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Presentation Overview

• Florida PS/RtI Project Overview
• Evaluation Model Philosophy
• Evaluation Model Blueprint
• Examples of Data Collected
• Preliminary Outcomes

The Vision

• 95% of students at “proficient” level
• Students possess social and emotional behaviors that support “active” learning
• A “unified” system of educational services
  — One “ED”
State Regulations Require

- Evaluation of effectiveness core instruction
- Evidence-based interventions in general education
- Repeated assessments in general education measuring rate changes as a function of intervention
- Determination of RtI

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.

What Does “Scaling Up” Mean?

- What is the unit of analysis
  - Building
  - District
  - State
  - Region
  - Nation?
- Scaling up cannot be considered without considering “Portability”
Portability

- Student mobility rate in the United States is significant
  - 33% Elementary Student, 20% Middle School (NAEP)
- Impact on Data
  - Different assessment systems/databases may limit portability
- Impact on Interventions
  - What if interventions used for 2-3 years are not “available” in the new district, state?
- Portability of systems MUST be considered when any realistic scaling up process is considered

Brief FL PS/RtI Project Description

Two purposes of PS/RtI Project:

- Statewide training in PS/RtI
- Evaluate the impact of PS/RtI on educator, student, and systemic outcomes in pilot sites implementing the model (FOCUS TODAY)

Scope of the Project

- PreK-12 (Current focus = K-5)
- Tiers 1-3
- Reading
- Math
- Behavior
FL PS/RtI Project: Where Does It Fit?

- Districts must develop a plan to guide implementation of their use of PS/RtI
- State Project can be one component of the plan
- It cannot be THE plan for the district
- District must own their implementation process and integrate existing elements and initiate new elements

Pilot Site Overview

- Through competitive application process
  - 8 school districts selected
  - 40 demonstration schools
  - 33 matched comparison schools
- Districts and schools vary in terms of
  - Geographic location
  - Student demographics
  - Districts: 6,200 – 360,000 students
- School, district and Project personnel work collaboratively to implement PS/RtI model

Demonstration Districts
Pilot Site Overview (cont’d)

• Training, technical assistance, and support provided to schools
  – Training provided by 3 Regional Coordinators using same format as statewide training
  – Regional Coordinators and PS/RtI coaches (one for each three pilot schools) provide additional guidance/support to districts and schools

• Purpose = program evaluation
  – Comprehensive evaluation model developed
  – Data collected from/on:
    • Approximately 25-100 educators per school
    • Approximately 300-1200 students per school

Year 1 Focus

Understanding the Model
Tier 1 Applications

Step 1 - Problem Identification
What’s the problem?

Step 2 - Problem Analysis
Why is it occurring?

Step 3 - Intervention Design
What are we going to do about it?

Step 4 - Response to Intervention
Is it working?
Three Tiered Model of School Supports - Tier I

Focus

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Academic Systems</th>
<th>Behavioral Systems</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students</td>
<td>Students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

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

Three Tiered Model of School Supports - Tier II

Focus

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Tier II: 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 II: 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 II: Intensive Interventions
- Individual Counseling
- FBA/BIP
- Prevent, Teach, Reinforce (PTR)
- Assessment-based Intense, durable procedures

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

Change Model

Consensus
- Belief is shared
- Vision is agreed upon
- Implementation requirements understood

Infrastructure Development
- Problem-Solving Process
- Data System
- Policies/Procedures
- Training
- Tier I and II intervention systems
  - E.g., K-3 Academic Support Plan
- Technology support
- Decision-making criteria established

Implementation

Stages of Implementing Problem-Solving/RtI

- Consensus
- Infrastructure
- Implementation
Training Curriculum

- Year 1 training focus for schools
  - Day 1 = Historical and legislative pushes toward implementing the PSM/RtI Model
  - Day 2 = Problem Identification
  - Day 3 = Problem Analysis
  - Day 4 = Intervention Development & Implementation
  - Day 5 = Program Evaluation/RtI
- Considerable attention during Year 1 trainings is focused on improving Tier I instruction

Evaluation Model

Difference Between Evaluation & Research

“Prove”
Research
Evaluation
Higher Certainty
Lower Relevance

“Improve”
Higher Relevance
Lower Certainty
Working Definition of Evaluation

• The practice of evaluation involves the systematic collection of information about the activities, characteristics, and outcomes of programs, personnel, and products for use by specific people to reduce uncertainties, improve effectiveness and make decisions with regard to what those program, personnel, or products are doing and affecting (Patton).

