Response to Intervention: Getting Going
Where to Start

Big Picture Objectives

• You, as “Trainee,” “Trainer” and “Coach”
• Three Components
  – To provide clarity on implementation at a school level
    • Consensus Building
    • Infrastructure Development
    • RtI Implementations
  – To provide you some initial tools to assist your work back at home
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Implementing Problem-Solving/Response to Intervention (PSM/RtI):

• Three Phases of Implementation
  – Consensus Building (Commitment)
  – Infrastructure Development
  – Implementation

Implementing Problem-Solving/Response to Intervention (PSM/RtI): Multiple Approaches

• Phase 1: Consensus Building
  • No one strategy works for everyone
  • Ergo, use multiple strategies
    1. Rationale and History
    2. Statutes and Regulations
    3. Research on existing programs/services
    4. Summarize, examine and evaluate school data

Implementing Problem-Solving/Response to Intervention (PSM/RtI): Multiple Approaches

• You know that you have achieved consensus when….
  – Target group clearly understands the need for the method
  – Target group perceives that they have the skills and/or support to implement the method
The significant problems we have cannot be solved at the same level of thinking with which we created them.

Albert Einstein (1879 – 1955)

Basic Beliefs

1. Decisions are best made with data - In God we trust...
2. Student response to intervention best indicator of capacity - we used to think IQ limited capacity. Now - we believe the only thing limiting capacity is capacity. The only way to determine capacity is to instruct and monitor
3. Early Intervention/Prevention - The best way to solve basic skill problems is to prevent them
4. Student characteristics less important than response to authentic curriculum—academic and/or behavior

Consensus Building:

What is the Statutory and Regulatory Foundation for Problem Solving and Response to Intervention?
1. Consensus Building: Rationale and History

- 1973 Vocational Rehabilitation Act
- 1975 PL 94-142
- 1983 A Nation at Risk
- 1994 ESEA Reauthorization
- IDEA 1997
- ESEA 2002 (AKA NCLB)
- IDEIA 2004

2. Consensus Building: Contextual Issues Affecting The Problem-Solving Process in General and Special Education

- IDEA Re-Authorization
  - Focus on academic outcomes
  - General education as baseline metric
  - Labeling as a "last resort"
  - Increasing general education options
  - Pooling building-based resources
  - Flexible funding patterns
  - RtI Introduced as option for LD eligibility
- ESEA Legislation-No Child Left Behind
- National Emphasis on Reading
- Evidence-based Interventions

2. Consensus Building: Why Problem-Solving? BIG IDEAS

- AYP and Disaggregated Data (NCLB) move focus of attention to student progress, not student labels
- Building principals and superintendents want to know if students are achieving benchmarks, regardless of the students’ "type”
- Accurate "placements" do not guarantee that students will be exposed to interventions that maximize their rate of progress
- Effective interventions result from good problem-solving, rather than good "testing”
- Progress monitoring is done best with "authentic" assessment that is sensitive to small changes in student academic and social behavior
2. Consensus Building: Big Ideas (con’d)

- Interventions must be “evidence based” (IDEA/NCLB)
- Response to Intervention (RtI) is the best measure of problem “severity”
- Program eligibility (initial and continued) decisions are best made based on RtI
- Staff training and support (e.g., coaching) improve intervention skills
- “Tiered” implementation improves service efficiency

3. Consensus Building: Research Documents Positive Effects

- Previous classification systems were invalid, inaccurate and in the case of LD, required “wait to fail” (President’s Commission Report, 2002)
- LD programming historically did not accelerate rates of growth (Torgesen, 2006)
- RtI can reduce special education placements (Tilly, 2002; Marston, 2001; VanDerHeyden et al., 2006)
- RtI can increase student performance for struggling learners (e.g., Vellutino, et al. 1996; Denton & Vaughn, 2003, Torgesen, et al., 2001)

3. Consensus Building: What evidence exists to evaluate the satisfaction of teachers and parents with the implementation of PSM/RtI?

- Swerdlik, et al. conducted a longitudinal study of the impact of PSM/RtI in the FLEXible Service Delivery system in Illinois. Results indicate that both teacher and parent satisfaction with the PSM/RtI method was superior to that of the traditional test-staff-place model.
Question 1: The problem solving process supports teachers in improving the performance of students whose academic skills and behaviors are of concern. This includes the Building Assistance Team or other intervention supports.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Gen Ed Teachers</th>
<th>Principal</th>
<th>Sp Ed Teachers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>87.3%</td>
<td>96.8%</td>
<td>92.13%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Question 2: Problem solving process leading to educational interventions is equally applicable for helping students in general and special education.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Gen Ed Teachers</th>
<th>Principal</th>
<th>Sp Ed Teachers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>83.0%</td>
<td>96.7%</td>
<td>92.14%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


3: Consensus Building: What is the impact of PSM/RtI on students from diverse backgrounds?

