service Providers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent Participation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Baseline Progress Chart**

- **November**
- **December**
- **January**
- **February**
- **March**
- **April**
- **May**
- **June**
Data-Based Determination of Expectations: Carlos

- Benchmark Level: 70 WCPM
- Current Level: 10 WCPM
- Difference to June Benchmark (Gap): 60 WCPM
- Time to Benchmark: 27 Weeks
- Rate of Growth Required:
  - \(\frac{60}{27} = 2.2\) WCPM for Carlos
- Peer Group Rate = 1.30 WCPM (for “some risk” benchmark)
- REALISTIC? Not unless you increase AET
Setting a Goal

Student Improvement is Job #1 Goal Area

Reading

Name: Carlos
District: 
School: 
Year: 
Teacher: Russo

Goal: By June, given a DIBELS monitoring passage Carlos will read 70 words correct in one minute.

Expected Level of Performance:
10 Words Correct per Minute

Service Providers:

Parent Participation: Parent will provide extra oral reading time at home. They would like graph sent home biweekly.

Peers’ Growth (some risk) is about 1.3 words per week

That’s about 2.2 words per week! Challenging, but possible.

Baseline

Aimline

Goal
Reality Check for Goals Set Against Benchmarks

In terms of establishing appropriate weekly rates of improvement when monitoring progress with oral passage reading, the student's grade level of functioning must be considered. Findings indicate that for first graders, an improvement of 2 words per week may represent a realistic slope. On the other hand, given research indicating the importance of ambitious goals to enhance student achievement (e.g., Fuchs, Fuchs, & Hamlett, 1989), an improvement of approximately 3 words per week (i.e., 2.10 plus one standard deviation of .80) may represent an appropriately ambitious standard for weekly growth. This may be especially true for students with disabilities who must decrease discrepancies between their performance and that of their peers. Realistic and ambitious standards for weekly growth, respectively, are:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Realistic</th>
<th>Ambitious</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>First</td>
<td>2 words per week</td>
<td>3 words per week</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second</td>
<td>1.5 words per week</td>
<td>2.0 words per week</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Third</td>
<td>1.0 word per week</td>
<td>1.5 word per week</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fourth</td>
<td>.85 words per week</td>
<td>1.1 words per week</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fifth</td>
<td>.5 word per week</td>
<td>.8 word per week</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sixth</td>
<td>.3 words per week</td>
<td>.65 words per week</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Table was created from article text.

Carlos’ Reading Goal

By June, given a DIBELS monitoring passage, Carlos will read 70 words correct in one minute with five or fewer errors.
# Instructional Decision Making

## Decision Making Plan:
Data will be collected at least once per week and charted. If three consecutive data points fall below the goal line the problem solving team will reconvene and an instructional change will be made.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Instructional Procedure</th>
<th>Materials</th>
<th>Arrangements</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Motivational Strategies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Teach phonemic awareness skills</td>
<td>Optimize Curriculum</td>
<td>Small group Supplemental to Carlos' core reading</td>
<td>30 minutes Daily</td>
<td>Verbal Praise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Instructional Decisions

- Instructional procedures
- Materials
- Arrangements
- Time
- Motivational Strategies
Consultation with Extended Problem Solving Team

- Define the Problem
  - Identify concern
  - Define behavior of concern
  - Problem validation
  - Problem analysis
  - Functional assessment
  - Write problem statement

- Evaluate
  - Data analyzed to determine effectiveness
  - Success determined by rate of progress & size of discrepancy
  - Recycle or determine need to consider entitlement for special education

- Develop a Plan
  - Generate possible solutions
  - Evaluate solutions
  - Select a solution
  - Collect baseline data
  - Set a goal
  - Write action plan
  - Select measurement strategy
  - Develop plan to evaluate effectiveness

- Implement Plan
  - Implement according to written plan
  - Ongoing systematic data collection
  - Follow-up as needed

• Evaluate • Develop a Plan
• Define the Problem

Consultation with Extended Problem Solving Team Finally Here
Decision Making Plan

- Frequency of data collection
- Strategies to be used to summarize data for evaluation
- Number of data points or time before analysis
- Decision rule
Data Collection and Charting
Supplemental Instruction 1

**Student Improvement is Job #1 Goal Area**

**Name:** Carlos

**District:**

**School:**

**Year:**

**Teacher:** Vanderburgh

**Goal:** By June, given a DIBELS progress monitoring passage, Carlos will read 70 words correct in one minute.

**Service Providers:**

**Parent Participation:** Parent will provide extra oral reading time at home. They would like graph sent home biweekly.

**Trendline = .07 WCPM**

**Baseline**

**Goal**

**Aimline**

Poor RtI

- Nov
- Dec
- Jan
- Feb
- Mar
- Apr
- May
- Jun
Data-Based Determination of Expectations: Carlos

- Benchmark Level: 70 WCPM
- Current Level: 12 WCPM
- Difference to June Benchmark (Gap): 58 WCPM
- Time to Benchmark: 20 Weeks
- Rate of Growth Required:
  - $\frac{58}{20} = 2.9$ WCPM for Carlos
- Peer Group Rate = 1.30 WCPM (for “some risk” benchmark)
- REALISTIC? Not unless you increase AET, increase effectiveness of instruction
Data Collection and Charting
Supplemental Instruction 1

**Student Improvement is Job #1 Goal Area** Reading

Name: Carlos
District: Vanderburgh
School: 
Year: 
Teacher: 

Goal: By June, given a DIBELS progress monitoring passage Carlos will read 70 words correct in one minute.

Service Providers: 
Parent Participation: Parent will provide extra oral reading time at home. They would like graph sent home biweekly.

