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Goals for the Sessions

Thursday
2. Aligning the Critical Elements Across Academic and Behavior Systems
3. Data-Based Problem-Solving: Instructional and Systems-Based
4. Defining and Articulating the Content of a Multi-Tiered System

Friday
2. District and School Organizational Structures to Support Implementation
3. Facilitators and Barriers to Implementation
4. Developing Action Plans for Implementation
5. A Program Evaluation Model to Sustain Implementation
The Conundrum of American Public Education

We can, whenever we choose, successfully teach all children whose schooling is of interest to us. We already know more than we need to do that. Whether or not we do it must finally depend on how we feel about the fact that we haven’t so far.

Ron Edmonds, 1982 in DeFour et al., 2004
Common Language
Common Understanding
MTSS: Integrating Two Evidence-Based Models to Improve the Academic and Behavior Outcomes for ALL Students

- Challenging Times In Which to Educate America’s Children and Youth
  - Performance Evaluations Tied to Student Growth
  - Economic Crises
  - Alternatives to Public K-12 Education
  - AYP Projections and Expectations
  - Recruitment and Retention of Qualified Professionals
  - Common Language/Common Understanding with Educators, Parents and the Community
Strategies for Successfully Addressing these Challenges

• Anticipate the Future
• Use of Highly Effective Practices
• Efficient Delivery of those Practices
• Data to Evidence Effectiveness of Practices
• Strong Professional Development and Support to Sustain Effective Practices
• Communicating Clearly and Frequently with Stakeholders
The Future: Re-Authorization of ESEA

• Data-Based Problem-Solving (MTSSS)
  – Learn Act (Literacy) S. 929IS
    • (x) applying the principles of universal design for learning;
    • (xi) using age-appropriate screening assessments, diagnostic assessments, formative assessments, and summative assessments to identify individual learning needs, to inform instruction, and to monitor--
      – (I) student progress and the effects of instruction over time
    • (xv) using strategies to enhance children's--
      – (I) motivation to communicate, read, and write; and
      – (II) engagement in self-directed learning

– Blueprint for Reform 2010
  • "Instead of labeling failures, we will reward success. Instead of a single snapshot, we will recognize progress and growth. And instead of investing in the status quo, we must reform our schools to accelerate student achievement, close achievement gaps..."
Senate Bill 541

• Achievement through Prevention Act (PBIS)
  – “The Achievement Through Prevention Act provides support for states, local educational agencies and schools to increase implementation of school-wide positive behavioral interventions and supports (PBIS) and early intervening services. This bill promises to improve student academic achievement and to reduce disciplinary problems in schools while improving coordination with similar activities and services provided under the federal special education law.”
Highly Effective Practices: Research

- High quality academic instruction (e.g., content matched to student success level, frequent opportunity to respond, frequent feedback) by itself can reduce problem behavior (Filter & Horner, 2009; Preciado, Horner, Scott, & Baker, 2009, Sanford, 2006)

- Implementation of school-wide positive behavior support leads to increased academic engaged time and enhanced academic outcomes (Algozzine & Algozzine, 2007; Horner et al., 2009; Lassen, Steele, & Sailor, 2006)

- “Viewed as outcomes, achievement and behavior are related; viewed as causes of the other, achievement and behavior are unrelated. (Algozzine, et al., 2011)

- Children who fall behind academically will be more likely to find academic work aversive and also find escape-maintained problem behaviors reinforcing (McIntosh, 2008; McIntosh, Sadler, & Brown, 2010)
Cycle of Academic and Behavioral Failure: Aggressive Response
(McIntosh, 2008)

Teacher presents student with academic task
Student engages in problem behavior
Teacher removes academic task or removes student
Student escapes academic task
Student's academic skills do not improve

So, which is it…
Academic problems lead to behavior problems?
or
Behavior problems lead to academic problems?
Not sure…
Probably a combination of both
School-wide Behavior & Reading Support

The integration/combination of the two:
• are critical for school success
• utilize the three tiered prevention model
• incorporate a team approach at school level, grade level, and individual level
• share the critical feature of data-based decision making
• produce larger gains in literacy skills than the reading-only model
   – (Stewart, Benner, Martella, & Marchand-Martella, 2007)
Efficient Delivery of Highly Effective Practices

• Statewide District Needs Assessment Results:
  – Focus Resource Development and District Resources On:
    – Evidence-based Coaching Strategies
    – Leadership Skills to Support MTSSS
    – Family and Community Engagement
    – Aligning K-12 MTSSS-Focus on Secondary
    – Evaluation Models to Demonstrate Outcomes
    – Common Language/Common Understanding Around an Integrated Data-Based Problem-Solving Process
    – Integrating Technology and Universal Design for Learning
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.
MTSS

• A Multi-Tiered System of Supports (MTSS) is a term used to describe an evidence-based model of schooling that uses data-based problem-solving to integrate academic and behavioral instruction and intervention.

• The integrated instruction and intervention is delivered to students in varying intensities (multiple tiers) based on student need.

• “Need-driven” decision-making seeks to ensure that district resources reach the appropriate students (schools) at the appropriate levels to accelerate the performance of ALL students to achieve and/or exceed proficiency.
Three Tiered Model of Student Supports

These students get these tiers of support in order to meet benchmarks.

The goal of the tiers is student success, not labeling.
MTSS & the Problem-Solving Process

ACADEMIC and BEHAVIOR SYSTEMS

**Tier 3: Intensive, Individualized Interventions & Supports.**
The most intense (increased time, narrowed focus, reduced group size) instruction and intervention based upon individual student need provided in addition to and aligned with Tier 1 & 2 academic and behavior instruction and supports.

**Tier 2: Targeted, Supplemental Interventions & Supports.**
More targeted instruction/intervention and supplemental support in addition to and aligned with the core academic and behavior curriculum.

**Tier 1: Core, Universal Instruction & Supports.**
General academic and behavior instruction and support provided to all students in all settings.
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Model of Schooling

• All district instruction and intervention services have a “place” in this model.
• If it does not fit in the model, should it be funded?
• All supplemental and intensive services must be integrated with core.
It's a Frame,
Not a Box
Parts of the “Frame”

• 3 Tiers of service delivery into which all academic and behavioral instruction/intervention “fit.”
  – Content is not been defined by the model

• Use and regular review of data to ensure students are responding to the tiered instructional delivery.
Parts of the “Frame”

- Instruction/interventions are modified and intensified based on student performance data

- Instruction is integrated and systematically planned across the tiers
Reflection #1

• What elements of RtI/MTSS do you believe reflect a common understanding with your staff?

• What elements of RtI/MTSS do you believe DO NOT reflect a common understanding with your staff?
Revolution or Evolution?
National Perspective

- 92% of districts are in some stage of implementing RtI (44% in 2007) 24% report Full Implementation

- 68% of districts are either in full implementation or district-wide implementation. Larger districts more likely to be in full implementation

- Implementation with integrity remains an issue. The median response for implementation with integrity was in the 50-74% range
National Perspective

• 56% of districts report having a district implementation plan.

• Most districts have school leadership teams, but not necessarily a district leadership team to implement RtI.

• Only 26% of districts currently evaluate the implementation of RtI. 47% report they are in the process of developing a plan to do this.