- First grade students at risk for reading problems, randomly assigned - intervention and control
- Intervention, supplemental reading instruction, 50 minutes a day
3. Consensus Building: RtI and English Language Learners

### TABLE 2
Summary of Spanish Intervention Results, by Group and Time

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome</th>
<th>Intervention</th>
<th>Control</th>
<th>Intervention</th>
<th>Control</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Did not meet RTI criteria</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n/N</td>
<td>1/51</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10/53</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Met RTI criteria</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n/N</td>
<td>22/22</td>
<td>15/17</td>
<td>1/18</td>
<td>6/11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: RTI = response to intervention. The difference in number of students between first and second grade is due to students moving out of the district. Each column sums to 100%, reflecting all of the students in that condition available at each time point.


3. Consensus Building: RtI and English Language Learners

### TABLE 3
Summary of English Intervention Results, by Group and Time

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome</th>
<th>Intervention</th>
<th>Control</th>
<th>Intervention</th>
<th>Control</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Did not meet RTI criteria</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n/N</td>
<td>22/22</td>
<td>15/17</td>
<td>1/18</td>
<td>6/11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Met RTI criteria</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n/N</td>
<td>30/31</td>
<td>22/23</td>
<td>22/23</td>
<td>22/23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>30/31</td>
<td>22/23</td>
<td>22/23</td>
<td>22/23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: RTI = response to intervention. The difference in number of students between first and second grade is due to students moving out of the district. Each column sums to 100%, reflecting all of the students in that condition available at each time point.


3. Consensus Building: Punch Line

- ELLs can make significant progress in an RtI model
- IF it is done right
4. Consensus Building: Summarize, Examine and Evaluate School Data

- Establish shared understanding of student needs through Tier 1-school, grade level or classroom data
- Ask staff to discuss what the data say about effectiveness of current practices
- Ask staff for their suggestions on how to use data to inform decisions

What are the instructional implications of the following data?

- 70% of students are above benchmark.
  - Is this good?
- 30% are moderate or high risk.
  - Will these students get lost if instruction is targeted to the 70%?
- Is our priority to get all students to benchmark prior to focusing on those above benchmark?
  - Do we have the resources to do both?
What are the implications of the following data?

- Are the needs of students the same across classrooms?
  - How do you know?
- Should instruction be the same in all classrooms?
- Should students be moved to “balance” the instructional need across classrooms?
What are the instructional implications of the data from the following slides?

• How will these data influence instructional decisions across skills?
• Do the same students “do well” regardless of the skill?
• Have the instructional strategies used had the same impact across different skills?
• How will you modify instruction based on these data?

A Math Example

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

Third Grade Math
Addition and Subtraction
About 81% Meeting minimum proficiency

Fourth Grade Math
Multiplication & Division
About 32% Meeting Minimum Proficiency

Fifth Grade Math
Multiplication & Division
About 42% Meeting Minimum Proficiency
RtI: Getting Going

Some Consensus Building Tools

• 1. Torgesen - Managing Complex Change Matrix Activity
• 2. Beyond Islands of Excellence Jigsaw
• 3. Readiness Checklists

Consensus Building Tool #1: School-Wide Systems Provide a Formula for Success

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

“Big Ideas” in a Content Domain

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

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

3 Types of Assessment

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

2. Diagnostic Assessments: Assessment conducted at any time during the school year when more in-depth analysis of a student’s strengths and weaknesses is needed to guide instruction (Institute for the Development of Educational Achievement, 2003)
   - Assessments conducted to pinpoint reasons why specific types of problems are occurring
   - Typically many items in each sub-area related to the problem
   - Yields testable hypotheses about problem etiology
   - Leads directly to teaching recommendations with a good likelihood of success
   - Examples: MASI, Curriculum-Based Evaluation, FBA, Gray Oral Reading Test IV (GORT-IV), Woodcock Reading Mastery Test - Revised (WRMT-R)
3 Types of Assessment

- Progress Monitoring Assessments: Assessment conducted a minimum of three times a year or on a routine basis (i.e., weekly, monthly, or quarterly) using comparable and multiple test forms to (a) estimate rates of student improvement, (b) identify children who are not demonstrating adequate progress and therefore require additional or different forms of instruction, and/or (c) compare the efficacy of different forms of instruction for struggling readers and thereby design more effective, individualized instructional programs for those at-risk learners. (adapted from Institute for the Development of Educational Achievement, 2003)

