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Shifts in the Law . . .
Alignment of ESEA and IDEA

- Improved student outcomes
- Effective instruction (highly qualified teachers)
- Early intervention and prevention
- Use of evidence-based interventions
- Use of data (data-driven accountability & data-based decision making)

Shifts in Practice . . .

- Focus on intervention not placement
- Use assessment to identify effective interventions
- Base intervention intensity on student need rather than label or diagnosis
- Make decisions based on student outcomes
- Apply Problem Solving/RtI fluidly
- Every Ed

Shifts in helping paradigm

- Eligibility focus
  - Diagnose and place
  - Getting label = help
- Outcome focus
  - Response to Intervention
  - Matching interventions to student need = help
An Essential **Shift** in Thinking

The central question is not:

“What about the students is causing the performance discrepancy?”

but

“What about the interaction of the curriculum, instruction, learners and learning environment should be altered so that the students will learn?”

This shift alters everything else

Ken Howell

---

**Shift** in Function of Interventions

Test and Place vs. Response to Intervention

- Test & Place
- Interventions
- Monitor Progress
- Consider ESE
- Regular Education

---

Revving it Up - Changing Gears & Scaling Up

- National
  - NCLB
  - IDEA 2004
  - Response to Intervention

- Florida
  - Statewide RtI Plan
  - Florida State Board of Education Rules
  - Differentiated Accountability
  - FDOE funded projects

---

Florida Department of Education

Statewide Response to Instruction/Intervention (RtI)
Tiered Model of School Supports & the Problem-Solving Process

**ACADEMIC and BEHAVIOR SYSTEMS**

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

**Tier 2:** Targeted Interventions & Supports.
More targeted interventions and supplemental support in addition to the core curriculum and school-wide positive behavior program.

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

---

**State-level Infrastructure Development for RtI**

- State Management Group
- State Transformation Team
- Regional RtI Coordinators
- DA Regional RtI Specialists
- District Based Leadership Teams
- School Based Leadership Teams
- School-Based Coaches
- Advisory Committee

---

**Response to Instruction/Intervention (RtI): The Foundation**

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** to guide instruction

National Association of State Directors of Special Education, 2005

Core Principles of RtI

- Frequent data collection on student performance
- Early identification of students at risk
- Early intervention (K-3)
- Multi-tiered model of service delivery
- Research-based, scientifically validated instruction/interventions
- Ongoing progress monitoring - interventions evaluated and modified
- Data-based decision making - all decisions made with data

The “I” in RtI

- RtI is based on the actuality of interventions delivered as intended
- We CANNOT assess RtI if the intervention was not implemented as designed
- Intervention integrity must be ensured and documented
- Integrity and documentation will become part and parcel of procedural safeguards

What is Problem Solving

A systematic and structured process that uses the skills of professionals from different disciplines to develop, implement, and evaluate intervention plans that result in the significant improvement (closing the gap) of student performance.
PS/RtI Relationship

Multiple Levels of PS
- State
- District
- School
- Grade
- Classroom
- Student

PS
 Occurs
 Continually
 Across all tiers
 Of the RtI Model

Step 1 – Problem Identification
What is the problem?

- To identify a problem, we start with three pieces of data
- Expected level of performance
- Student(s) level of performance
- Peer level of performance
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Step 2 - Problem Analysis: Why is it occurring?

- Hypotheses about why the student is not demonstrating the replacement behavior
- Assessment data are collected to validate hypotheses

Step 3 – Intervention Design
Why are we going to do?

- Match intervention type & intensity to student(s), setting, problem
- Interventions must focus on teaching replacement behavior or skill
- Select evidence-based interventions that match context of school/classroom culture
- Provide support for implementation
  - Training/coaching as needed
  - Evaluation of implementation integrity
Step 4: Evaluating the effectiveness of the intervention

- Is intervention evidence-based?
- How effective is this intervention with students from similar backgrounds?
- How intense is the intervention? – the dosage (time and focus of intervention)
- Was the intervention implemented as planned?

Decision Rules: What is a “Sufficient” Response to Intervention

- Positive Response
  - Gap is closing
  - Can extrapolate point at which target student will “come in range” of peers – even if this 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
Decision Rules: What is a “Sufficient” Response to Intervention?

Positive 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

Responses & Intervention Decisions

- Positive
  - Continue intervention with current goal
  - Continue intervention with goal increased
  - Fade intervention to determine if student(s) have acquired functional independence.
Responses & 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.

- **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)

Intervention Integrity Decisions

- Evidence based intervention linked to verified hypothesis planned
- Evidence based intervention implemented
- Student Outcomes (SO) Assessed
- Treatment Integrity (TI) Assessed
- Data-based Decisions
- Continue Intervention
- Implement strategies to promote treatment integrity
- Modify/change Intervention

Who should be involved in problem-solving & response to instruction/intervention (PS/RtI)?