• Rate of implementation is greater at the elementary level, with a greater focus on academic (reading) than on behavior.
National Perspective

• Of the districts reporting the data:

  • Majority indicate a positive effect of RtI on AYP

  • 80% report a reduction on special education referrals (same as last 2 years)

RtI Adoption Survey (2011) - [www.spectrumk12.com](http://www.spectrumk12.com)
New Logic

• Begin with the idea that the purpose of the system is student achievement

• Acknowledge that student needs exist on a continuum rather than in typological groupings

• Organize resources to make educational resources available in direct proportion to student need

David Tilly, 2004
Student Achievement
Student Performance

• **Academic Skills**
  – Goal setting tied to state/district standards
  – Common Core State Standards
  – Developmental Standards

• **Academic Behaviors-Student Engagement**
  – Behaviors associated with successful completion of the academic skills
  – On-task, self-monitoring, goal setting, content of private speech

• **Inter-/Intra-Personal Behaviors**
  – Behaviors that support social skills
  – Social/emotional development
Lesson Study: Integrating Academic Instruction and Student Behavior

- What are the evidence-based instructional strategies that will attain the *academic skill set*?
- What *academic engagement behaviors* will be necessary to translate the academic skill into academic performance?
- What *social/emotional behaviors* are resources and obstacles to the skill and performance goals?
- HOW WILL WE MATCH THE INSTRUCTIONAL STRATEGIES WITH ENGAGEMENT FACTORS?
Critical Elements

• District/School Organizational/Team Structure
• Multi-Tiered System
• Data-Based Problem-Solving Process
• Scheduled Data Review
  – Health and Wellness
  – Problem Solving
• Intervention Sufficiency and Support
• Implementation Data
• Professional Development
Organizational Structure
Implementation Model

- District-based leadership team (DBLT)
- School-based leadership team (SBLT)
- School-based coaching
  - Process Technical Assistance
  - Interpretation and Use of Data
- Evaluation Data
District Infrastructure

• District Leadership
  – Common Language/Common Understanding
  – Is there a “unified” system of instruction at the district level?

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

• Develop Policies and Procedures to Support Implementation
• Provide Support for Infrastructure
• Professional Development Aligned with Implementation and Student Need
• Allocation of Resources to Buildings based on Level of Implementation and Student Outcomes
• Monitor Implementation and Outcomes
• Support System for Principals
• Leadership Evaluation
Role of District Administrators

- Communicate a clear and common vision
- Demonstrate effective leadership practices to create a climate that supports and sustains staff during a reform process
- Provide personnel resources and logistical support for the implementation of the model
- Monitor implementation
Role of District Administrators

• Modify training, technical assistance and support to sustain implementation

• Model the problem-solving process at the District level through the consistent use of data for decisions that improve student performance and the skills of the professional staff

• Ensure the use of program evaluation to evaluate the impact of implementation
School-Based Infrastructure

- School-based leadership team (SBLT)
- School-based coaching
  - Process Technical Assistance
  - Interpretation and Use of Data
- Master Calendar
- Data Days
- Evaluation Model
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
Reflection #1

• Does your district have an implementation plan?

• What supports does your district provide to promote implementation?

• What supports do you need from your district to accelerate implementation?
Multi-Tiered System
Multi-Tiered System

Tier III
For Approx 5% of Students
Core
+
Supplemental
+
Intensive Individual Instruction
...to achieve benchmarks

1. Where is the student performing now?
2. Where do we want him to be?
3. How long do we have to get him there?
4. What supports has he received?
5. What resources will move him at that rate?

Tier III Effective if there is progress (i.e., gap closing) towards benchmark and/or progress monitoring goals.
Tiers of Behavioral Intervention/Support

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

**Tier I Assessments**
- Discipline Data (ODR)
- Benchmark Assessment
- Universal Screening

**Tier II Targeted Interventions**
- Targeted Group Interventions
- Social Skills Training
- Small Groups

**Tier II Assessments**
- Behavioral Observations
- Intervention Data
- Gap Analysis

**Tier III: Individualized Interventions**
- Behavior Intervention Plan
- Individual Counseling
- Self-Monitoring

**Tier III: Assessments**
- FBA
- Progress Monitoring Graph/RtI (Eligibility Assessment)

**Tiers of Intervention**
- **80 - 90%**
- **10 - 15%**
- **1 - 5%**

- Tier I: Core Interventions
- Tier II: Targeted Interventions
- Tier III: Individualized Interventions

**Visual Representation**
- The pyramid diagram illustrates the percentage distribution of tiers with corresponding interventions and assessments.
TIER I: Core, Universal Academic and Behavior

GOAL: 100% of students achieve at high levels

Tier I: Implementing well researched programs and practices demonstrated to produce good outcomes for the majority of students.

Tier I: Effective if at least 80% are meeting benchmarks with access to Core/Universal Instruction.

Tier I: Begins with clear goals:
1. What exactly do we expect all students to learn?
2. How will we know if and when they’ve learned it?
3. How you we respond when some students don’t learn?
4. How will we respond when some students have already learned?

Questions 1 and 2 help us ensure a guaranteed and viable core curriculum.
What does core instruction look like for reading?

K-5

- 90 minute reading block
  - Comprehensive reading program is the central tool for instruction.
  - Explicit, systematic, and differentiated instruction is provided.
  - In-class grouping strategies are in use, including small group instruction as appropriate to meet student needs.
  - Active student engagement occurs in a variety of reading-based activities, which connect to the essential components of reading and academic goals.
  - Effective classroom management and high levels of time on task are evident.

6-12

- Content area courses in which the reading content standards are addressed for all students including:
  - Middle School Developmental Reading
  - English/Language Arts
  - Other core areas such as science, social studies, and math
**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>
What Does Core Instruction Look Like for Behavior?

- School-wide Positive Behavior Support
- School-wide social skills/character skill education (e.g., Boys Town)
- School-Home collaboration and partnerships
- Active student engagement in promoting a prosocial environment (e.g., bully prevention)
- School-wide discipline plan that can be explained by both staff and students
Sources of Data

- Academic performance
- Discipline data - Office discipline referrals (ODR)
- Records
- Referral history
- Observation - Student Engagement Behaviors
- PBS benchmark assessment
- School climate surveys
- Attendance data
Why ODRs May Not Be Enough

• May not identify students with severe “internalizing” behaviors
• May not identify students with many “minors” but few “majors”
• May reflect that some teachers refer and some don’t
• May miss students in ESE settings with persistent or violent behavior who may not generate office referrals
## Class Recommended Level of Instruction Report

<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>Initial</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>Strategic</td>
<td>Strategic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student E</td>
<td>Initial</td>
<td>Initial</td>
<td>Strategic</td>
<td>Strategic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student F</td>
<td>Strategic *</td>
<td>Strategic</td>
<td>Initial</td>
<td>Initial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student G</td>
<td>Initial</td>
<td>Strategic</td>
<td>Initial</td>
<td>初始Strategic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student H</td>
<td>Initial</td>
<td>Strategic</td>
<td>Strategic</td>
<td>Strategic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student I</td>
<td>Initial</td>
<td>Removed</td>
<td>Removed</td>
<td>Removed</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>Strategic</td>
<td>Strategic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student N</td>
<td>Strategic</td>
<td>Initial</td>
<td>Initial</td>
<td>Initial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student O</td>
<td>Initial</td>
<td>Initial</td>
<td>Initial</td>
<td>Initial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student P</td>
<td>Initial</td>
<td>Initial</td>
<td>Initial</td>
<td>Initial</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.
District Example

Reading - Curriculum Based Measurement
Grade 3: 2010-2011 School Year

Note: Unscored also includes any students who may have been transferred.
SWIS Data: Elementary Example

Average Referrals Per Day Per Month, 2011-12

[Bar chart showing average referrals per day per month from August 2011 to July 2012. The chart indicates a peak in referrals during November.]
XXX High School

ODR Progress and Goal

More than 2100 Hours (351 Days) of Instructional Time Recouped during 2009-2010 School Year
School is on-track to meet 2010-2011 Goal
School is not currently on-track to meet absenteeism goal and is in the process of revising the intervention plan.
School has added 1 hour to the school day to provide tiered intervention services for Algebra 1 and English 1
TIER II: Supplemental, Targeted

Tier II
For approx. 20% of students
Core
+
Supplemental

...to achieve benchmarks
Tier II Effective if at least 70-80% of students improve performance (i.e., gap is closing towards benchmark and/or progress monitoring standards).