Baseline

Goal

Trendline = .07 WCPM

Aimline

That’s about 2.9 words per week
VERY Ambitious, but let’s go with it.
Entitlement for Special Education

Assessment and Progress Data From Problem Solving/RTI Process Group and Individual Interventions

Educational Progress

Discrepancy

Instructional Needs

Convergence of Data from a Variety of Sources
At This Point We Know

- Carlos' Performance is significantly discrepant from peers (Somewhere between the 2nd and 4th percentile) – (Discrepancy in Level)
- His progress is about 50 WCPM discrepant from benchmark performance levels during the winter benchmark period (Discrepancy in Level)
- He has not made significant progress when provided supplemental instruction and this progress is documented with progress monitoring data (Discrepancy in Trend)
- We have a clear description of what his instruction needs to look like (problem analysis – phonemic awareness, phonics, fluency have clear deficits)
- Additional data were collected on other important variables (vision, hearing, parental input, teacher input etc.)
### Instructional Decision Making

**Decision Making Plan:**
Data will be collected at least once per week and charted. If three consecutive data points fall below the goal line the problem solving team will reconvene and an instructional change will be made.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student</th>
<th>Carlos</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Goal Area</td>
<td>Reading</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intervention Designer</td>
<td>Phillips</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advisor</td>
<td>D. Tilly</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Instructional Procedure</th>
<th>Materials</th>
<th>Arrangements</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Motivational Strategies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Teach phonemic awareness skills. Focus on transitioning activities. Provide cues when reading</td>
<td>Optimize Curriculum</td>
<td>Small group Supplemental to Carlos' core reading</td>
<td>30 minutes Daily</td>
<td>Verbal Praise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Add special Education instruction matched to student individual needs</td>
<td>Add reading mastery instruction</td>
<td>Intensive instruction 1 to 4 Teacher/student ratio</td>
<td>Add 30 minutes</td>
<td>Mystery Motivators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Data Collection and Charting Intensive Instruction 2

**Student Improvement is Job #1 Goal Area**  
**Reading**

**Name**  
Carlos

**District**  

**School**  

**Year**  

**Teacher**  
Vanderburgh

**Goal**  
**By June, given a DIBELS progress monitoring passage Carlos will read 70 words correct in one minute.**

**10 Words Correct per Minute**

**Service Providers**

**Parent Participation**  
Parent will provide extra oral reading time at home. They would like graph sent home biweekly.

---

**Graph**

Baseline  
Trendline = .07 WCPM  
Trendline = .54 WCPM  
Goal
## Instructional Decision Making

### Decision Making Plan:
Data will be collected at least once per week and charted. If three consecutive data points fall below the goal line the problem solving team will reconvene and an instructional change will be made.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Instructional Procedure</th>
<th>Materials</th>
<th>Arrangements</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Motivational Strategies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Teach phonemic awareness skills. Focus on transitioning activities. Provide cues when reading</td>
<td>Optimize Curriculum</td>
<td>Small group Supplemental to Carlos' core reading</td>
<td>30 minutes Daily</td>
<td>Verbal Praise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Add special Education instruction matched to student individual needs</td>
<td>Add reading mastery instruction (discontinue PfR)</td>
<td>Intensive instruction 1 to 4 Teacher/student ratio</td>
<td>Add 30 Minutes daily</td>
<td>Mystery Motivators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Add additional explicit phonics Instruction</td>
<td>Phonics for reading</td>
<td>Intensive Instructional Group Small groups will rotate between teachers.</td>
<td>Add 20 Minutes 3x per wk.</td>
<td>Verbal Praise Classroom motivators</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Data Collection and Charting Intensive Instruction 2

**Student Improvement is Job #1 Goal Area**

**Name**: Carlos  
**District**:  
**School**:  
**Year**:  
**Teacher**: Vanderburgh

**Goal**: By June, given a DIBELS progress monitoring passage Carlos will read 70 words correct in one minute.

**Service Providers**

**Parent Participation**: Parent will provide extra oral reading time at home. They would like graph sent home biweekly.

**Trendline = .07 WCPM**  
**Trendline = .17 WCPM**

That's 4.16 WCPM  
Probably Not Reasonable
**Student Improvement is Job #1 Goal Area**

Name: Carlos

Goal: By June, given a DIBELS progress monitoring passage Carlos will read 70 words correct in one minute.

Service Providers

Parent Participation: Parent will provide extra oral reading time at home. They would like graph sent home biweekly.

**Graph**

- Trendline = .07 WCPM
- Trendline = .54 WCPM

**Trendline**

Use 2.0 as a challenging Goal (Fuchs et al.)
Data-Based Determination of Expectations: Carlos

- Benchmark Level: 70 WCPM
- Current Level: 20 WCPM
- Difference to June Benchmark (Gap): 50 WCPM
- Time to Benchmark: 12 Weeks
- Rate of Growth Required:
  - $\frac{50}{12} = 4.16$ WCPM for Carlos (Undoable)
  - Will use 2.0 as a challenging goal
- Peer Group Rate = 1.30 WCPM (for “some risk” benchmark)
- REALISTIC? Not unless you increase AET/instruction becomes more effective
Data Collection and Charting Intensive Instruction 2

**Student Improvement is Job #1 Goal Area**  
**Reading**

- **Name**: Carlos  
- **District**:  
- **School**:  
- **Year**:  
- **Teacher**: Vanderburgh

**Goal**: By June, given a DIBELS progress monitoring passage Carlos will read 70 words correct in one minute.

**Service Providers**:  
**Parent Participation**: Parent will provide extra oral reading time at home. They would like graph sent home biweekly.

---

**Graph Description**

- **Baseline**:  
- **Trendline = .07 WCPM**:  
- **Trendline = .54 WCPM**:  
- **Trendline = 1.93 WCPM**:  

---

**Better, Good RtI**