- ANYONE who can meaningfully contribute to the process of addressing the problem.
- For individual student level problems, the team engaging in systematic problem-solving belongs to the individual student, so that the students’ needs dictate who is involved.
"The perfect is the enemy of the good."

Voltaire

Implications for Instruction & Assessment:

Assessment Continuum

Interim

Universal Screening

Diagnostic

Summative

Formative

Progress Monitoring

Benchmark

- Waypoint
- No stakes
- Descriptive outcome
- During teaching
- Feedback

- Endpoint
- High stakes
- A score or grade
- After teaching
- High reliability

Florida Progress Monitoring Tools

- Reading
  - Florida Assessments for Instruction in Reading (FAIR)
  - FCRR - [http://www.fcrr.org](http://www.fcrr.org)

- Math
  - Formative assessments – being developed
  - FCR-STEM - [http://www.fcrstem.org](http://www.fcrstem.org)
### Progress Monitoring Tools in Reading

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Premade probes</th>
<th>Creating probes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Monitoring Basic Skills Progress</td>
<td>Intervention Central</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curricular-based Measurement in Reading (CBM-R)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yearly Progress Pro</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AIMSweb</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mCLASS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edcheckup</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIBELS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>easycbm</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Premade probes
- Monitoring Basic Skills Progress
- mCLASS
- Edcheckup
- DIBELS
- easycbm

### Progress Monitoring Tools in Math

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Premade probes</th>
<th>Creating probes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Monitoring Basic Skills Progress</td>
<td>Intervention Central</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Algebra Assessment and Instruction</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mCLASS Math</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yearly Progress Pro</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accelerated Math</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AIMSweb</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STEEP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edcheckup</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>easycbm</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Premade probes
- Monitoring Basic Skills Progress
- Algebra Assessment and Instruction
- mCLASS Math
- Yearly Progress Pro
- Accelerated Math
- AIMSweb
- STEEP
- Edcheckup
- easycbm

### Thinking Differently

- Aim of assessment is to identify effective interventions
- What information is needed and how will it be obtained must make sense within each unique problem-solving context...this cannot be "prescribed" and applied uniformly.
- Student response drives decisions
- Four steps of Problem Solving & RtI is continual and fluid

### IDEA 2004 and Florida Board of Education Rules

- APlusMath
- The Math Worksheet
IDEA Evaluation Procedures

http://idea.ed.gov/explore/home

General Education Intervention Procedures

Rule 6A-6.0331, F.A.C.

General education intervention procedures

Rule 6A-6.0331(1), F.A.C.

- District responsibility to implement coordinated general education intervention procedures for students needing additional academic and behavioral support to succeed in the general education environment
- District may carry out activities that include the provision of educational and behavioral evaluations, services, and supports as part of general education intervention procedures

General education intervention procedures

Rule 6A-6.0331(1), F.A.C.

- Parent involvement in RtI process
- Observations in educational environment to document areas of concern
- Review of existing data – including attendance
- Screenings – permits screening or assessments for intervention
- Evidence-based interventions
Evidence-based interventions
Rule 6A-6.0331(1)(e), F.A.C.

- Interventions developed through a problem-solving/RtI process
- Interventions implemented as designed for a reasonable period of time
- Level of intervention intensity matched to student need
- RtI data collected – pre-intervention and ongoing progress monitoring
- Progress monitoring data communicated to parents in understandable format

General Education Intervention Memos

- General Education Intervention Requirements for Home Education and Private School Students – June 27, 2008
- General Education Intervention Prior to Referral for Special Education – December 23, 2008

Evaluation procedures
Rule 6A-6.0331, F.A.C.

- District must conduct a full and individual evaluation before initial provision of ESE
- Documentation that general education interventions were implemented prior to request for evaluation
- If parent requests evaluation, district must complete interventions concurrently with evaluation
- Evaluations conducted by qualified examiners
- Establishes evaluation timeline – 60 days from receipt of parent consent
### Evaluation procedures 6A-6.0331(5)
- In conducting an evaluation, the district must:
  - Use a variety of assessment tools and strategies
  - Not use a single measure or assessment as the sole criteria
  - Use technically sound instruments
- District must ensure that assessments are:
  - Nondiscriminatory in selection and administration
  - Provided and administered in the native language
  - Used for purposes for which measures are valid and reliable
  - Administered by qualified personnel in accordance with the test producer’s instructions

### Evaluation procedures 6A-6.0331(5)
- For students with impaired sensory, manual, or speaking skills, assessments are selected and administered so that results accurately reflect the student’s aptitude or achievement level.
- Use assessment tools and strategies that provide information relevant to determining educational need.
- Assess student in all areas of suspected disability.
- Conduct an evaluation that is sufficiently comprehensive to identify all of a student’s ESE needs.