1. Where are the students performing now?
2. Where do we want them to be?
3. How long do we have to get them there?
4. How much do they have to grow per year/monthly to get there?
5. What resources will move them at that rate?
Critical Questions/Issues
Tier 2

• Purpose and expectation of Tier 2 services should be explicit and understood by providers:
  – Increase performance of students relative to Tier 1 standards
  – Link curriculum content and strategies with Tier 1
  – Assess against Tier 1 expectations
  – 70% of students receiving Tier 2 should attain proficiency.
Tier II

• **Focus of School-based Intervention Team**
  – Identifying students needing targeted interventions
  – Developing/Implementing interventions that address student needs

• **Interventions**
  – small group
  – targeted group interventions
# 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></td>
<td>Music 5013000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Music 5013000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Literacy 5010050</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Literacy 5010050</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Guidance 5022000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Guidance 5022000</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></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5010010</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Minutes: 375
Total Instructional Minutes: 345

* = Sheltered
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
Referrals by Behavior

Custom Graph - Referrals By Problem Behavior

Number of Referrals

M-Other, M-Tardy, M-Tech, M-Dress, M-Prpt Misuse, M-Disruption, M-Disrupt, M-Contact, M-Inapp Len, Minor, Unknown behav, Weapons, Arson, Bomb, Vandal, Combust, Drugs, Alcohol, Tobacco, Out bounds, Inapp affection, Tech, Dress, Theft, Prop dam, Skip, Tardy, Lying, Harass, Inapp Len, Disrespt, Other behav, Disruption, Agg/Fight
TIER III:

Intensive, Individualized

Tier III
For Approx 5% of Students

Core

+

Supplemental

+

Intensive Individual Instruction
...to achieve benchmarks

1. Where is the student performing now?
2. Where do we want him to be?
3. How long do we have to get him there?
4. What supports has he received?
5. What resources will move him at that rate?

Tier III Effective if there is progress (i.e., gap closing) towards benchmark and/or progress monitoring goals.
Tier III

• **Focus of School-based Intervention Team**
  – *Identify individual academic and behavioral issues through data analysis*
  – *Develop intensive individual interventions & supports*
  – *Ensure that these interventions and supports are linked to core instruction*
  – *Assess integrity and intensity of interventions*
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
Good RtI
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 = 0.95 words/week
Tier I (Universal) and Tier II (Supplemental) Interventions

Victor D. 7

- Grade-Level Social Skill Training
- Grade-Level Social Skill Training + Supplemental Group
- Grade-Level Social Skill Training + Supplemental Group + Self-Monitoring

Baseline

% Compliance

Jan
Feb
Mar
Apr
May

50%  58%  62%  86%
42%  53%  71%
33%  66%
27%

(+5%)  (+29%)  (+1%)
(-7%)  (+2%)
(-25%)

Rate of change to make benchmark in 18 weeks is +3% a week

= Peer Group
= Target Student
= Aimline
= Trendline

*Rate of change required each week for target student to reach benchmark is (+3%)
Validity of Special Education Classification

• Conclusion of the National Research Council’s investigation on the accuracy of special education eligibility and outcomes

• Evaluated on the basis of three criteria:
  
  – the quality of the general education program
  
  – the value of the special education program in producing important outcomes for students
  
  – the accuracy and meaningfulness of the assessment process in the identification of a disability

Heller, Holtzman, & Messick, 1982
Integrating the Tiers
Instructional Integration

• Focus of Tiers 2 and 3 is specialized instructional strategies, time and focus of instruction
• Application of instructional strategies should include application to core instructional materials and content
• Single intervention plan with focus, activities and content contributed by each provider
• Agreement on progress monitoring level and content (Should be Tier 1)
Reflection #3

• What resources exist at your school, district, regional or state level to facilitate the implementation of an integrated MTSS model?

• What obstacles exist as barriers to implementation at your level?
Data-Based Problem-Solving Process
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
Data Review

- Regularly scheduled “data days” at the district and school levels
- Health and Wellness reviews
- 3-4 times/year
- Grade level aggregates to school
- School level aggregates to district
- Principal meets with school-based staff
- District meets with principals
- “What is inspected is respected”
Intervention Sufficiency

Intervention Support

• Sufficiency is equated with time

• Intervention support addresses the implementation integrity issues

• How do you document sufficiency?
• How do you facilitate integrity?
Implementation Data

• Data collected to measure the level of implementation of the critical elements
  – SAPSI
  – BOQ

• Implementation data used to inform building-level supports

• Implementation data related to student and staff outcomes

• Implementation data is part of the principal’s annual performance evaluation
Professional Development:
Core Skill Areas for ALL Staff

• *Data-Based Decision Making Process*
• *Coaching/Consultation*
• Problem-Solving Process
• Data Collection and Management
• Instruction/Intervention Development, Support and Evaluation
• Intervention Fidelity
• Staff Training
• Effective Interpersonal Skills
Aligning the Elements Across Academic and Behavior Areas
Alignment

• Academic
  – District Structure
  – School Structure
  – Multi-tiered System
  – Data-Based Problem Solving
  – Data Review
  – Intervention Sufficiency and Support
  – Implementation Data
  – Professional Development

• Behavior
  – District Structure
  – School Structure
  – Multi-tiered System
  – Data-Based Problem Solving
  – Data Review
  – Intervention Sufficiency and Support
  – Implementation Data
  – Professional Development
Reflection #4

• Briefly look at each of the areas of alignment and indicate the degree to which your school, district or state has “functional” alignment for each of the areas.

To what degree are each of these areas truly “interchangeable” across the academic and behavior problem-solving domains?????
Data-Based Problem-Solving
4- and 8- Step Processes
Problem-Solving is the Engine That Drives Instruction and Intervention

It is the MOST Critical Skill A Leader Can Possess
Engage in expert problem solving

- Identify the correct problem efficiently and effectively
- Engage in good problem analysis with an understanding that there are many causes for school underperformance
- Know that there are several identified strategies for school improvement & apply appropriate strategies based upon school-specific needs
- Evaluate the effectiveness of implemented strategies
Problem-Solving Processes

• 4- Step
  – Student focus, Tiers 1, 2 and/or 3

• 8- Step
  – Solving System-Level Problems
Problem Solving Process

Define the Problem
Defining Problem/Directly Measuring Behavior

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

Implement Plan
Implement As Intended
Progress Monitor
Modify as Necessary

Evaluate
Response to Intervention (RtI)
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
REPLACEMENT BEHAVIORS

• State your goal and/or desired behaviors
  – Academics
    • State approved grade-level benchmarks
    • Desired engagement behaviors
  – Entire school (e.g., % students at proficiency)
  – Groups of students (e.g., reading fluency)
  – Individual students (e.g., improve compliance).
• Behavior should reflect competencies to improve adaptation
• Behavior must be measurable, observable or reportable
REPLACEMENT BEHAVIORS

• 90% of the students in first grade will demonstrate reading fluency at district benchmarks by January 15th of each year.