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

Consensus Building Tool #1
RtI Activity

- As a table, turn in your activity packet to RtI Activity (It is on colored paper)
- As a group, examine the matrix
- Discuss, item by item, what the result of implementing a school wide model, missing any individual component, is likely to produce in practice.
  Have one person capture your responses line-by-line on their activity page
RtI Consensus Activity #2

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

RtI Consensus Activity #2

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

Consensus Building Activity #3: RtI Readiness Survey

- Examples of readiness surveys can be obtained at:

  - http://sss.usf.edu
    - Link: NASP 07 Tilly/Batsche Presentation
Critical Consensus Building Lessons

- Consensus building is the RtI Purolator Commercial: You can pay me now, or you can pay me later
- Some will want to short shift this step
- Best to take a poll re: level of support within the school
- Less than 80% support, you’re climbing up hill

Phase 2 Building An RtI Infrastructure

Infrastructure: Critical Components

- Structured Problem Solving Process
- Data Sources
- Technology to Manage Data
- Multi-tiered Intervention System
- Uniform Decision Rules for Intervention, Development, Evaluation and Modification
- Data Coach/Mentor
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 these 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

**Problem Solving: Strengths**

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

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

Data For Each Tier - Where Do They Come From?

- Tier 1: Universal Screening, accountability assessments, grades, classroom assessments
- Tier 2: Universal Screening - Group Level Diagnostics (maybe), systematic progress monitoring, large-scale assessment data and classroom assessment
- Tier 3: Universal Screenings, Individual Diagnostics, intensive and systematic progress monitoring, formative assessment, other informal assessments

Tier I Data Example
Tier 1 Data Example

Fourth Grade Math

About 32% Meeting Minimum Proficiency
Big Ideas of RtI: For RtI to be Effective We Must

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

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

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

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

- **Poor Response**
  - Gap continues to widen with no change in rate.
IMPLEMENTATION

Change is Hard for Some

Planning Ahead: Predicting Who Will Be Referred

- Code referrals (reasons) for past 2-3 years
  - Identifies problems teachers feel they do not have the skills/support to handle
  - Referral pattern reflects skill pattern of the staff, the resources currently in place and the “history” of what constitutes a referral in that building
  - Identifies likely referral types for next 2 years
  - Identifies focus of Professional Development Activities AND potential Tier II and III interventions
  - Present data to staff. Reinforces “Need” concept
Data-Driven Infrastructure: Identifying Needed Interventions

• Assess current “Supplemental Interventions”
  – Identify all students receiving supplemental interventions
  – For those interventions, identify
    • Type and Focus (academic, direct instruction, etc)
    • Duration (minutes/week)
    • Provider
  – Aggregate
    • Identifies instructional support types in building
    • This constitutes Tier II and III intervention needs

Outline – Implementing An RtI System

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

Outline – Implementing An RtI System

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

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

Outline – Implementing An RtI System

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

Criteria for Evaluating Response to Intervention

- Is the gap between desired/current rate or gap between slopes of current and benchmark converging? If yes, this is a POSITIVE RtI
- Is the gap closing but not converging (e.g., parallel)? If yes, this is a QUESTIONABLE RtI
- If the rate/slope remains unchanged OR if there is improvement but shows no evidence of closing the gap, then this is a POOR RtI
Criteria for Evaluating Response to Intervention: Dilemmas

- Currently, many educators "understand" the ability/achievement discrepancy concept.
- We are changing from a "discrepancy or deviation" model to a "longitudinal" model—As long as the student remains on the AIMLINE, the intervention is working EVEN IF THE STUDENT IS STILL DISCREPANT OR BEHIND PEER/BENCHMARK PERFORMANCE STANDARDS
- Unless this concept is replaced with another one that makes MORE sense to them, the old concept will prevail.
- We have to guard against the, "of course they do not have a good RtI…we cannot expect them to…that’s why I referred them."
- A positive response IS WHAT WE EXPECT, we just have to problem-solve until we get it.
RtI: Getting Going

Decision Model at Tier 1- General Education Instruction

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

  Is this student at risk?