### Additional evaluation requirements 6A-6.0331(8)
- Review existing data including:
  - Evaluation & information provided by parents
  - Classroom, district, and state assessments
  - Observations by teachers & related service providers
- Identify what additional data – if any – are needed to determine:
  - Whether the student is a student with a disability
  - Educational needs of the student
  - Whether the student needs special education and related services

### Determination of eligibility 6A-6.0331(6)
- Made by group of qualified professionals & parent
- Draw on data/information from variety of sources:
  - Aptitude & achievement tests
  - Student response to instruction
  - Input from parent, teacher, & student
  - Socio/cultural background and adaptive skills
- Not eligible if determinant factor is:
  - Lack of appropriate instruction in reading
  - Lack of instruction in math
  - Limited English proficiency
Language Impairment

Shannon Hall-Mills, Ph.D., CCC-SLP
Bureau of Exceptional Education and Student Services
Shannon.Hall-Mills@fldoe.org
(850) 245-0478

IDEA

IDEA defines language impairment as:

- “...a communication disorder, such as stuttering, impaired articulation, a language impairment, or a voice impairment, that adversely affects a child’s educational performance.”

Florida

- Proposed SBER 6A-6.030121 (LI) definition:
  - (1) “Language Impairments are defined as disorders of language that interfere with communication, adversely affect performance and/or functioning in the student’s typical learning environment, and result in the need for exceptional student education services.”
  - (1)(a) “A language impairment is defined as a disorder in one or more of the basic learning processes involved in understanding or in using spoken and/or written language. These include:
    - Phonology
    - Morphology
    - Syntax
    - Semantics
    - Pragmatics
Proposed SBER 6A-6.030121 (LI)

9 sections:
1. Definition
2. Procedures prior to initial valuation for PK
3. Evaluation procedures for PK
4. Eligibility criteria for PK
5. General education intervention procedures & activities for K-12
6. Evaluation procedures for K-12
7. Eligibility criteria for K-12
8. Documentation of determination of eligibility
9. Language services

Common areas

- General education intervention procedures
- Data re: well-delivered scientific, research based Instruction & intervention
- Data-based documentation
- Request consent to evaluate:
  - Inadequate progress
  - Interventions effective but require sustained & substantial effort
  - When referral made
- Repeated measures of performance/functioning @ reasonable intervals, graphic reflection of student response
- Parent involvement 
  - Observations
  - Review of data
  - Vision/hearing screenings
  - EB Interventions
- Despite appropriate instruction & intense individualized interventions
- Documentation of eligibility determination

LI and SLD

LI Rule
SLD Rule

SLPs

- Have specialized knowledge and skills re: language processes of:
  - Listening
  - Speaking
  - Reading
  - Writing
- ...skills critical for developing literacy, numeracy, etc. that students need.
SLP Involvement in RtI

- **When to involve the SLP?** When a student’s academic difficulties are linked to deficiencies in speech, language, and communication skills.
- **How might the SLP be involved?** Three broad areas (ASHA, 2006):
  - Program design
  - Collaboration
  - Service delivery

Resources

- Technical Assistance Paper FY 2006-1: Roles of Speech-Language Pathologists in Regard to Reading
  - [http://www.fldoe.org/ese/tap-home.asp](http://www.fldoe.org/ese/tap-home.asp)
- Language Reading Connection (LRC)
  - [http://rtitlc.ucf.edu/LRC/](http://rtitlc.ucf.edu/LRC/)
- SLP Role in RtI; brochure under development
  - [http://rtitlc.ucf.edu/](http://rtitlc.ucf.edu/)
- American Speech, Language, and Hearing Association; [www.asha.org](http://www.asha.org)
  - Professional Consultant Packets
  - Fact sheets
  - Professional development resources
  - Article links

Specific Learning Disabilities

Does how students qualify matter to you?

- Adopted on January 21, 2009
- Effective as of March 23, 2009
Related Communications & Guidance

- IDEA 2004
- RtI TAP – February 2006
- IDEA Federal Regs – August 2006
- SLD Interim Memo – March 23, 2007 (Revised March 25, 2008)
- General Education Intervention Requirements for Home Education and Private School Students Memo – June 27, 2008
- General Education Interventions – December 23, 2008
- Response to Intervention for Gifted Learners – January 19, 2009
- RtI for Gifted Clarification – February 4, 2009
- Compilation of Stakeholder Concerns & FLDOE Responses – April 22, 2009
- SLD TAP – November 2009

How is the SLD Rule organized?