• School-wide Office Discipline Referrals (ODRs) will be at or below the ________ level monthly.

• 75% of ELL students receiving Tier 2 services will achieve district level benchmarks in fluency.
Data Required for Problem Identification

- Replacement Behavior
- Current Level of Functioning
- Benchmark/Desired Level
- Peer Performance
- GAP Analysis
Determining the Focus of the Instruction/Intervention: Multi-Tier Context
Problem ID Review

- Peers
- Benchmark
- Student(s)
Problem ID Review

Benchmark

Peers

Student(s)
TIER I: Core, Universal Academic and Behavior

GOAL: 100% of students achieve at high levels

Tier I: Implementing well researched programs and practices demonstrated to produce good outcomes for the majority of students.

Tier I: Effective if at least 80% are meeting benchmarks with access to Core/Universal Instruction.

Tier I: Begins with clear goals:
1. What exactly do we expect all students to learn?
2. How will we know if and when they’ve learned it?
3. How you we respond when some students don’t learn?
4. How will we respond when some students have already learned?

Questions 1 and 2 help us ensure a guaranteed and viable core curriculum.
Tier 1 Data Analysis-Building Level: Step 1

• Identify the number and names of students who are in core instruction 100% of the time.
• Identify the number and names of students who receive supplemental instruction.
• Identify the number and names of students who receive intensive instruction.
• Calculate the % of students who receive only Tier 1, core instruction.
  – Is this at, above or below 80%?
• Same for Tiers 2 and 3?
  – What does the distribution look like? A triangle, a rectangle?
Tier 1 Data Analysis-Building Level: Step 2

- What % of Tier 1 students made proficiency?
- What % of Tier 2 students made proficiency?
- What % of Tier 3 students made proficiency?
- What was the overall % of students who made proficiency?
- Calculate by disaggregated groups.
Tier 1 Data Analysis-Building Level: Step 4

• Are you happy with:
  – % of students in core who are proficient?
  – Same for each of the other Tiers.

• % of students in the three Tiers?

• Given that the national increase in % of students who move to proficiency is about 7%, how are you doing with the rate over the past years and what does this information mean to you for the next 5 years?
  – In 2014, 95% of students should be proficient
Problem Identification: SUMMARY

- Data drive the PI step, reduce bias
- Data:
  - Current level (Baseline for RtI)
  - Benchmark level (Needed to determine rate of progress required)
  - Peer level (Needed to determine Tier 1 or 2 intervention protocol)
  - GAP (Needed to determine scope of work to be done and length of time required to do it)
Problem Analysis
Steps in the Problem-Solving Process: Problem Identification

2. PROBLEM ANALYSIS

- Develop hypotheses
- Develop predictions/assessment
Steps in Problem Analysis

• Fact Finding
• Generate ideas about possible causes (hypotheses)
• Sort out which possible causes seem most viable and which don’t (validation)
• Link the things we’ve learned to intervention
Assessment Procedures
that are used:

R: Review
I: Interview
O: Observe
T: Test

Assessment Domains
are not limited to the student:

I: Instruction
C: Curriculum
E: Environment
L: Learner
Content Of Assessment Domains

**INSTRUCTION**

- instructional decision-making regarding selection and use of materials
- instructional decision-making regarding placement of students in materials
- clarity of instructions
- communication of expectations and criteria for success
- direct instruction with explanations and criteria for success
- sequencing of lessons designs to promote success
- variety of practice activities
Content Of Assessment Domains

**CURRICULUM**

- long range direction for instruction
- instructional materials
- intent
- arrangement of the content/instruction
- pace of the steps leading to the outcomes
- stated outcomes for the course of study
- general learner criteria as identified in the school improvement plan and state benchmarks
Content of Assessment Domains

**ENVIRONMENT**

- physical arrangement of the room
- furniture/equipment
- clear classroom expectations
- management plans
- peer interaction
- task pressure
Content Of Assessment Domains

**LEARNER**

- This addresses student performance.

- The purpose in looking at the learner is to find the discrepancy between setting demands (instructions, curriculum, and the environment) and the student performance.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DOMAINS</th>
<th>R Review</th>
<th>I Interview</th>
<th>O Observe</th>
<th>T Test</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I Instruction</td>
<td>Permanent products, e.g., written pieces, tests, worksheets projects</td>
<td>Teachers' thoughts about their use of effective teaching and evaluation practices, e.g., checklists</td>
<td>Effective teaching practices, teacher expectations, antecedent conditions, consequences</td>
<td>Classroom environment scales, checklists and questionnaires; Student opinions about instruction and teacher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C Curriculum</td>
<td>Permanent products, e.g., books, worksheets, materials, curriculum guides, scope &amp; sequence</td>
<td>Teacher &amp; relevant personnel regarding philosophy (e.g., generative vs. supplantive), district implementation and expectations</td>
<td>Classroom work, alignment of assignments (curriculum materials) with goals and objectives (curriculum). Alignment of teacher talk with curriculum</td>
<td>Level of assignment and curriculum material difficulty; Opportunity to learn; A student's opinions about what is taught</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E Environment</td>
<td>School rules and policies.</td>
<td>Ask relevant personnel, students &amp; parents about behavior management plans, class rules, class routines</td>
<td>Student, peers, and instruction; Interactions and causal relationships; Distractions and health/safety violations</td>
<td>Classroom environment scales, checklists and questionnaires; Student opinions about instruction, peers, and teacher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L Learner</td>
<td>District records, health records, error analysis, Records for: educational history, onset &amp; duration of problem, teacher perceptions of the problem, pattern of behavior problems, etc.</td>
<td>Relevant personnel, parents, peers &amp; students (what do they think they are supposed to do; how do they perceive the problem?)</td>
<td>Target behaviors – dimensions and nature of the problem</td>
<td>Student performance; find the discrepancy between setting demands (instruction, curriculum, environment) and student performance</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Hypothesis / Prediction Statement

The desired behavior is not occurring because
__________________________________________________

If __________________ would occur, the desired behavior would occur.
Intervention Development

• Criteria for “Appropriate” and “Effective” Interventions:
  – Evidence-based
    • Type of Problem
    • Population
    • Setting
    • Levels of Support
Intervention Development

• Verified Hypothesis
  – Students who have attendance/tardy issues are performing significantly lower than students who attend regularly and are seldom tardy.

  – Intervention?
Intervention Development

• Verified Hypothesis
  – Students who are completing less than 75% of their work are progressing below benchmark expectations and receive \( \frac{1}{2} \) of the teacher feedback as students completing 75% or more of their work.

  – Intervention?
Intervention Format

- Step 3: Intervention Development
  
  Plan:
  - Resources
  
  Obstacles
  
  Integration with Tier 1
  
  Who:
  
  Timeline:
  
  Documentation:
Reflection #5

• How consistently do your problem-solving teams integrate both the academic skill and the behavior engagement hypotheses?

