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Overview

- Rationale for service delivery model
- Project background
- Project overview
  - Reading
  - Behavior
- Next steps
## Changing Standards: Policy Influence

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NCLB, 2002</th>
<th>IDEA, 2004</th>
<th>Florida’s K-12 Comprehensive Reading Plan, 2006</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>▪ Academic improvement for all students</td>
<td>▪ Pragmatic assessment for intervention</td>
<td>▪ 90 min. reading block</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ Evidence-based instruction</td>
<td>▪ LRE - focus on general education</td>
<td>▪ Research-based curriculum and interventions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ Data-based decision-making</td>
<td>▪ Response to Intervention</td>
<td>▪ Strategic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ Increased parent role</td>
<td>▪ Parent rights and participation in decision making</td>
<td>▪ Comprehensive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>▪ Collect Data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>▪ Meet in teams, data (40 min/week)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1. Emphasize what must count... **RESULTS**
(and what is most important)

2. Use and depict **KEY DATA** to drive continuous improvement

3. Support **SCIENTIFICALLY-VALID** practices
Why Problem-Solving/RtI?

• RtI is the practice of providing *high-quality instruction/intervention* matched to student needs and *monitoring student progress frequently* to apply child *response data* to make important educational decisions (Adapted from Batsche et al., 2005).
Problem Solving Process

Define the Problem
Identify Replacement Behavior/Directly Measuring Behavior

Problem Analysis
Identify Variables that Contribute to Problem

Program Evaluation/RtI
Was It Effective?

Develop & Implement Plan
Implement Intervention(s)
Progress Monitor
Modify as Necessary
RtI Model

IT I: UNIVERSAL INTERVENTION:
- School-Wide Systems
- All Students, All Settings
- Preventive, Proactive

IT II: SUPPLEMENTAL INTERVENTION:
- IT I + Targeted Group Interventions
- Students At-Risk
- High Efficiency, Rapid Response

IT III: COMPREHENSIVE INTERVENTION:
- IT I + IT II + Individual Students with Intensive Needs
- Specialized Procedures, of Longer Duration
- Assessment-Based

Intervention Tier I
- ~80-90% of Students

Tier II
- ~10-15% of Students

Tier III
- ~5% of Students
Problem Solving & Response to Intervention

Project Overview: Reading
Background: 2004-05 School Year

• RtI presentations and book study
• Key stakeholders saw need for change
• Demographics
  – Title I school
  – 633 students
    • 68% eligible for free and reduced lunch
    • Ethnicity
      – 89% Caucasian
      – 6% Hispanic
      – 2% African-American
Background: 2005-06 School Year

- District and school personnel met with USF RtI team
- Discussed kindergarten student needs
  - Universal screening
  - Tier I problem-solving
- Consensus reached
  - Administration
  - Reading specialist
  - Kindergarten teachers
Procedures: 2005-06 School Year

- Implementation occurred in kindergarten
- Assessment
  - Used 4 screening windows suggested by the Florida Center for Reading Research (FCRR; www.fcrr.org)
  - Monthly progress monitoring for students identified as at-risk
  - Assistance provided by USF team
  - Data entered into the Progress Monitoring and Reporting Network (PMRN) by school staff
  - Data transferred to excel by USF team
Procedures: 2005-06 School Year

- Intervention
  - Supplemental intervention group identified
  - Evidence-based supplemental program selected
  - Implemented
    - 5 days per week
    - 30 minutes per day

- Data meetings
  - School leadership, district personnel, and USF RtI team attended
  - Student RtI data presented and discussed
Procedures: 2005-06 School Year

- Instructional planning
  - Teachers met 40 minutes per week
  - Identified classroom-wide skill needs
  - Linked classroom instruction to supplemental intervention program
How Effective Was the Core Curriculum?

**Anclote NWF-3**

- Low Risk: 59%
- Moderate Risk: 21%
- High Risk: 20%

**Anclote NWF-4**

- Low Risk: 70%
- Moderate Risk: 21%
- High Risk: 9%
Which Students Required Supplemental Intervention?
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How Effective Was the Supplemental Intervention Program?