1. Definition
2. General Education Intervention Procedures and Activities
3. Evaluation
4. Criteria for Eligibility
5. Documentation of Criteria of Eligibility
6. Implementation

Definition

6A-6.03018 (1)

- Manifests in difficulties affecting ability to listen, speak, read, write, and/or do mathematics
- Associated conditions may include but are not limited to...perceptual disabilities...dyslexia, dyscalculia, dysgraphia...
- Not primarily the result of...environmental, cultural, or economic factors

General Education Intervention Activities

6A-6.03018 (2)

- To ensure that lack of progress is not due to lack of appropriate instruction...
- Data that demonstrate that the student was provided well-delivered scientific, research-based instruction delivered by qualified personnel in general education settings
- Data-based documentation, provided to parent, of repeated measures of achievement at reasonable intervals, graphically reflecting student’s RtI during instruction
- Requirements in 6A-6.0331 may satisfy
Evaluation
6A-6.03018 (3)

- Request parental consent to evaluate if
  - Student has not had adequate response to intervention or
  - Effective interventions require sustained and substantial effort and
  - Whenever referral is made
- Adhere to timelines in general rule unless mutual agreement to extend

Criteria for Eligibility
6A-6.03018 (4)

- Does not achieve adequately in one or more of the major areas
- Does not achieve adequately based on RtI process, consistent with comprehensive evaluation procedures OR RtI process and pattern of strengths and weaknesses (both include comprehensive evaluation per administrative rules)
- Findings not primarily result of other factors
- Team must include: General education teacher, person qualified to conduct and interpret individual diagnostic examinations, District Designee
- At least one observation in typical learning environment

Criteria for Eligibility
6A-6.03018 (4)

- Does not achieve adequately in one or more of the major areas
- Does not achieve adequately based on RtI process, consistent with comprehensive evaluation procedures OR RtI process and pattern of strengths and weaknesses (both include comprehensive evaluation per administrative rules)
- Findings not primarily result of other factors
- Team must include: General education teacher, person qualified to conduct and interpret individual diagnostic examinations, District Designee
- At least one observation in typical learning environment

Documentation of determination of eligibility
6A-6.03018 (5)

- Written summary of group’s analysis
  - Basis for determination, noted behavior during observation, medical findings
  - RtI data confirming: performance discrepancy, rate of progress, educational need
  - Effects of other factors
  - Interventions, support provided, duration, frequency, student data
  - Parent involvement
  - Signatures of agreement
Implementation

- SP&P identifies applicable process school-by-school
- Effective July 1, 2010, districts can no longer require pattern of strengths and weaknesses as allowed in option B
- For schools using process #2, description of relevant pattern must be included in written summary
- 26 Districts chose option A
- 46 Districts chose interim option B

Florida SLD Criteria for Eligibility
(until July 1, 2010)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Condition 1</th>
<th>Condition 2</th>
<th>Condition 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Underachievement in: Oral expression Listening comprehension Written expression Basic reading skills Reading fluency skills Reading comprehension Mathematics Calculation Mathematics problem-solving</td>
<td>Rtl: Resource intensive or insufficient response to scientific, research-based intervention</td>
<td>Conditions 1 and 2 not primarily the result of: Visual, hearing or motor disability Intellectual disability Emotional/Behavioral disability Cultural factors Irregular attendance Environmental or economic disadvantage Classroom behavior Limited English proficiency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+</td>
<td>or</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Florida SLD Criteria for Eligibility
(after July 1, 2010)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Condition 1</th>
<th>Condition 2</th>
<th>Condition 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Underachievement in: Oral expression Listening comprehension Written expression Basic reading skills Reading fluency skills Reading comprehension Mathematics Calculation Mathematics problem-solving</td>
<td>Rtl &amp; Pattern of Strengths/Weaknesses: Rtl &amp; pattern of strengths and weaknesses relevant to identifying SLD</td>
<td>Conditions 1 and 2 not primarily the result of: Visual, hearing or motor disability Intellectual disability Emotional/Behavioral disability Cultural factors Irregular attendance Environmental or economic disadvantage Classroom behavior Limited English proficiency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+</td>
<td>or</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Collection of Current Technical Assistance

NEW SLD Web link on the BEESS Web site featuring related rules, technical assistance, documents, and Web sites:
http://www.fldoe.org/ese/sldr.asp
**Analysis Activity: Quality Implementation & Self-assessment Procedural Compliance**

- Handouts
  - Compliance Self-Assessment Excerpt
  - DRAFT Technical Assistance Paper Q&A
  - Relevant Rules (FINAL)
  - Coversheet for the required Written Summary of the Group’s Analysis
  - Self-assessment/TAP Crosswalk
- Read, Reflect, Discuss, and Report

---

**Our District’s Journey: PS/RtI**

*From: Knowing*  
*To: Understanding*  
*To: Learning By Doing*  
*To: Being*

---

**Large Scale Reform**

“There is a growing problem in large-scale reform; namely, the **terms** travel well, but the underlying **conceptualization** and **thinking** do not.”

Michael Fullan

---

**Educators will embrace new ideas when two conditions exist:**

- They understand the **NEED** for the idea
- They perceive that they either have the **SKILLS** to implement the idea OR they have the **SUPPORT** to develop the skills
Visible Learning, Sustainable Implementation

“Teams are committed to working collaboratively in ongoing processes of problem solving and action research in order to achieve better results for the students they serve.”

