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Overview

- Overview of Response to Intervention
- Implementing a Response to Intervention model
- Using DIBELS® for systems-wide consultation and evaluating response to intervention with an Outcomes-Driven Model
For Whom Would You Use RTI?

- Amy is a second grader who has been referred for a special education evaluation by her teacher due to low academic achievement.
- Miguel is a new bilingual student in Ms. Frizzle’s first grade classroom (in a school with few other bilingual students). Ms. Frizzle does not know how to support Miguel in learning to read.
- Sander is a third grade student referred to the educational support team for behavior problems.
- Mica is a kindergarten child who has difficulty following directions and attending during group activities. His teacher has referred him for an “ADHD evaluation.”
What is Response to Intervention?

1. An alternative approach to determine eligibility for learning disability under IDEA 2004:
   - Response to intervention (RTI) functions as an alternative for learning disability (LD) evaluations within the general evaluation requirements of IDEA 2004 (20 U.S.C 1414 (B)(6)(A)) .
   - IDEA 2004 adds a new concept in eligibility that prohibits children from being found eligible for special education if they have not received instruction in reading that includes the five essential components of reading instruction identified by the Reading First Program. RTI is included under this general umbrella.
What is Response to Intervention?

2. An approach for maximizing student learning/progress through sensitive measurement of effects of instruction:
   – Diagnostic teaching
   – Precision teaching
   – Problem-solving model
   – Outcomes-driven model
Description of RTI

• Students are provided with “generally effective” instruction by classroom teacher.
• Progress of students receiving general education is monitored.
• Students who do not respond are identified.
• “Nonresponders” to general education instruction receive something else or something more, either from teacher or someone else.
• Progress of students receiving “something else/more” is monitored.

Eligibility approach: Those who do not respond qualify for special education/evaluation.

Maximize learning approach: Those who do not respond get “something else/more” until they respond.
Underlying Assumptions of RTI

• Eligibility Model
  – Disabilities are due to within child factors and are intractable.
  – There are children who are “nonresponders.”
  – Goal is special education placement.

• Maximize Learning Model
  – Most children can learn when provided with effective instruction.
  – There are children for whom we have not yet found effective interventions.
  – Goal is to find the “match,” i.e., instructional approach/strategies effective for the individual student.
Our View:

• Inadequate response to intervention is NOT a defensible endpoint.
• Response to intervention IS a defensible means to maximize student learning and progress.
When and for Whom Should RTI be Used?

• All students
• Within a prevention-oriented system of progress monitoring and evaluating system-wide effectiveness: Outcomes Driven Model
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ODM Step</th>
<th>Decisions/Questions</th>
<th>Data</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Identify Need</td>
<td>Are there students who may need support? How many? Which students?</td>
<td>Screening data (DIBELS Benchmark data)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Validate Need</td>
<td>Are we confident that the identified students need support?</td>
<td>Diagnostic assessment data and additional information as needed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Plan and Implement Support</td>
<td>What level of support for which students? How to group students? What goals, specific skills, curriculum/program, instructional strategies?</td>
<td>Diagnostic assessment data and additional information as needed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Evaluate and Modify Support</td>
<td>Is the support effective for individual students?</td>
<td>Progress Monitoring data (DIBELS progress monitoring data)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Evaluate Outcomes</td>
<td>As a school/district: How effective is our core (benchmark) support? How effective is our supplemental (strategic) support? How effective is our intervention (intensive) support?</td>
<td>Outcome Assessment information (DIBELS Benchmark data)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Outcomes-Driven Model

1. Identify Need for Support
2. Validate Need for Support
3. Plan Support
4. Evaluate Effectiveness of Support
5. Implement Support
6. Review Outcomes

- Screening (Benchmark Assessment)
- Additional information as needed
- Assess strengths/needs
- Progress monitoring
- Outcome Assessment (Benchmark Assessment)
Why Use a RTI Approach? (Why Use the ODM?)