  Current Gen Ed Instruction is Working

  Continue Tier 1 Instruction

  Move to Tier 2: Strategic Interventions

Latana Grade 2
Tier 1 Oral Reading Fluency

School Weeks

Words Correct Per
Rita

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

---

Decision Model at Tier 1 - General Education Instruction

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

- Current Gen Ed Instruction is NOT Working

---

Tilly & Batsche, March 2007
Data-Based Determination of Expectations: Rita

- Benchmark Level: 54 WCPM
- Current Level: 20 WCPM
- Difference to Feb Benchmark (Gap): 34 WCPM
- Time to Benchmark: 20 Weeks
- Rate of Growth Required: 34/20 = 1.70 WCPM for Rita
- Peer Group Rate = 1.20 WCPM growth (at benchmark) 1.40 WCPM (for "some risk" benchmark)
- REALISTIC? Not unless you increase AET

Decision Model at Tier 2 - Strategic Interventions & Instruction

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

- Find additional time
- Ensure that supplemental and intensive interventions are integrated with core instruction/behavior plan
- Intervention support available
  - Frequent meetings with teacher(s)
  - Data review
  - Review intervention steps

Intervention Implementation

- Identify number of intervention support personnel available
- Identify the number of students needing supplemental and intensive support
- See if the ratios make sense!
- Example
  - 600 students, 300 making benchmarks
  - 30 teachers, 6 support personnel
  - 30 teachers for 300 students
  - 6 support staff for 300 students
  - DOES NOT MAKE SENSE

Intervention Development and Support

- Intervention Development
  - Proximal (Immediate)
    - Increase Supervision
    - Lower Difficulty Level
  - Distal (Longer Term)
    - Teach skills
    - Shape Behavior
    - Empirically Supported
Intervention Development and Support

- Intervention Support (G. Noell, 2006)
  - Initial Week Teacher Meeting
    - 2 or more times
  - Subsequent-weekly (6-8 week minimum)
  - Agenda for Meetings
    - Review Data
    - Review Intervention Steps
    - Problem Solve Barriers

---

**Rita - Tier 2**

**Graph:**
- Trendline = 1.85 words/week
- Aimline = 1.70 words/week

Good RtI

---

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

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

**Student is Responsive to Intervention**

- **Yes**: Continue monitoring or return to Tier 1
- **No**: Move to Tier 3 - Intensive Interventions
Elsie

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

Decision Model at Tier 1 - General Education Instruction

- Step 1: Screening
  - ORF = 62 wcpm, end of second grade benchmark for at risk is 70 wcpm (see bottom of box)
  - Compared to other Heartland students, Elsie scores around the 12th percentile + or -
  - Elsie’s teacher reports that she struggles with multisyllabic words and that she makes many decoding errors when she reads
  - Is this student at risk?

  - This Student is at Risk, General Education Not Working
    - No
    - Yes

  - Move to Tier 2 Strategic Interventions
Decision Model at Tier 2 - Supplemental Instruction

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

Data-Based Determination of Expectations: Elsie

- Benchmark Level: 90 WCPM
- Current Level: 47 WCPM
- Difference to June Benchmark (Gap): 34 WCPM
- Time to Benchmark: 41 Weeks
- Rate of Growth Required:
  - 34/41 = .83 WCPM for Elsie
  - NOT VERY AMBITIOUS!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!
- What would happen if we moved the target to the middle of the "some risk box"?
Data-Based Determination of Expectations: Elsie

- Benchmark Level: 100 WCPM
- Current Level: 47 WCPM
- Difference to June Benchmark (Gap): 53 WCPM
- Time to Benchmark: 41 Weeks
- Rate of Growth Required:
  - 53/41 = 1.29 WCPM for Elsie
- Peer Group Rate = about 1.1 WCPM growth (at benchmark) 1.2 WCPM
  (for “some risk” benchmark)
- REALISTIC? Not unless you increase AET
The intervention appeared to be working. What the teachers thought was needed was increased time in supplemental instruction. They worked together and found a way to give Elsie 30 minutes of supplemental instruction, on phonics and fluency, 5x per week.

### Data-Based Determination of Expectations: Elsie

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

---

**Tier 2- Supplemental Instruction - Revision**

- The intervention appeared to be working.
- What the teachers thought was needed was increased time in supplemental instruction.
- They worked together and found a way to give Elsie 30 minutes of supplemental instruction, on phonics and fluency, 5x per week.
By the Spring of Third Grade

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

Decision Model at Tier 1-
General Education Instruction

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

Tilly & Batsche, March 2007
**Steven**

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

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Month</th>
<th>Words Correct Per Min</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sept</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oct</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

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

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

  ![Decision Model Diagram]

  - **No**: Continue Tier 1 Instruction
  - **Yes**: Move to Tier 2: Strategic Interventions
Decision Model at Tier 2: Strategic Interventions & Instruction

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

---

Poor RtI

---

Decision Model at Tier 2: Strategic Intervention & Instruction

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

Move to Tier 3: Intensive Interventions

---

Tilly & Batsche, March 2007
Decision Model at Tier 3 - Intensive Interventions & Instruction