Visible Learning, SI Scenic Vistas
- Clarify what students must learn
- Gather evidence of student learning
- Analyze that evidence
- Identify the most powerful teaching strategies
- Build time for collaborative reflection

Hattie, 2009 Visible Learning

TIER I: Visible Learning

Tier 1 C-I-A
GOAL: 85% of students achieve at high levels.

Tier 1: Implementing well researched programs and practices demonstrated to produce good outcomes for the majority of students.

Tier 1: Effective if at least 80% are meeting benchmarks with access to Core/Universal Instruction.

Tier 1 begins with clear goals:
1. What exactly do we expect all students to learn?
2. How will we know when they’ve learned it?
3. How will 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 I: Visible Learning for ALL

Curriculum-Instruction-Assessment Cycle

- Standards-driven system of curriculum
- High quality, research-based instructional practices
- Appropriate use of formative and summative practices and scores
- Responsive to the instructional needs of students
  - Differentiation & movement of students
  - Accessible instructional materials
  - Accessible multimedia
  - Academic and Social-Emotional Learning

Decision Making Rubric for use with School-Wide Screening

- Are over 20% of students struggling?
- Are between 5% and 20% of students struggling?
- Are 5% or fewer students struggling?
- Examine organization, curriculum, instruction, and environment for needed changes or adaptations
  - Go to problem definition
  - Develop small group intervention
  - Go to intervention evaluation

When Top-Down Works

- Grade-wide/Course
  - School-wide & Subgroups
    - Classwide
    - Groups
    - Individual Students

Big IDEAS - Common Formative Assessments

- Percentage of students that have demonstrated mastery
- Identify which students have not demonstrated mastery of essential standards
- Identify effective instructional practices
- Identify patterns in student mistakes
- Plan and target intervention
- Id students in need to additional help
Classroom Performance Report

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Number Correct</th>
<th>Percent Correct</th>
<th>LS Correct</th>
<th>LS 2 d</th>
<th>LS 2 c</th>
<th>LS 2 e</th>
<th>LS 2 h</th>
<th>LS 2 a</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>30</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>29</td>
<td>96.67%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
<td>43.33%</td>
<td>33.33%</td>
<td>33.33%</td>
<td>33.33%</td>
<td>33.33%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>19</td>
<td>63.33%</td>
<td>63.33%</td>
<td>63.33%</td>
<td>63.33%</td>
<td>63.33%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td>33</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td>27</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td>28</td>
<td>93.33%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td>25</td>
<td>83.33%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td>25</td>
<td>83.33%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td>30</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td>25</td>
<td>83.33%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td>25</td>
<td>83.33%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td>25</td>
<td>83.33%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Averages</td>
<td></td>
<td>26.7</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Assessments
- Formative and Summative Processes
- Forms of Assessment
- Obrusive
- Unobtrusive
- Uses of Assessment
- Summative Scores
- Summative Scores
- Instructional Feedback
- You can never rely on a single assessment
Where SOES started

- Traditional System & Thinking
  - Focus on individual students
  - Large referral rates to special education/low eligibility rates
  - Two separate kingdoms (General Ed vs. ESE)

- Weekly SBIT & TBIT
  - Each teacher team brought up 3 students to SBIT twice a year for individualized interventions
  - Teachers also discussed individual students at TBIT

- Quarterly Progress Monitoring Meetings
  - Reviewed student data one-by-one

Where SOES is Today

Engaging in Tier I, Tier II, & Tier III Problem Solving School Wide

- Using existing meetings to engage in problem solving
- Using new documentation to reflect the process of problem solving
- Assigned SBLT members to specific grade levels as PS/RtI consultants and meeting facilitators
Tier I Problem Solving

- **When:**
  - During grade level meetings & TBIT meetings (if needed)
- **What:**
  - Data sources
    - FCAT
    - FAIR (previously used DIBELS)
    - 1st – 5th Math Benchmark Assessment
    - Fast Track for 4/5
  - Demand writing based on the “Florida Writes” Rubric
- **Who:**
  - SBLT members present grade wide data and guiding questions

---

**INTERVENTION PLAN**

Who is this intervention plan being developed for? Whole grade group (Tier I?) and targeted group (Tier II?)

What is the replacement behavior/target? FLUENCY with letter/sound identification

What is the verified hypothesis?