Anclote Original Intervention Group - ISF

Instructional Week

ISPM

Before Intervention

After Intervention

Supplemental Intervention

FCAT

Supplemental

Intervention

Benchmark

Low Risk

Moderate Risk

High Risk

n=3

n=10

n=2

n=11

.90 ISPW

-.34 ISPW

.67 ISPW

-.45 ISPW

1.22 ISPW

1.67 ISPW

.55 ISPW

-22 ISPW

-67 ISPW

-33 ISPW

-.34 ISPW
“Good”, “Questionable”, and “Poor” Response to Intervention

• Guidelines:
  – “Positive” RtI
    • Improvement in level of student performance
    • Gap is closing at acceptable level
  – “Questionable” RtI
    • Improvement in student performance
    • Gap is maintained OR closing but at an unacceptable rate
  – “Poor” RtI
    • Slight improvement OR no improvement in level
    • Gap continues to widen
How Did Students Respond to Supplemental Intervention?

Case# XXX - NWF

Before Intervention

After Intervention

Supplemental Intervention

FCAT Supplemental Intervention

Benchmark

Rate = 2.16 NWPW

MR Benchmark

Goal = 1.33 NWPW

1.33 NWPW

NWF Score

Benchmark

Goal = 1.33 NWPW

Rate = 2.16 NWPW

Instructional Week

NWPW
How Did Students Respond to Supplemental Intervention?
How Did Students Respond to Supplemental Intervention?

Case# XXX - PSF

Before Intervention

Supplemental Intervention

After Intervention

Goal = 2 PSPW
Rate = .83 PSPW

PSF Score
Benchmark
MR Benchmark
Procedures: 2006-07 School Year

• 2005-06 kindergarten students
  – Continue supplemental intervention
  – Monthly progress monitoring

• 2006-07 kindergarten students
  – Universal screening 3 times per year
  – Monthly progress monitoring for students identified as at-risk
  – Implement supplemental intervention in November
How Effective Was the Core Curriculum?

Kindergarten Initial Sounds Fluency
Classroom X

Assessment Window

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ISF-1</th>
<th>ISF-2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HR</td>
<td>HR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MR</td>
<td>MR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LR</td>
<td>LR</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- ISF-1: 50% (50%)
- ISF-2: 65% (65%)
How Effective Was the Core Curriculum?

Benchmark = 25
Which Students Required Supplemental Intervention?

Case# XXX: ISF

Initial Sounds Per Minute

Assessment Window

Goal = 0.81 ISPW

0.2 ISPW

0 5 10 15 20 25 30

ISP Benchmark

MR Benchmark

MR Benchmark

ISP Benchmark

MR Benchmark

ISP Benchmark

MR Benchmark

Goal = 0.81 ISPW

0.2 ISPW
How Effective Was the Supplemental Intervention Program?

Kindergarten Intervention Group - ISF

- 48% on track to hit end of year benchmark (10 of 21 students)
- 59% on track to hit end of year benchmark (13 of 22 students)
How Did Students Respond to Supplemental Intervention?

Case # XXX: ISF

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assessment Window</th>
<th>Initial Sounds Correct Per Minute</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>Peer = 0.44 ISPW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>Benchmark</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>MR Benchmark</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goal = 2.0 ISPW</td>
<td>ISPW</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Goal = 2.0 ISPW

Peer = 0.44 ISPW

Benchmark

MR Benchmark

ISPW

Benchmark

MR Benchmark

Class
How Did Students Respond to Supplemental Intervention?

Case # XXX: ISF

Initial Sounds Correct Per Minute

Assessment Window

Peer = 0.44 ISPW
Goal = 0.33 ISPW

ISPW
Benchmark
Class
MR Benchmark
How Did Students Respond to Supplemental Intervention?