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

---

Decision Model at Tier 3 - Intensive Intervention & Instruction

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

---

Tilly & Batsche, March 2007
RtI: Getting Going

- RTI Applied to Behavior Interventions

[Graph showing Raphael's Compliance with data points and trends indicated]

[Table showing Baseline, User-Wide User Skill Testing, and Benchmark data with percentages]
**Problem-Solving Process**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student</th>
<th>Information</th>
<th>Interventions</th>
<th>Core Program</th>
<th>Core Program</th>
<th>Core Program</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lee Miller</td>
<td>2 (BOY)</td>
<td>1. Math, Reading and Reasoning</td>
<td>HM, HE</td>
<td>HM, HE</td>
<td>HM, HE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/31/96</td>
<td>2. Social Skills</td>
<td>HM, HE</td>
<td>HM, HE</td>
<td>HM, HE</td>
<td>HM, HE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>3. Effort</td>
<td>HM, HE</td>
<td>HM, HE</td>
<td>HM, HE</td>
<td>HM, HE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>Reading, Fluency, Comprehension</td>
<td>HM, HE</td>
<td>HM, HE</td>
<td>HM, HE</td>
<td>HM, HE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Written Expression</td>
<td>HM, HE</td>
<td>HM, HE</td>
<td>HM, HE</td>
<td>HM, HE</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Current Reasons Information**

- Student lacks letter-sound knowledge.
- Student lacks automaticity with sight words.
- Student reads word-for-word.
- Student needs more time and practice.

**Strengths:**
- Math Problem-Solving and Reasoning
- Social Skills
- Effort

**Concerns:**
- Reading - Phonics, Fluency, Comprehension
- Writing - Conventions, Expression

**Recommended Interventions:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Core Program</th>
<th>Early Success</th>
<th>HM, HE</th>
<th>HM, HE</th>
<th>HM, HE</th>
<th>HM, HE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Core Program</td>
<td>Early Success</td>
<td>HM, HE</td>
<td>HM, HE</td>
<td>HM, HE</td>
<td>HM, HE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Core Program</td>
<td>Early Success</td>
<td>HM, HE</td>
<td>HM, HE</td>
<td>HM, HE</td>
<td>HM, HE</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Recommended Interventions:**

- Core Program | Early Success | HM, HE | HM, HE | HM, HE | HM, HE |
- Core Program | Early Success | HM, HE | HM, HE | HM, HE | HM, HE |
- Core Program | Early Success | HM, HE | HM, HE | HM, HE | HM, HE |
IDEIA Comprehensive Evaluation

- Problem Identification
  - Oral Expression
  - Listening Comprehension
  - Written Expression
  - Basic Reading Skill
  - Reading Fluency Skills
  - Reading Comprehension
  - Mathematics Calculation
  - Mathematics Problem-Solving

IDEIA Comprehensive Evaluation

- Relevant behavior noted during the observation and relationship of Bx to academic functioning
  - Data from required observation

IDEIA Comprehensive Evaluation

- The child does not achieve adequately for the child’s age or to meet state-approved grade-level standards
  - GAP Analysis from Tier 1

AND
IDEIA Comprehensive Evaluation

- The child does not make sufficient progress to meet age or to meet state-approved standards when using a process based on the child's response to scientific, research-based intervention
  - RtI Data from Tiers 2 and 3

OR

IDEIA Comprehensive Evaluation

- The child exhibits a pattern of strengths and weaknesses in performance, achievement or both, relative to age, state-approved grade level standards or intellectual development that is determined by the group to be relevant to the identification of a SLD, using appropriate assessments
  - Differential Academic Performance Levels
  
  NOTE: Requirement for a severe discrepancy between ability and achievement was removed.

IDEIA Comprehensive Evaluation

- The findings are not primarily the result of:
  - Sensory or Motor Disability
  - Mental Retardation
  - Assess Adaptive Behavior First
  - Emotional Disturbance
    - Data from observation
    - Observation and performance data
  - Cultural Factors
    - AYP Data for Race (NCLB)
    - Comparative AYP for Culture (Local Norms)
    - Environmental or Economic Disadvantage
    - AYP Data for Low SES
    - Limited English Proficiency
    - AYP Data for LEP
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Task 1</th>
<th>Task 2</th>
<th>Task 3</th>
<th>Task 4</th>
<th>Task 5</th>
<th>Task 6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1/1</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:
- Task 1: Weekly Activities
- Task 2: Monthly Assessments
- Task 3: Quarterly Reports
- Task 4: Annual Reviews
- Task 5: Bi-Annual Meetings
- Task 6: Annual Planning