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tier 1</th>
<th>What will be done?</th>
<th>Who is responsible?</th>
<th>When will it occur?</th>
<th>How will progress be monitored?</th>
<th>Support plan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Utilize more phonics activities</td>
<td>K Teacher</td>
<td>Throughout instructional routine</td>
<td>Perform additional phonics instruction (daily) and assess progress with McGraw-Hill's assessment tools</td>
<td>Same as above</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phonological awareness practice opportunities</td>
<td>K Teacher</td>
<td>During guided reading</td>
<td>Perform additional phonics instruction (daily) and assess progress with McGraw-Hill's assessment tools</td>
<td>Same as above</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tier 2 (if needed)</th>
<th>What will be done?</th>
<th>Who is responsible?</th>
<th>When will it occur?</th>
<th>How will progress be monitored?</th>
<th>Support plan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Additional practice with phonics</td>
<td>K Teacher</td>
<td>3 days a week</td>
<td>Perform additional phonics instruction (daily) and assess progress with McGraw-Hill's assessment tools</td>
<td>Same as above</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**The Impact after Tier I Problem Solving**

1st Benchmark Assessment

- PSF: 26%
- NWF: 29%

2nd Benchmark Assessment

- PSF: 27%
- NWF: 29%
Leadership Teams at Visible Learning

- How effective is the core curriculum/instructional routine for all students?
- How effective is the core curriculum/instructional routine for subgroups of students?
- Do data indicate areas in need of professional development/interventions for the entire grade?
- Have we identified ways to provide a first dose of differentiated instruction in our Tier I?
- Which students may require additional intervention?

Supplemental Supports, Resource Allocation

“It is disingenuous for any school to claim its purpose is to help all students learn at high levels and then fail to create a system of interventions to give struggling learners additional time and support for learning.”

Du Four

What we are learning...

- Teachers are Knowledge Learners – Loose/Tight
- Student achievement gains are influenced by organizational variables beyond the skills of individual teachers
- We must embed systematic processes to impact professional practices – invitation won’t work
- Nothing changes the mind like seeing real life data
- Transparency of results creates positive peer pressure
- We must protect time to meet
- Teaming does lead to more consistency and ownership

TIER II: Supplemental Supports

Tier II C-I-A  
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?
**TIER II: Supplemental Supports**

- Is in addition to and in alignment with the district core instruction/universal program
- More instruction to support acquisition of learning
- More strategic instruction
  - Additional modeling and guided practice
  - More Scaffolding
  - Smaller Groups
  - Immediate corrective feedback
- Ongoing data determines need to continue, discontinue, or change
- Does NOT replace core

---

**TIER II: Problem Solving**

- **When:**
  - During TBIT meetings
    - We can continue to solve Tier I and Tier II depending on what the data is telling us
- **What:**
  - Data Sources
    - Same as Tier I + teacher data from small groups
    - Data collected in the classrooms such as Running Records/teacher observations
- **Who:**
  - Assigned member of SBLT facilitates meeting
    - Team or classwide data
    - Uses guiding questions to facilitate the discussion
Problem Identification: What is the problem?

Target Skill -
What would we like our students to do? (Phonemic Awareness, Phonics, Comprehension strategy, Number Sense, Geometry, etc.)
Pick ONE skill to target that impacts the largest number of students in need of Tier 2 supports on your team.

This group of students need to improve their retelling/comprehension skills

Expected Level: What is the grade-level expectation in the target area? (Running Records, Fast Track, 4 Traits, etc.)
RR: 3 - 4 Retell Expectation: 3

Name the students who are not meeting Expected Levels in this skill on your team?
Dora
Shrek
Diego
Fiona

Current Level: Give a range of scores for the students listed above (Running Records, Fast Track, 4 Traits, etc.)
These 4 students have RR Rebus - 2
Retell is 1 - 2

Problem Analysis: Why isn’t the skill we want to see occurring?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What academic skills do we want to see that are not being displayed in this group of students?</th>
<th>Why are the academic skills not being demonstrated with this entire group of students?</th>
<th>If ______ occurred the group of students would demonstrate the necessary academic skills.</th>
<th>What Data Should We Collect to confirm these problems and to monitor the group of students’ progress over time?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>These students are not displaying comprehension skills including difficulty with summarization and sequence of events.</td>
<td>These students need increased exposure to summarization and sequencing strategies as well as more exposure to graphic organizers.</td>
<td>MHH Weekly Assessments: Show what you know. FAIR - Broad Screen, Targeted Diagnostics.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

INTERVENTION DEVELOPMENT

Specify the skills you want to see improved as a result of your intervention. (Replacement Behavior/Target Skill)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What will be done? (Intervention)</th>
<th>Who is responsible for implementing the intervention?</th>
<th>When will the intervention occur? (Days of Week, Time period)</th>
<th>How often will progress be monitored? (using the data you mentioned above)</th>
<th>What support do I need to make the interventions happen? (e.g., Materials, professional development)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Leadership Teams at Supplemental Supports

- How will we provide supplemental supports for students who experience difficulty in a way that is timely, directive and systematic?
- How will we enrich and extend the learning for the students who already know it?
- How will we evaluate supplemental supports?
- Have we allocated the resources to respond to our students? Have we designated time?
- Which students may require additional intervention?

Assessments

- Increased frequency
- Formative Process
- Forms of Assessment
  - Obtrusive
  - Unobtrusive
- Uses of Assessment
  - Formative Scores
  - Summative Scores
  - Instructional Feedback
- You can never rely on a single assessment

What we are learning...