• Or, do they consider them, but separately?
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 Fidelity Strategies

• Tier 1
  – Walkthroughs assessing presence/absence of effective instructional strategies

• Tier 2/3
  – Intervention Support Practices
Intervention Support Meeting Activities

• Review student performance data

• Identify barriers to successful implementation of the instruction/intervention
  – Problem-solve barriers

• Review critical components of the instruction/intervention
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

• 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>
<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**

- **T** = Time (number of minutes)
- **P** = Program
- **F** = Focus

**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)

__________________________
__________________________
__________________________
__________________________
__________________________
__________________________
__________________________
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race/Ethnicity</th>
<th>Number of Students</th>
<th>Number Referred for Intervention</th>
<th>Number Referred for Evaluation</th>
<th>Intervention Effectiveness</th>
<th>Risk of Intervention</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>430</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>13.95%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>19.20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>4.76%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiracial</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>#DIV/0!</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian/Pacific Islander</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>#DIV/0!</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian/Alaskan Native</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>#DIV/0!</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>890</strong></td>
<td><strong>118</strong></td>
<td><strong>52</strong></td>
<td><strong>56%</strong></td>
<td><strong>13.26%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**District/School:**
Reflection #6

• What methods do you use to document instructional/intervention integrity?

• What methods do you use to document sufficiency?

• What methods do you use to evaluate intervention effectiveness across demographics of students?
8-Step Process

1. Set a goal and identify how you will measure that goal.
2. Identify Resources and Obstacles to attaining that goal.
3. Prioritize the Obstacles
4. Identify strategies to Eliminate or Reduce the obstacle
5. Develop Action Plan to implement strategies
6. Develop Follow-Up Plan
7. Evaluate impact of the action plan
8. Evaluate progress on Original Goal
District Action Planning Process

• Collaboration of PSRtI, FLPBS and DA staff
  – 2-4 person district teams

• Protocol for DAPP Process
  – Organizing/preparing for DAPP
  – Step 1: Needs Assessment
  – Step 2: Action Planning – 8-Step Group problem-solving used
  – Step 3: Delivery of Training and TA
  – Step 4: Evaluation
8-Step Problem-Solving Process: Problem ID

- The District will modify its organizational structure to support the implementation of MTSS

- Teaching “lessons” will include both evidence-based instructional strategies AND direct instruction/assessment of student engagement behaviors necessary for the lesson

- School-based problem-solving teams will identify BOTH desired academic goals AND engagement behaviors necessary to achieve the goal at ALL problem-solving meetings
Step 1: Desired Goal and Measurement Method

• School-based problem-solving teams will identify BOTH desired academic goals AND engagement behaviors necessary to achieve the goal at ALL problem-solving meetings
Step 2/3: Resources and Obstacles

• Resources
  – Data?

• Obstacles
  – Data

• Prioritize the Obstacles
Step 4: Reduce/Eliminate Obstacle

• What are possible strategies to reduce or eliminate the obstacle?

• What evidence do you have for your strategies?

• Select a strategy or strategies
Step 5/6:
Develop an Action Plan

• What will be done?

• Who will be responsible?

• Timelines?

• Resources?

• Who will follow-up and support?
Step 7: Evaluate the Plan

• Was the obstacle reduced or eliminated?

• What do the data say?

• What do the stakeholders say?
Step 8: Evaluate the Impact on the Original Goal

• What do the data say?

• Are teams now integrating A and B into all problem-solving meetings?

• How do we problem-solve variability in the data?
Facilitating Systems Change
Every system is perfectly aligned for the results it gets.
Why have past initiatives failed?

- Failure to achieve CONSENSUS
- School culture is ignored
- Purpose unclear
- Lack of ongoing communication
- Unrealistic expectations of initial success
- Failure to measure and analyze progress
- Participants not involved in planning
- Participants lack skills and lack support for the implementation of new skills
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)
Sustainable Scaling-Up

Framework for Change

**Consensus Building throughout the Phases**
Stages of Implementing Problem Solving/RtI

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

• Infrastructure Development
  – Regulations
  – Training/Technical Assistance
  – Model (e.g., Standard Protocol)
  – Tier I and II intervention systems
    • e.g., K-3 Academic Support Plan
  – Data Systems and Management
  – Technology support
  – Decision-making criteria established
  – Schedules

• Implementation
The Process of Systems Change

• Until, and unless, **Consensus** (understanding the need and trusting in the support) is reached no support will exist to establish the **Infrastructure**. Until, and unless, the **Infrastructure** is in place **Implementation** will not take place.

• A fatal error is to attempt **Implementation** without **Consensus** and **Infrastructure**

• Leadership must come from all levels
Efficient Delivery of Highly Effective Practices

• Statewide District Needs Assessment Results:
  – Focus Resource Development and District Resources On:
    – Evidence-based Coaching Strategies
    – Leadership Skills to Support MTSSS
    – Family and Community Engagement
    – Aligning K-12 MTSSS-Focus on Secondary
    – Evaluation Models to Demonstrate Outcomes
    – Common Language/Common Understanding Around an Integrated Data-Based Problem-Solving Process
    – Integrating Technology and Universal Design for Learning
Mission and Vision

Multi-Tiered System of Student Supports - Inter-Project Collaborative

The collaborative vision of the Florida Problem-Solving/Response to Intervention (FL PS/RtI) and the Florida Positive Behavior Support/Response to Intervention for Behavior (FLPBS/RtI:B) Projects is to:

• Enhance the capacity of all Florida school districts to successfully implement and sustain a multi-tiered system of student supports with fidelity in every school;

• Accelerate and maximize student academic and social-emotional outcomes through the application of data-based problem solving utilized by effective leadership at all levels of the educational system;

• Inform the development, implementation, and ongoing evaluation of an integrated, aligned, and sustainable system of service delivery that prepares all students for post-secondary education and/or successful employment within our global society.
Translating Mission to Motion

• Created Leadership Team – Leadership Team became STT in function
• Created workgroups to develop vision and resources:
  – Leadership
  – Coaching
  – DBPS
  – Evaluation
  – Secondary
  – Family and Community Engagement
  – Sub Leadership team – protocol and logistics
  – Technology?
What do we know about implementation rates of MTSS?
District Infrastructure

• A District Plan that includes:
  – Consensus, Infrastructure, Implementation
  – Alignment of District Policies
  – On-going Professional Development and Technical Assistance
  – Implementation Monitoring
  – Implementation Fidelity
  – Evaluation Plan
Capacity to Implement MTSS

District Level
Self-Assessment of Problem Solving Implementation (SAPSI)
Infrastructure Development: Data Utilization

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Year 1_BOY</th>
<th>Year 1_EOY</th>
<th>Year 2_EOY</th>
<th>Year 3_EOY</th>
<th>Year 4_EOY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6. Data is collected</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Data used to make decisions</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Data presented to staff</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Data used to evaluate core acad programs</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Data used to evaluate core beh programs</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. CBM data used to ID students needing acad interventions</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. ODR data used to ID students needing beh interventions</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Data used to evaluate Tier 2 interventions</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Data used to determine Tier 3 RtI</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

• Achieved when a group of individuals with a common goal agree to support activities necessary to achieve that goal even if that agreement flies in the face of the wishes of individual members of the group.

• Facilitated when leadership is strong.
Problem-Solving Process and Development of Consensus

• **Problem Identification** -
  – Achieve Consensus with Building/District Personnel
  – Current Level of Performance
  – Desired Performance
  – Gap Analysis

• **Problem Analysis** - Why Are We Unable to Achieve Consensus?
  – Understand Need, Have Skills (Joyce/Showers)

• **Develop and Implement a Plan**

• **Evaluate the Plan**
Critical Elements of Consensus Building

• **Shared Beliefs**
  – What do we believe about students and how they are best served?
  – Are the beliefs aligned—or not—with the RtI model?
  – Are beliefs a resource, an obstacle or BOTH?