- Preventive: Provides help more quickly to more students
- Inclusive: Focuses on success for all students
- Instructionally relevant: Keeps focus on student learning; shift away from labeling
- Cost effective: Reduces need for special education
- Collaborative: Increases teaming and integration of services
What are Critical Components of an Effective RTI Model?

• Team approach
• Specification of system of support
• Specification of procedures for RTI
  – Model of RTI
  – Measurement
  – Intervention fidelity
  – Criteria for effectiveness
Team Approach: Who Should be on the Team?

• Everyone who has a vested interest in this student’s success, for example:
  – Classroom teachers
  – Parents
  – Title/Resource teachers
  – Special Education teachers
  – Speech/language pathologists
  – School psychologists
  – Reading coaches/specialists
  – Principals
School-Wide System of Support

- We recommend that RTI be implemented within a clearly specified school-wide system of instruction and support.
School-wide System of Instruction and Support: Three Levels (Tiers) of Support

- Continuum of generally effective services of varying intensity
Specifying a System of Support

- Who will receive what intervention, by whom, for what amount of time, when?
- What materials and strategies will be used?
- What measures will be used for progress monitoring?
- How frequently will progress monitoring occur?
- What criteria will be used to determine effectiveness of intervention?
Specify Procedures for RTI

• RTI Model
• Measures
• Intervention Fidelity
• Criteria for determining effectiveness (adequate responsiveness)
RTI Models

• Standard protocol
  – Student receives specified intervention program for specified amount of time (e.g., Read Well for 12 weeks)

• Individual Problem solving
  – Student receives individually designed intervention program
Measurement for RTI

- State-wide or group achievement tests
- Individually administered achievement tests
- Curriculum-based assessments
- General outcome measures
  - Curriculum-Based Measurement
  - Dynamic Indicators of Basic Early Literacy Skills
  - Individual Growth and Development Indicators
Fidelity of Intervention Implementation

• We must measure fidelity of implementation of interventions at all levels of the continuum
  – *Who* will measure treatment integrity?
  – *How* will treatment integrity be measured?
Determining Effectiveness

Option 1: Final status

– Test students after intervention, apply a standard, and separate the “responders” from the “non-responders”
  • Ending in the average range on a norm-referenced measure
  • Ending at or above an established benchmark criterion
Determining Effectiveness

• Option 2: Growth Models
  – Repeatedly test students during intervention, establish growth trajectories, and separate the “responders” from the “non-responders”.
    • Compare the student’s actual rate of progress to the expected rate of progress, based on a normative framework.
    • Compare the student’s actual rate of progress to a limited normative framework (e.g., other students receiving intensive intervention).
    • Compare the student’s actual rate of progress to the expected rate of progress, based on a criterion for acceptable growth.
Reading Trajectories of Low and Middle Readers
Grades 1-6

© 2006, Dynamic Measurement Group
Example of Oral Reading Fluency Growth Rates*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Minimum growth rate</th>
<th>Slope of benchmark targets (growth per week)</th>
<th>Maximum growth rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>1.36</td>
<td>1.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td>1.31</td>
<td>1.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td>1.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td>1.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>1.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>1.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>0.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>0.84</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Based on average growth rates.
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Plan Support: Aimline for Brandon

The **aimline** connects where you are to where you want to get to, and shows the course to follow to get there.

© 2006, Dynamic Measurement Group
# Effectiveness Report: Classroom Kindergarten Mid to End of Year

**Sneezy Elementary: Ms. White PM Class**

**Dynamic Indicators of Basic Early Literacy Skills**

**Summary of Effectiveness by Class**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District: Seven Dwarfs Public Schools</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>School: Sneezy Elementary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date:       January, 2004–2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class:      Ms. White PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step:       Middle of Kindergarten to End of Kindergarten</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Effectiveness of Intensive Support Program</th>
<th>Effectiveness of Strategic Support Program</th>
<th>Effectiveness of Core Curriculum and Instruction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students at Intensive at Middle of Year</td>
<td>Students at Strategic at Middle of Year</td>
<td>Students at Benchmark at Middle of Year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle PSF Score</td>
<td>End PSF Score</td>
<td>Check If Reached</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>☺</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Determining Effectiveness