Case # XXX: ISF

Initial Sounds Correct Per Minute

Assessment Window

Goal = 1.41 ISPW

Peer = 0.81 ISPW

ISPW
Benchmark
MR Benchmark
Class
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Project Overview: Systematic Behavior Supports
Background

- Problem Identification
  - No school wide plan that used a preventive approach
  - No school wide rules
  - Lack of consistency in discipline across settings

- 2005-06 school year = planning
- 2006-07 school year = implementation
Tier I Procedures

**Step 1**: Formation of discipline committee
- Met once per month
- Developed a school wide discipline plan
- Focused on prevention of discipline problems (Tier 1)

**Step 2**: Clear set of common expectations and behaviors
- School-wide rules [posted throughout the school]
  - Be Safe
  - Be Respectful
  - Be Responsible
Step 3: Teaching behavior expectations
- Modeling and role-playing
- Taught and reinforced by classroom teachers

Step 4: Procedures for encouraging expected behavior
- School-wide positive reinforcement
  - “Caught Ya Being Good” tickets
  - Anclote’s 200 Club
  - Celebrity book

Step 5: Procedures for discouraging inappropriate behavior
- Level system
Step 6: Social skills and character education
  - Second Steps
    - Survey data
    - Evidence-based intervention

Step 7: Procedures for ongoing monitoring and evaluation
  - Surveys
  - Discipline records

Step 8: Effective academic support

Step 9: Classroom behavior management
  - Professional development
  - Assistance with developing programs, when requested
**Tier 3: Intensive Interventions**
- Individual Counseling
- FBA/BIP
- Teach, Reinforce, and Prevent (TRP)
- Assessment-based
- Intense, durable procedures

**Tier 2: Targeted Group Interventions**
- Some students (at-risk)
- Small Group Counseling
- Parent Training (Behavior & Academic)
- Bullying Prevention Program
- FBA/BIP
- Classroom Management Techniques
- Professional Development
- Small Group Parent Training
- Data

**Tier 1: Universal Interventions**
- All settings, all students
- Committee
- Preventive, proactive strategies
- School Wide Rules/ Expectations
- Positive Reinforcement System (Tickets & 200 Club)
- School Wide Consequence System
- School Wide Social Skills Program
- Data (Discipline, Surveys, etc.)
- Professional Development (behavior)
- Classroom Management Techniques
- Parent Training
How Effective Was the Core Curriculum?

Percentage of Students Who Reported Bullying as a Problem

Kindergarten: 44%
1st Grade: 49%
2nd Grade: 39%
How Effective Was the Core Curriculum?

Percentage of Students Who Reported Bullying as a Problem

- 3rd grade: 46%
- 4th grade: 44%
- 5th grade: 20%

Grade
How Effective Was the Core Curriculum?

Number of ODRs

RtI: Academics & Behavior

**Tier 3: Comprehensive and Intensive Interventions**
- Individual Students or Small Group (2-3)
- Reading: Scholastic Program, Reading Mastery, ALL, Soar to Success, Leap Track, Fundations

**Tier 2: Strategic Interventions**
- Students that don’t respond to the core curriculum
- Reading: Soar to Success, Leap Frog, CRISS strategies, CCC Lab
- Math: Extended Day
- Writing: Small Group, CRISS strategies, and “Just Write Narrative” by K. Robinson

**Tier 1: Core Curriculum**
- All students
- Reading: Houghton Mifflin
- Math: Harcourt
- Writing: Six Traits Of Writing Learning Focus Strategies

**Tier 3: Intensive Interventions**
- Individual Counseling
  - FBA/BIP
  - Teach, Reinforce, and Prevent (TRP)
  - Assessment-based
  - Intense, durable procedures

**Tier 2: Targeted Group Interventions**
- Some students (at-risk)
- Small Group Counseling
- Parent Training (Behavior & Academic)
- Bullying Prevention Program
- FBA/BIP
- Classroom Management Techniques
- Professional Development
- Small Group Parent Training
- Data

**Tier 1: Universal Interventions**
- All settings, all students
- Committee
- Preventive, proactive strategies
- School Wide Rules/ Expectations
- Positive Reinforcement System (Tickets & 200 Club)
- School Wide Consequence System
- School Wide Social Skills Program
- Data (Discipline, Surveys, etc.)
- Professional Development (behavior)
- Classroom Management Techniques
- Parent Training
Next Steps

• Consistently implement preventive strategies (i.e., Tier I)
• Implement problem-solving/RtI procedures in other grades
• Modify data presentation to be more user-friendly
• Increase district ownership of project
• Expand project to include more elementary schools
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