• **Understanding of Current Practices and Skills**
  – What are we currently doing and does this align with our beliefs?
  – Do the practices of this model align with beliefs?
  – Are we currently doing things that result in good outcomes for students?
  – Do we have the skills to do this or will we be able to get them AND the support (PD)?

• **Common Understanding of Need**
  – Are we happy with our student outcome data?

(Joyce and Showers)
Consensus Building: Beliefs

• 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.

• Students who are at-risk (ELL, SWD, F/RL, Behavior, Cultural Diversity) can achieve proficiency
Evaluating Consensus Development
Measuring Consensus

• Florida PS/RtI Project Tools
  – Beliefs Survey
  – Perception of Practices Survey
  – Perception of Skills
  – Self Assessment of Problem-Solving Implementation (SAPSI): Consensus Section

  – Florida PS/RtI Technical Manual
Beliefs Survey

• Assess educator beliefs related to PS/RtI
  – Strongly Agree to Strongly Disagree

• 27 items, Likert Scale format

• 3 Factors:
  – SWD Achieve Benchmarks
  – Data-Based Decision Making
  – Core & Supplemental Instruction
9a. Most LD students achieve reading benchmarks
9b. Most LD students achieve math benchmarks
10a. Most EBD students achieve reading benchmarks
10b. Most EBD students achieve math benchmarks
11a. Students receiving SPED services are capable of achieving reading benchmarks
11b. Students receiving SPED services are capable of achieving math benchmarks

All Project Beliefs Survey Item Response Data
Factor One (Student Academic Ability)
Perception of Practices Survey

- Assess educator perception of practices related to PS/RtI
- 18 items, Likert Scale format
  - Never Occurred to Always Occurred (with Don’t Know option)
- 2 Factors:
  - Academic Practices
  - Behavior Practices
Perception of RtI Skills Survey

• Assesses educator perception of skills related to PS/RtI
  – Range from Not Having Skill to Very Highly Skilled
• 21 items, Likert Scale format
• 3 Factors
SBLT Perceptions of RtI Skills Survey Item Response Data
Factor Three (Data manipulation skills)

Percentage of Total Responses

Constituent Item / Overall Factor

14a. Graph target student data
14b. Graph benchmark data
14c. Graph peer data
14d. Draw an aimline
14e. Draw a trendline
15. Interpret graphed PM data to determine student RtI
19. Disaggregate data by various demographic factors
20a. Access intervention resources via the Internet
20b. Use PDAs to collect data
20c. Use the SWIS for PBS
20d. Use the SWIS for PBS
20e. Graph and display student and school data
21. Facilitate a Problem Solving Team meeting

Legend:
- Orange: Very Highly Skilled
- Red: Highly Skilled
- Green: Some Support Necessary
- Purple: Minimal Skills
- Light Blue: No Skill at all
SAPSI: Consensus Section

- Needs assessment & progress monitoring tool evaluating Consensus, Infrastructure, & Implementation of PS/RtI

- 5 Consensus Items, ranging from Not Started to Maintaining
Strategies to Facilitate Consensus

• Ensure that a “structure” exists to facilitate consensus development
  – Professional Learning Communities (PLCs)
• Presentation and discussion of disaggregated student data for the school
• Opportunities to discuss beliefs and practices
Developing Infrastructure: Decision Rules

- Decision rules regarding students’ RtI must be established
- Criteria for positive and negative response to intervention must be established and must be consistent across schools in a district
- What constitutes Positive, Questionable, and Poor RtI
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
**Questionable Response to Intervention**

- **Performance**
- **Expected Trajectory**
- **Observed Trajectory**
Poor Response to Intervention

Performance

Expected Trajectory

Observed Trajectory

Time
Response to Intervention

Performance vs Time

- Expected Trajectory
- Observed Trajectory
- Positive
- Questionable
- Poor

Performance trajectory is compared to expected trajectory over time, indicating positive, questionable, or poor outcomes.
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)
Evaluating Infrastructure Development
Measuring Infrastructure Development

• Florida PS/RtI Project Tools
  – Self Assessment of Problem-Solving Implementation (SAPSI): Infrastructure Section

• Florida PBS Project Tools
  – Benchmarks of Quality (BOQ)
SAPSI: Infrastructure Section

- Needs assessment & progress monitoring tool evaluating Consensus, Infrastructure, & Implementation of PS/RtI
- 18 Infrastructure Items
  - Range from Not Started to Maintaining
- Completed by SBLT 2 times per year
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 RtI

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

Status

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

Fall 07
Spr 08
Win 09
Spr 09

Item
Professional Development: Pedagogy

- Direct Instruction
- Modeling
- Practice
- Feedback
- Application
- Technical Assistance
Training Sequence

1. Train Trainers
2. Train Coaches and Principals
3. Train District Personnel
4. Train SBLTs
   – SBLT’s train school staff
5. Data Infrastructure
   – Assessment Tools
   – Technology for Analysis of Data (e.g. Survey Monkey)
# Problem Solving - Response to Instruction/Intervention Training Outline