• Option 3: Dual Focus on Final Status and Growth
  – Combination of previous approaches; requires repeated assessment of student skills throughout intervention and assessment of final status after intervention
  – Evaluate responsiveness by comparing the student’s actual rate of growth to an expected rate of growth based on a normative/criterion framework and considering whether the student’s final status meets an established benchmark criterion
Our Thoughts

• To promote positive outcomes and reading success for all students:
  – We need to evaluate effectiveness of the instructional context, i.e., the system of support.
  – We need to use a standard-protocol approach in combination with a problem-solving approach.
  – We need to use established (i.e., normative and/or research-based) outcomes criteria.
How to Put it all Together

• DIBELS® as a tool for Systems-Wide Consultation and Evaluating Response to Intervention
  – Evaluating system effectiveness
  – Evaluating student responsiveness to intervention within a system
Using DIBELS in a Systems-Wide RTI Standard Protocol + Problem-Solving Approach

• Benchmark assess all students 3 times per year.
• Review effectiveness of system of support/intervention each benchmark period.
• Identify (and validate) students needing additional support each benchmark period.
• For students needing additional support, implement & monitor response to a predetermined research-based intervention.
• If response is not adequate, develop & implement an intervention designed for the individual needs of the student.
• If response is not adequate, modify intervention and continue implementation.
• If response continues to be inadequate, student may need special education support.
• Continue to modify intervention and evaluate responsiveness until the desired outcomes are achieved.
District: Test District  
School: All Schools  
Data: 2001-2002  
Step: Beginning of 1st Grade to Middle of 1st Grade

### Summary of Effectiveness by District

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District</th>
<th>School</th>
<th>Data</th>
<th>Step</th>
<th>Percentage of Total Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Test District</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>2001-2002</td>
<td>Beginning of 1st Grade to Middle of 1st Grade</td>
<td>64%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Intensive at Beginning of Year

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Instructional Recommendation</th>
<th>Mid-Year Deficit</th>
<th>Mid-Year Emerging</th>
<th>Mid-Year Established</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Test District</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Instructional Recommendation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Strategic at Beginning of Year

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Instructional Recommendation</th>
<th>Mid-Year Deficit</th>
<th>Mid-Year Emerging</th>
<th>Mid-Year Established</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Test District</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Instructional Recommendation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Benchmark at Beginning of Year

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Instructional Recommendation</th>
<th>Mid-Year Deficit</th>
<th>Mid-Year Emerging</th>
<th>Mid-Year Established</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Test District</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Instructional Recommendation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### School Names

- Test District
- Adams
- Garfield
- Jefferson
- Lincoln
- McKinley
- Washington
4 Ways to Achieve Adequate Responsiveness to Intervention

**Time 1 (e.g., Fall)**

- **Intensive**
  - At-Risk
  - 1. Some Risk
  - 2. Low Risk

- **Strategic**
  - At-Risk
  - Some Risk
  - 3. Low Risk

- **Benchmark**
  - At-Risk
  - Some Risk
  - 4. Low Risk

**Time 2 (e.g., Winter)**
What is an Effective System of Support?

• **Benchmark Students**
  – *Effective core curriculum & instruction* should:
    • support **95%** of benchmark students to achieve each literacy goal.

• **Strategic Students**
  – *Effective supplemental support* should:
    • support **80%** of strategic students to achieve each literacy goal.