- Many barriers will appear
  - We don’t have the resources
  - We don’t have the money to hire new staff
  - We don’t have the time in the schedule
  - We can’t use another “program”
- Go back to the fundamental purpose to make it happen
- Clearly define and evaluate Tier II Levels of Support
- Use a standard treatment protocol with FIDELITY
  - Timely, Directive and Systematic (Du Four)
- Use the problem solving framework to make it happen
Intensive Supports, Catch-Up Growth

“High expectations for success will be judged not only by the initial staff beliefs, and behaviors, but also by the organization’s response when some students don’t learn”

Larry Lezotte, 1991

TIER III: Intensive Supports

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 them to be?
3. How long do we have to get them 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.

Response to Intervention: **Good**

GOOD RtI: Can this student be moved to a less restrictive tier? (slope)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Observed Trajectory</th>
<th>Expected Trajectory</th>
<th>Classroom</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum &amp; Instruction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Response to Intervention: **Questionable**

If steady progress, but not adequate slope:

What else does this student need in order to reach the goal? Look at the diagnostic data.

Is there new, relevant diagnostic data that needs to be considered?

Caution

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Observed Trajectory</th>
<th>Expected Trajectory</th>
<th>Classroom</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum &amp; Instruction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Response to Intervention: Poor

If progress not sufficient / inadequate slope:
Does this student need more intensive intervention? What should it look like?
Review the diagnostic data. Is there new relevant diagnostic data that needs to be considered?

Curriculum & Instruction

Expected Trajectory

Caution

Observed Trajectory

Time

Caution

TIER III: Intensive Supports

When:
- During SBIT meetings
- Students who are brought up to SBIT:
- Students not responding to Tier I & Tier II interventions
- ESE students who are not making progress towards their IEP goals
- Students being revisited from last year
- Retained students

What:
- Data Sources:
- Tier I and II Formative and Summative Data
- Parent input
- Student’s school records

Who:
- SBIT Meeting is facilitated by a member of SBLT Team

Meeting Date:

Student- Based Intervention Team (SBIT): Problem Solving Worksheet

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student</th>
<th>Team</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grade:</td>
<td>Date of Birth:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Retained:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>IEP:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strengths</th>
<th>Concerns</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| "Skills to be developed:"

I. PROBLEM ID: DATA: Where are they? Where should they be? How big is the gap?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Current Levels</th>
<th>Peer Levels</th>
<th>EXPECTED Levels</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[Date: 2/20]</td>
<td>[Date]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

II. HYPOTHESES/PROBLEM ANALYSIS: Why is it happening?
(Instruction, Curriculum, Environment, Learner)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hypotheses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Observation Results:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Screening Results:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Assessments

- More Diagnostic, More Frequent
- More Formative and Summative Processes
- Forms of Assessment
  - Obtrusive
  - Unobtrusive
- Uses of Assessment
  - Formative Scores
  - Summative Scores
  - Instructional Feedback
- You can never rely on a single assessment
Continuous Improvement, Transparency Rules

“There is no way continuous improvement can occur without constant transparency fueled by good information. Effective organizations create systems to ensure clear and continuous display of results and clear and continuous access to practice – that is, what is being done to get the results”

Fullan, 2008

Big-Ideas FIRST STEPS...

What is our purpose? What is the task we are to accomplish?

- Define our purpose as ensuring ALL students will learn, rather than as student will be taught
- We work together collaboratively – not in isolation
- Create systematic interventions that give students extra time and support for learning
- Build continuous improvement processes into routine team practices
- Create a results oriented culture by engaging in formative and summative processes

ESE Eligibility: Two Worlds Colliding?!?
RtI & ESE Eligibility: BIG IDEAS

- Evidence of implementation fidelity: TIERED SUPPORTS
- Evidence of effectiveness/reach of Tier I and Tier II
- Formative and Summative Practices (i.e., progress monitoring, diagnostic, outcome data...)
- Intensity of supports necessary to maintain acceptable rates of learning
- Absence of acceptable student learning (peers; benchmark)
- Exclusionary Factors

- Dual Discrepancy Criteria
- Pre-post intervention:
  - Level of Performance
  - Rate of Growth
- RtI data is graphed and analyzed in a defensible manner

Areas of Debate:

- How much student learning is acceptable? Under what conditions?
- How many evidence based interventions are needed? For how long?

Our Story

- ESE, RtI, SS, CIS
- Reflection and Dialogue:
  - General Education Intervention Memo
  - SLD Technical Assistance Paper
  - Clear connections
- Considered Implications
- Generated Questions
- Determined Next Steps

Our Story (Cont.)

- Communicated compelling why with schools
- Team reviewed all open cases at the District Office:
  - Where are we as a District?
    - What are the “look fors” and “ask abouts”?
  - Goal: Consistent and Defensible Decisions
  - Commendations
  - Concerns/Recommendations
  - Action Plan
- Feedback to Schools: Next Steps

Our Story (Cont.)