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Day 1</th>
<th>Year One</th>
<th>Year Two</th>
<th>Year Three</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Curriculum</strong></td>
<td>Change Model - Consensus, Infrastructure, Implementation</td>
<td>Review of Year 1 Training</td>
<td>Problem Solving</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Big ideas of Problem Solving</td>
<td>Focus on Tier One</td>
<td>Case Study Example</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Four Problem Solving Steps – Overview</td>
<td>Four Problem Solving Step</td>
<td>Tier Three Problem Identification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Problem Identification</td>
<td>State RtI Plan</td>
<td>T1, T2, T3 data source</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Problem Analysis</td>
<td>National RtI Data</td>
<td>Linking the Tiers in context</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Intervention Design/Implementation</td>
<td>Review Data from Year One</td>
<td>Using Tier Two data to determine effectiveness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Response to Instruction/Interventions</td>
<td>SAPSI Data</td>
<td>of Tier Two and appropriateness of Tier Three intervention</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Three Tiered Model of Service Delivery</td>
<td>Survey Data</td>
<td>T3 Problem Analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Law – NCLB, IDEA, Florida Rule/Statute</td>
<td>Skill Assessment Data</td>
<td>Hypothesis Generation, Validation, Prediction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Formation, Function and Purpose of Problem Solving Teams</td>
<td>Strategies for Consensus</td>
<td>Statements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Data Collection</strong></td>
<td>Beliefs Survey</td>
<td>Roles for Team Members</td>
<td>Worksheet - Problem Identification, Problem Analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Perception of Practices</td>
<td>Data Collection</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>School Personnel Satisfaction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Data Collection</strong></td>
<td>Perception of Skills</td>
<td>Perception of Practices</td>
<td>School Blueprint - Consensus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Beliefs Survey</td>
<td>School Personnel Satisfaction</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Skill Assessment</td>
<td>Skill Assessment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Training Evaluation</td>
<td>Training Evaluation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Data Collection</strong></td>
<td>Perception of Skills</td>
<td>Skill Assessment</td>
<td>Technical Assistance Session (s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Beliefs Survey</td>
<td>Training Evaluation</td>
<td>Technical Assistance Session (s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Skill Assessment</td>
<td>Training Evaluation</td>
<td>Technical Assistance Session (s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gap Analysis</td>
<td>Data Collection</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Data Collection</strong></td>
<td>Tier One Data Sources</td>
<td>Data Feedback Activity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Academic, Behavioral</td>
<td>Examples: Tier 1 Data Indicating Tier 2 Needs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Replacement Behaviors</td>
<td>Tier 2 Defined &amp; Characterized</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Current Performance</td>
<td>Standard Treatment Protocol</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Benchmark Performance</td>
<td>Strategies for Identifying Tier 2/Standard Protocol Needs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Peer Performance</td>
<td>Tier 2 and the K-12 Reading Plan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gap Analysis</td>
<td>Decision Making at Tier 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Data Collection</strong></td>
<td>Tier One Data Sources</td>
<td>Data Collection</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Academic, Behavioral</td>
<td>Data Feedback Activity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Replacement Behaviors</td>
<td>Examples: Tier 1 Data Indicating Tier 2 Needs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Current Performance</td>
<td>Tier 2 Defined &amp; Characterized</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Benchmark Performance</td>
<td>Standard Treatment Protocol</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Peer Performance</td>
<td>Strategies for Identifying Tier 2/Standard Protocol Needs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gap Analysis</td>
<td>Tier 2 and the K-12 Reading Plan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Data Collection</strong></td>
<td>Tier One Data Sources</td>
<td>Data Collection</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Academic, Behavioral</td>
<td>Data Feedback Activity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Replacement Behaviors</td>
<td>Examples: Tier 1 Data Indicating Tier 2 Needs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Current Performance</td>
<td>Tier 2 Defined &amp; Characterized</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Benchmark Performance</td>
<td>Standard Treatment Protocol</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Peer Performance</td>
<td>Strategies for Identifying Tier 2/Standard Protocol Needs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gap Analysis</td>
<td>Tier 2 and the K-12 Reading Plan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Day 3</td>
<td><strong>Curriculum</strong></td>
<td><strong>Curriculum</strong></td>
<td><strong>Curriculum</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step II – Problem Analysis</td>
<td>Data Feedback Activity</td>
<td>Intervention Evaluation Protocol</td>
<td>Case Study Review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data Feedback Activity</td>
<td>Review: Problem Identification</td>
<td>Resource Maps</td>
<td>Review Y3D2 Content Briefly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Big Ideas/Concepts of Problem Analysis</td>
<td>Intervention Evaluation Plan</td>
<td>Goal Setting</td>
<td>Skill Assessment Performance Review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hypothesis/Prediction Statement</td>
<td>Resource Mapping Activity</td>
<td>Intervention Integrity</td>
<td>Tier Three Intervention Design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment &amp; Hypothesis Validation</td>
<td>Intervention Integrity Types</td>
<td>Examination of Integrity measures currently used to assess Tier Three</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Examples of Hypothesis Generation and Evaluation</td>
<td>Barriers</td>
<td>Tier Three RtI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Data Collection</strong></td>
<td>Improving</td>
<td>Progress Monitoring</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skill Assessment</td>
<td>Assessing</td>
<td>Arrangements (frequency, data source, who, etc.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training Evaluation</td>
<td><strong>Data Collection</strong></td>
<td>Content specific measures</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skill Assessment</td>
<td><strong>Data Collection</strong></td>
<td>Decision Rules</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training Evaluation</td>
<td>Action when RtI is Positive, Questionable, Poor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Movement among Tiers relative to student need</td>
<td>Complete Comp. Intervention Plan with supporting</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Resource Map &amp; Schedule</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SLD TAP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>School Blueprint - Implementation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Collect School Blueprint – Infrastructure</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Data Collection</strong></td>
<td>School Personnel Satisfaction Survey</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Perceptions of Practices</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Skill Assessment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Training Evaluation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Technical Assistance Session(s) | Technical Assistance Session(s) | Technical Assistance Session(s) |
| Day 4 | Curriculum |  | Curriculum |  | Curriculum |
|-------|------------|  |------------|  |------------|
|       | Step III – Intervention Design and Implementation |  | Data Feedback Activity |  | Review Y3D3 Content |
|       |  |  | State Board of Education Rules |  | Skill Assessment Performance Review |
|       |  |  | 6A-6.0331 – General Education Intervention |  | Case Study – Eligibility decisions |
|       |  |  | 6A-6.03018 – SLD |  | SLD Eligibility |
|       |  |  | 6A-6.03017 – EBD |  | Collect School Blueprint - Implementation |
|       |  |  | Procedural Safeguards |  | Data Collection |
|       |  |  | Effectiveness of Tier One |  | Beliefs Survey |
|       |  |  | Effectiveness of Tier Two |  | Perception of Skills |
|       |  |  | Tier Three Decisions |  | Skill Assessment |
|       |  |  |  |  | Training Evaluation |
|       | Data Collection |  | Data Collection |  |  |
|       | Skill Assessment |  | Beliefs Survey |  |  |
|       | Training Evaluation |  | Perception of Skills |  |  |
|       |  |  | Skill Assessment |  |  |
|       |  |  | Training Evaluation |  |  |
| Technical Assistance Session (s) |  |  |  |  |  |

| Day 5 | Curriculum |  | Curriculum |  |  |
|-------|------------|  |------------|  |  |
|       | Step IV – Response to Intervention |  |  |  |  |
|       |  |  | Rationale for Progress Monitoring |  |  |
|       |  |  | Graphing |  |  |
|       |  |  | Goal Setting |  |  |
|       |  |  | Interpreting Graphs |  |  |
|       |  |  | Decision Making |  |  |
|       |  |  | Positive Response to Instruction/Intervention |  |  |
|       |  |  | Questionable Response to Instruction/Intervention |  |  |
|       |  |  | Poor Response to Instruction/Intervention |  |  |
|       |  |  | Review of Problem-Solving Steps |  |  |
|       | Data Collection |  |  |  |  |
|       | Beliefs Survey |  |  |  |  |
|       | Perception of Skills |  |  |  |  |
|       | Skill Assessment |  |  |  |  |
|       | Training Evaluation |  |  |  |  |
Evaluating the Implementation of Professional Development
Program Evaluation Methods

1. Skill Assessments During Training
   - Direct Assessments

2. Skill Assessments During Application
   - Observations

3. Permanent Products
   - Review

4. Implementation
   - Self Reports
Assessment of Skills During Training
Skill Assessments

• Skill Assessments During Training

• Perception of Skills
  – Self-Evaluation of RtI Skills

• Perception of Practices
  – Self-Evaluation of RtI Practices in their building
Skill Assessment

• Use the 5 steps of problem identification to make a Tier I decision for Victor.
  – What is the desired replacement behavior?
  – What is the student’s current level of performance?
  – What is the expected level of performance?
  – What is the peer level of performance?
  – Gap Analysis
    • What is the gap between the expected level and the student?
    • What is the gap between the peer level and the student?
    • What is the gap between expected level and peer level?
  – Based on the observation data and the ODR data, would you support a Tier 1 or Tier 2 intervention? Justify your answer with appropriate data.
Results of Skill Assessments

School Based Leadership Team Skill Assessment Performance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Problem Solving Domain</th>
<th>Percent of Points Possible</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Problem Identification</td>
<td>85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Problem Analysis</td>
<td>93%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intervention Development &amp; Implementation</td>
<td>76%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Evaluation/RtI</td>
<td>88%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Results of Skill Assessments