• **Intensive Students**
  – *Effective interventions* should:
    • support **80%** of intensive students to achieve the goal or achieve emerging or some risk status.
Example: Washington Elementary

First Grade Classroom #3
Cassandra
Using DIBELS in a Systems-Wide RTI Standard Protocol + Problem-Solving Approach

- Benchmark assess all students 3 times per year.
- Review effectiveness of system of support/intervention each benchmark period.
- Identify (and validate) students needing additional support each benchmark period.
- For students needing additional support, implement & monitor response to a predetermined research-based intervention.
- If response is not adequate, develop & implement an intervention designed for the individual needs of the student.
- If response is not adequate, modify intervention and continue implementation.
- If response continues to be inadequate, student may need special education support.
- *Continue to modify intervention and evaluate responsiveness until the desired outcomes are achieved.*
### Dynamic Indicators of Basic Early Literacy Skills
#### Summary of Effectiveness by District

**District:** Test District  
**School:** All Schools  
**Date:** 2001-2002  
**Step:** Beginning of 1st Grade to Middle of 1st Grade

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Benchmark Status on NWF</th>
<th>Intensive at Beginning of Year to Middle of First Instructional Recommendation</th>
<th>Strategic at Beginning of Year to Middle of First Instructional Recommendation</th>
<th>Benchmark at Beginning of Year to Middle of First Instructional Recommendation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Test District</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Count</strong></td>
<td>49 Students Intensive at Beginning of 1st 12.1% of Total Students 11 18 15</td>
<td>101 Students Strategic at Beginning of 1st 24.9% of Total Students 11 44 46</td>
<td>256 Students Benchmark at Beginning of 1st 63.1% of Total Students 4 43 209</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>% of Instructional Recommendation</strong></td>
<td>32.7% 36.7% 30.6%</td>
<td>10.9% 43.6% 45.5%</td>
<td>1.6% 16.8% 81.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>% of Total</strong></td>
<td>3.9% 4.4% 3.7%</td>
<td>2.7% 10.8% 11.3%</td>
<td>1% 10.6% 51.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Adams</strong></td>
<td>5 Students Intensive at Beginning of 1st 6.8% of Total Students 1 3 1</td>
<td>18 Students Strategic at Beginning of 1st 24.7% of Total Students 11 4 41</td>
<td>50 Students Benchmark at Beginning of 1st 68.5% of Total Students 1 8 41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Count</strong></td>
<td>20% 60% 20%</td>
<td>16.7% 61.1% 22.2%</td>
<td>2% 16% 82%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>% of Instructional Recommendation</strong></td>
<td>1.4% 4.1% 1.4%</td>
<td>4.1% 15.1% 5.5%</td>
<td>1.4% 11% 56.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>% of Total</strong></td>
<td>9.8% 23.5% 1.1%</td>
<td>23.5% 23.5% 5.5%</td>
<td>66.7% 23.5% 63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Garfield</strong></td>
<td>14 Students Intensive at Beginning of 1st 20.6% of Total Students 2 3 1</td>
<td>18 Students Strategic at Beginning of 1st 26.5% of Total Students 3 7 27</td>
<td>34 Students Benchmark at Beginning of 1st 52.9% of Total Students 0 7 27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Count</strong></td>
<td>40% 40% 20%</td>
<td>0% 25% 75%</td>
<td>0% 20.6% 79.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>% of Instructional Recommendation</strong></td>
<td>3.9% 3.9% 2%</td>
<td>0% 25% 75%</td>
<td>0% 20.6% 79.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>% of Total</strong></td>
<td>2% 2% 2%</td>
<td>0% 25% 75%</td>
<td>0% 20.6% 79.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Jefferson</strong></td>
<td>10 Students Intensive at Beginning of 1st 13.9% of Total Students 3 9 3</td>
<td>17 Students Strategic at Beginning of 1st 23.6% of Total Students 2 7 9</td>
<td>45 Students Benchmark at Beginning of 1st 62.5% of Total Students 0 7 28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Count</strong></td>
<td>30% 30% 30%</td>
<td>11.8% 47.1% 41.2%</td>
<td>1.5% 19.4% 41.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>% of Instructional Recommendation</strong></td>
<td>4.2% 5.6% 4.2%</td>
<td>2.8% 11.1% 9.7%</td>
<td>1.5% 19.4% 41.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>% of Total</strong></td>
<td>5% 5% 5%</td>
<td>2.8% 11.1% 9.7%</td>
<td>1.5% 19.4% 41.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lincoln</strong></td>
<td>10 Students Intensive at Beginning of 1st 18.2% of Total Students 5 4 1</td>
<td>12 Students Strategic at Beginning of 1st 21.8% of Total Students 1 10 1</td>
<td>33 Students Benchmark at Beginning of 1st 60% of Total Students 1 10 22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Count</strong></td>
<td>50% 40% 10%</td>
<td>8.3% 83.3% 8.3%</td>
<td>1% 30.3% 66.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>% of Instructional Recommendation</strong></td>
<td>9.1% 7.3% 1.8%</td>
<td>1.8% 18.2% 1.8%</td>
<td>1% 30.3% 66.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>% of Total</strong></td>
<td>4% 4% 0%</td>
<td>2.8% 11.1% 9.7%</td>
<td>1.8% 18.2% 1.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Washington</strong></td>
<td>5 Students Intensive at Beginning of 1st 5.7% of Total Students 3 3 0</td>
<td>24 Students Strategic at Beginning of 1st 27.6% of Total Students 3 5 16</td>
<td>58 Students Benchmark at Beginning of 1st 66.7% of Total Students 1 2 55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Count</strong></td>
<td>40% 60% 0%</td>
<td>12.5% 20.8% 66.7%</td>
<td>1.7% 3.4% 94.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>% of Instructional Recommendation</strong></td>
<td>2.3% 3.4% 0%</td>
<td>3.4% 5.7% 18.4%</td>
<td>1.1% 3.4% 94.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>% of Total</strong></td>
<td>2.3% 3.4% 0%</td>
<td>3.4% 5.7% 18.4%</td>
<td>1.1% 3.4% 94.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Washington School: Effectiveness of Core