- School Visits: Educating Teams using their own cases
- Parent Requests: Assisting schools to communicate and make decisions
- RtI Matrix: Emphasizing Big Ideas
- PS/RtI Subcommittee: ASCIS, CIS, SS, RtI, ESE
- Monthly meetings to trouble shoot
- Ongoing Professional Development - Knowledge and Skills
CASE EXAMPLE

Do you have everything you need?

- Evidence of lack of response to reasonable general education interventions
- Evidence of severe discrepancy from peer’s performance levels in the area(s) of concern
- A data-based description of resources necessary to improve and maintain the individual’s rate of learning at an acceptable level
- Convergent evidence logically and empirically supporting the team’s decisions

Student: Male
Grade: 2nd
Age: 8-9

History:
- At SOES since 2006-07
- No prior retention
- Pre-school experience

I DO - CASE EXAMPLE

- Attendance: No concerns
- ODR: No concerns
- Health: No concerns
- Subgroups: 1 – HISPANIC
- PMP: Reading and Writing
- Areas of Concern:
  - Decoding Unknown Words
  - Fluency
  - Reading Comprehension
  - Focus

Lexile Scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The students below are Hispanic students in STUDENT’s grade at Imangi Place Elementary</th>
<th>Lexile Scores from May 2009</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>927</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>894</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>893</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>749</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>539</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>441</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Median (MEDIAN SCORE) 401

| Male | 328 |
| Female | 296 |
| Male | 287 |
| Female | 244 |
| Male | 193 |
| Female | 115 |

STUDENT 108

Problem ID

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Current Levels</th>
<th>Peer Levels</th>
<th>Expected Levels (Spring)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reading</td>
<td>Reading</td>
<td>Reading</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIBELS</td>
<td>DIBELS</td>
<td>DIBELS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ORF: 46 word read correctly (WRC)</td>
<td>ORF: 82 WRC</td>
<td>ORF: 90 WRC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NWF: 43 phonemes read correctly</td>
<td>NWF: Not measured</td>
<td>NWF: 50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Running Record: 14</td>
<td>Running Record: 28</td>
<td>Running Record: 28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The students below are Hispanic students in STUDENT's grade at Imaginary Place Elementary
Lexile Score from May 2009
male  992
male  884
female  785
male  593
male  540
female  539
male  443
Male**(Median Score)  405***
male  328
female  296
male  287
male  244
female  198
male  110
STUDENT 108
Assessments

- Formative and Summative Process
- Forms of Assessment
  - Obtrusive
  - Unobtrusive
- Uses of Assessment
  - Formative Scores
    - Instructional Planning
    - Instructional Feedback
    - Response to Intervention
  - Summative Scores
    - Response to Intervention
- Exclusionary Factors
- You can never rely on a single assessment

WE ALL LEARN

“Ultimately there are two kinds of schools; learning enriched schools and learning-impoverished schools. I have yet to see a school where the learning curves...of the adults were steep upward and those of the students were not. Teachers and students go hand and hand as learners...or they don’t go at all”

Rolland Barth, (2001)

Thank You!!!
Why not go out on a limb?
Isn’t that where the fruit is?
- Frank Scully

Panoramic View

Florida’s PS/RtI Scale-up Status
- State Transformation Team Update
- Project Updates
  - PS/RtI
  - RtI-TLC
  - RtIB-PBS

Response to Instruction/Intervention (RtI):
The Foundation

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 to guide instruction

National Association of State Directors of Special Education, 2005
Stay Informed & Access PS/RtI Resources

- BEESS Weekly Newsletter
- BEESS Florida’s RtI Website: http://www.florida-rti.org/
  - News and Events
  - Resources (ex., RtI Parent Brochure)
  - State Plan
  - On-line Professional Development
  - Partnerships
- Three Statewide Projects:
  - PS/RtI Pilot Project: http://floridarti.usf.edu/
  - RtI-TLC Project: http://rtitlc.ucf.edu/
  - PBS Project: http://flpbs.fmhi.usf.edu/

Resource CD - Overview

- FL RtI Web site
- BEESS SLD Web site
- Professional Development
- Evidence Based Practices & Implementation
- Response to Intervention
- Learning Disabilities & Eligibility Rules
- Tools

Activity: Think, Pair, Share

- To what degree has your organization effectively addressed awareness and consensus-building for these concepts? How do you know?
- What examples do you have a infrastructure in place to support the implementation of the SLD Rule? How can you contribute to building supports at the “system” level?
- What critical issues have you and your team identified related to implementing PS/RtI, specifically as it applies to SLD eligibility decisions?
- What ACTION ITEM have you formulated as a result of this workshop?

Results?
Why, man, I have gotten a lot of results. I now know several thousand things that won’t work.
- Thomas Edison
Thank you for attending!