Data Collection Philosophy

• Data elements selected that will best answer Project evaluation questions
  - Demonstration schools
  - Comparison schools when applicable
• Data collected from
  - Existing databases
    - Building
    - District
    - State
  - Instruments developed by the Project
• Data derived from multiple sources when possible
• Data used to drive decision-making
  - Project
  - Districts
  - Schools

FL PS/RtI Evaluation Process
FL PS/RtI Evaluation Model

- IPO model used
- Variables included
  - Levels
  - Inputs
  - Processes
  - Outcomes
  - Contextual factors
  - External factors
  - Goals & objectives

Levels

- Students
  - Receiving Tiers I, II, & III
- Educators
  - Teachers
  - Administrators
  - Coaches
  - Student and instructional support personnel
- System
  - District
  - Building
  - Grade levels
  - Classrooms

Inputs (What We Don’t Control)

- Students
  - Demographics
  - Previous learning experiences & achievement
- Educators
  - Roles
  - Experience
  - Previous PS/RtI training
  - Previous beliefs about services
- System
  - Previous consensus regarding PS/RtI
  - Previous PS/RtI infrastructure
    - Assessments
    - Interventions
    - Procedures
    - Technology
Processes (What We Do)

- **Students**
  - Assessment participation (e.g., DIBELS screening)
  - Instruction/intervention participation
- **Educators**
  - Frequency and duration of participation in PS/RtI Project training
  - Content of Project training in which they participated
- **System**
  - Frequency & duration of professional development offered by the Project
  - Stakeholders participating in professional development activities
  - Communication between Project and districts/buildings

Implementation Integrity Checklists

- Implementation integrity measures developed
- **Measure**
  - Steps of problem solving
  - Focus on Tiers I, II, & III
- **Data come from:**
  - Permanent products (e.g., meeting notes, reports)
  - Problem Solving Team meetings
Outcomes (What We Hope to Impact)

- Educators
  - Consensus regarding PS/RtI
  - Beliefs
  - Satisfaction
  - PS/RtI Skills
  - PS/RtI Practices
Outcomes cont.

• System
  – PS/RtI Infrastructure
    • Assessments
    • Interventions
    • Procedures
    • Technology
    • Costs
  – PS/RtI Implementation

Outcomes cont.

• Students
  – Academic achievement
  – Behavioral outcomes

• Systemic
  – Discipline referrals
  – Referrals for problem solving
  – Referrals for SPED evaluations
  – SPED placements
Student Data Elements

- **Outcome Data**
  - Florida Comprehensive Assessment Test (FCAT)
    - Grades 3-5
    - Reading & Math
  - Stanford Achievement Test - 10
    - Grades 1 & 2 where applicable
    - Reading & Math

- **Formative Data**
  - DIBELS (targeted grade levels)
  - District assessments where applicable

Pilot School Example

Slides from Data Meeting Following Winter Benchmarking Window

Sources of Evidence — What do our readers know? What are they able to do?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The student demonstrates knowledge of the concept of print and how it is organized and read.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Concepts of print test</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shared reading</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guided reading/Observation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early Literacy Behaviors Checklist (Scott Foresman)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The student demonstrates phonological awareness.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phonological Awareness Test</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guided reading/Observation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early Literacy Behaviors Checklist (Scott Foresman)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The student demonstrates phonemic awareness.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phonological Awareness Test</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guided reading/Observation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early Literacy Behaviors Checklist (Scott Foresman)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Sources of Evidence —
What do our readers know? What are they able to do?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The student demonstrates knowledge of the alphabetic principle and applies grade level phonics skills to read text.</th>
<th>The student uses multiple strategies to develop grade appropriate vocabulary.</th>
<th>The student uses a variety of strategies to comprehend grade level text.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| - Running records with miscue analysis  
- Guided reading/Observation  
- Literacy centers  
- NWF  
- Writing samples  
- Early Literacy Behaviors Checklists (Scott Foresman)  
- Reading Strategy Assessment (Scott Foresman) | - Shared reading with distributed practice  
- Guided reading/Observation  
- Conferences  
- Literacy centers  
- Writing samples  
- Reading Strategy Assessment (Scott Foresman) | - Shared reading with distributed practice  
- Guided reading/Observation  
- Conferences  
- Literacy centers  
- Writing samples  
- Early Literacy Behaviors Checklists (Scott Foresman)  
- Reading Strategy Assessment (Scott Foresman) |
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Systemic Outcomes - Office
Discipline Referrals
Other Variables to Keep in Mind

- Contextual factors
  - Leadership
  - School climate
  - Stakeholder buy-in

- External factors
  - Legislation
  - Regulations
  - Policy

Factors Noted So Far

- Legislative & Regulatory Factors
  - NCLB reauthorization
  - FL EBD rule change effective July 1, 2007
  - Pending FL SLD rule change

- Leadership
  - Level of involvement (school & district levels)
  - Facilitative versus directive styles

School Goals & Objectives

- Content Area Targets
  - Reading
  - Math
  - Behavior

- Majority focusing on reading
- Some selected math and/or behavior as well
- Grade levels targeted varied
  - Some chose K or K-1
  - Some chose K-5
Special Thanks

• We would like to offer our gratitude to the graduate assistants who make the intense data collection and analysis that we are attempting possible

Project Website

• http://floridarti.usf.edu

• http://www.nasdse.org

• http://www.florida-rti.org  (Active Fall, 2008)