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>58 Students Benchmark at Beginning of 1st</th>
<th>n = 87</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st Grade</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>94.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Established</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81.6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deficit</td>
<td>6.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emerging</td>
<td>11.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Established</td>
<td>81.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Using DIBELS in a Systems-Wide RTI
Standard Protocol + Problem-Solving Approach

• Benchmark assess all students 3 times per year.
• Review effectiveness of system of support/intervention each benchmark period.
• **Identify (and validate) students needing additional support each benchmark period.**
• For students needing additional support, implement & monitor response to a predetermined research-based intervention.
• If response is not adequate, develop & implement an intervention designed for the individual needs of the student.
• If response is not adequate, modify intervention and continue implementation.
• If response continues to be inadequate, student *may* need special education support.
• *Continue to modify intervention and evaluate responsiveness until the desired outcomes are achieved.*
Cassandra: Identify and Validate Need for Support

Verify Need for Instructional Support by Retesting with Different Forms Until We Are Reasonably Confident.
Using DIBELS in a Systems-Wide RTI Standard Protocol + Problem-Solving Approach

- Benchmark assess all students 3 times per year.
- Review effectiveness of system of support/intervention each benchmark period.
- Identify (and validate) students needing additional support each benchmark period.
- For students needing additional support, implement & monitor response to a predetermined research-based intervention.
- If response is not adequate, develop & implement an intervention designed for the individual needs of the student.
- If response is not adequate, modify intervention and continue implementation.
- If response continues to be inadequate, student may need special education support.
- *Continue to modify intervention and evaluate responsiveness until the desired outcomes are achieved.*
Cassandra: Evaluating Responsiveness to Intervention

Tier 2 Support: add’l 30 min small group using research-based program
Example: McKinley Elementary

First Grade Classroom #5
Matthew, Tia
Using DIBELS in a Systems-Wide RTI Standard Protocol + Problem-Solving Approach