School Based Leadership Team Members Application of Problem Identification Steps to a Novel Situation

- Identifying New Problem Skill Area: 80%
- Engaging in 4 Steps of Problem Identification: 35%

Novel Situation
Assessment of Skills During Application
Assessing Fidelity

• **Purpose**
  – To determine if the critical components of the RtI Process (Problem ID, Analysis, Intervention (fidelity) and Response to Intervention) are visible in both Process AND Product
  – To determine if the focus of the PD is actually occurring in the behavior of the staff and the products for the students

• **Critical Elements**
  – Steps in the PS/RtI Process

• **Methods**
  – Critical Components Checklist
Critical Components Checklist

Component
1 = Present  2 = Partially Present  3 = Absent

Problem Identification
One or more replacement behaviors were identified
1  2  3
Data describing current and expected levels of performance collected
1  2  3
A gap analysis was conducted to determine the appropriate tier of intervention
1  2  3

Problem Analysis
Hypotheses were developed across multiple domains
1  2  3
Hypotheses were developed to determine if the student was not performing the replacement behavior because of a performance and/or skill deficit
1  2  3
Data were used to determine viable or active hypotheses for why the replacement behavior was not occurring
1  2  3
## CCC Demonstration District: Year 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1a</td>
<td>Data to determine effectiveness of core instruction - modifications made to core instruction - decision regarding student RtI was defined or modified or modified, or Plan for continuing, modifying, or discontinued</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>

- Data to determine effectiveness of core instruction
- Team hypotheses to identify reasons for student not making progress
- Universal screening or other data used to determine effectiveness
- Data used to determine decisions made to modify core or supplemental instruction
- Modifications made to core instruction
- Modifications made to supplemental instruction
- Criteria for positive progress monitoring data
- Decision regarding student RtI was defined or modified or modified, or Plan for continuing, modifying, or discontinued

Score range: 0.00 to 2.00
CCC Demonstration District: Year 2

Data to determine effectiveness of core instruction or other interventions used

- Modifications made to core instruction
- Data used to determine
- Team hypotheses to identify reasons for
- Universal screenings or other data used
- Modifications made to core instruction
- Modifying or other interventions
- Criteria for positive RtI were defined
- Progress monitoring data
- Decision regarding student RtI was
- Plan for continuing, modifying, or
### CCC Demonstration District: Year 3

#### Data to determine effectiveness of

- Decisions made to modify core or Universal screening or other data used
- Team hypotheses to identify reasons for
- Data used to determine
- Modifications made to core instruction -
- Modifications made to core instruction -
- Supp. instruction developed or
- Supp. instruction developed or
- Criteria for positive RtI were defined
- Progress monitoring data
- Decision regarding student RtI was
- Plan for contin, modifying, or

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1a</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1b</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.00</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>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CCC Demonstration District: Year 4

Data to determine effectiveness of decisions made to modify core or universal screening or other data used. Team hypotheses to identify reasons for modifications made to core instruction. Supp. instruction developed or criteria for positive RtI were defined. Progress monitoring data. Decision regarding student RtI was. Plan for continuing, modifying, or.
# Tier I & II Observation Checklist

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Critical Component</th>
<th>Present</th>
<th>Absent</th>
<th>Evidence/Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Personnel Present</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Administrator</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Classroom Teacher</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Parent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Data Coach</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Instructional Support (e.g., Reading Coach)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Special Education Teacher</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Facilitator</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Recorder (i.e., Notetaker)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Timekeeper</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Problem Identification</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Data were used to determine the effectiveness of core instruction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Decisions were made to modify core instruction and/or to develop supplemental (Tier II) interventions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Universal screening (e.g., DIBELS, ODRs) or other data sources (e.g., district-wide assessments) were used to identify groups of students in need of supplemental intervention</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Problem-Solving Team Meeting Checklist (Initial & Follow-up Version)

• Observation of Problem-Solving Team Meeting
  – Assesses whether the critical components of PS/RtI were present or absent during the Problem-Solving Team Meeting
    • ONLY to be used for individual student (Tier III) focused problem-solving sessions
  – Initial version focuses on first 3 steps of PS process
    • Problem identification, problem analysis, intervention development and support
  – Follow-up version focuses on last step of PS process
    • Intervention evaluation (RtI)
## Problem-Solving Team Meeting Checklist (Initial)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Critical Component</th>
<th>Present</th>
<th>Absent</th>
<th>Evidence/Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Personnel Present</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Administrator</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Classroom Teacher</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Parent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Data Coach</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Instructional Support (e.g., Reading Coach)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Special Education Teacher</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Facilitator</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Recorder (i.e., Notetaker)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Timekeeper</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Problem Identification</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Replacement behavior(s) was identified</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Data were collected to determine the current level of performance for the replacement behavior</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Data were obtained for benchmark (i.e., expected) level(s) of performance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Data were collected on the current level of peer performance or the data collected adequately represents average peer performance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. A gap analysis between the student’s current level of performance and the benchmark, and the peers’ current level of performance (or adequate representation of peer performance) and the benchmark was conducted</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Problem-Solving Team Meeting Checklist (Follow-Up)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Critical Component</th>
<th>Present</th>
<th>Absent</th>
<th>Evidence/Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Personnel Present</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Administrator</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Classroom Teacher</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Parent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Data Coach</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Instructional Support (e.g., Reading Coach)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Special Education Teacher</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Facilitator</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Recorder (i.e., Notetaker)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Timekeeper</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Program Evaluation/RtI</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Progress monitoring data were presented graphically</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Documentation of implementation of the intervention plan was presented</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. A decision regarding good, questionable, or poor RtI was made</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. A decision to continue, modify, or terminate the intervention plan was made</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. A decision to continue, modify, or terminate the intervention support plan was made</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. A follow-up meeting was scheduled</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Problem-Solving Team Meeting Checklist (Initial)

Initial Problem-Solving Team Meeting Checklists
Project Level Graph

Roles Represented
Problem Identification
Problem Analysis
Intervention Development/Support

Roles Present and Problem-Solving Steps

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentage of Roles/Components Present</th>
<th>Roles Represented</th>
<th>Problem Identification</th>
<th>Problem Analysis</th>
<th>Intervention Development/Support</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Percent Present %</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Problem-Solving Team Meeting Checklist (Follow-Up)

Follow-Up Problem-Solving Team Checklist
Project Level

Roles Represented
Program Evaluation/Response to Intervention

Percent of Roles/Components Present

Roles Present and Problem-Solving Step
Assessment of Outcomes
Technical Assistance

• General
  – Follow-Up to Training Sessions
  – Promotes Integrity

• Targeted
  – Based on Needs Assessment
  – Can Be Group Based
  – Focused, Fewer Topics
  – Based on Data From Sites
    • Critical Components
    • Direct Observations
Florida Resources to Support PS/RtI Implementation

- Just Read, Florida!  http://www.justreadflorida.com/
- Florida Center for Reading Research  http://www.fcrr.org/
- Florida’s PS/RtI Project:  www.floridarti.usf.edu
- Office of Early Learning, Florida Department of Education  
  http://www.fldoe.org/earlylearning/
- Bureau of School Improvement, Florida Department of Education  
  http://www.flbsi.org/
- Bureau of Exceptional Education and Student Services, Florida Department of Education  
  http://www.fldoe.org/ese/
- Florida Response to Intervention, Florida Department of Education  
  http://www.florida-rti.org/
Developing Action Plans