- Benchmark assess all students 3 times per year.
- Review effectiveness of system of support/intervention each benchmark period.
- Identify (and validate) students needing additional support each benchmark period.
- For students needing additional support, implement & monitor response to a predetermined research-based intervention.
- If response is not adequate, develop & implement an intervention designed for the individual needs of the student.
- If response is not adequate, modify intervention and continue implementation.
- If response continues to be inadequate, student *may* need special education support.
- *Continue to modify intervention and evaluate responsiveness until the desired outcomes are achieved.*
### Dynamic Indicators of Basic Early Literacy Skills

#### Summary of Effectiveness by District

- **District:** Test District
- **School:** All Schools
- **Date:** 2001-2002
- **Step:** Beginning of 1st Grade to Middle of 1st Grade

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Benchmark</th>
<th>Test District</th>
<th>Adams</th>
<th>Garfield</th>
<th>Jefferson</th>
<th>Lincoln</th>
<th>McKinley</th>
<th>Washington</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Beginning of First Instructional Recommendation to Middle of First Benchmark Status on NWF</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Count</strong></td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>% of Instructional Recommendation</strong></td>
<td>32.7%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>21.4%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>9.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>% of Total</strong></td>
<td>3.9%</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mid-Year Deficit</strong></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mid-Year Emerging</strong></td>
<td>44</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mid-Year Established</strong></td>
<td>46</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mid-Year Deficit</strong></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mid-Year Emerging</strong></td>
<td>43</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mid-Year Established</strong></td>
<td>209</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>N</strong></td>
<td>406</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Deficit</strong></td>
<td>7.6%</td>
<td>6.8%</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
<td>8.8%</td>
<td>6.9%</td>
<td>12.7%</td>
<td>6.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Emerging</strong></td>
<td>25.9%</td>
<td>30.1%</td>
<td>23.5%</td>
<td>25.5%</td>
<td>29.2%</td>
<td>43.6%</td>
<td>11.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Established</strong></td>
<td>66.5%</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>72.5%</td>
<td>77.6%</td>
<td>63.6%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>81.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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McKinley School
Effectiveness of Core

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>33 Students Benchmark at Beginning of 1st</th>
<th>n = 55</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>60% of Total Students</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3%</td>
<td>30.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Deficit</td>
<td>12.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emerging</td>
<td>43.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Established</td>
<td>43.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Using DIBELS in a Systems-Wide RTI Standard Protocol + Problem-Solving Approach

• Benchmark assess all students 3 times per year.
• Review effectiveness of system of support/intervention each benchmark period.
• Identify (and validate) students needing additional support each benchmark period.
• For students needing additional support, implement & monitor response to a predetermined research-based intervention.
• If response is not adequate, develop & implement an intervention designed for the individual needs of the student.
• If response is not adequate, modify intervention and continue implementation.
• If response continues to be inadequate, student may need special education support.
• Continue to modify intervention and evaluate responsiveness until the desired outcomes are achieved.
Matthew: Validate Need for Support

Verify Need for Instructional Support by Retesting with Different Forms Until We Are Reasonably Confident.
Tia: Validate Need for Support

Verify Need for Instructional Support by Retesting with Different Forms Until We Are Reasonably Confident.
Using DIBELS in a Systems-Wide RTI Standard Protocol + Problem-Solving Approach

• Benchmark assess all students 3 times per year.
• Review effectiveness of system of support/intervention each benchmark period.
• Identify (and validate) students needing additional support each benchmark period.

- For students needing additional support, implement & monitor response to a predetermined research-based intervention.
- If response is not adequate, develop & implement an intervention designed for the individual needs of the student.
- If response is not adequate, modify intervention and continue implementation.

• If response continues to be inadequate, student may need special education support.
• Continue to modify intervention and evaluate responsiveness until the desired outcomes are achieved.
Matthew: Evaluating Responsiveness to Intervention

Tier 1 Support: general education consultation to increase fidelity of core program implementation
Tia: Evaluating Responsiveness to Intervention

Tier 1: gen ed fidelity
Tier 2: add'l program
Tier 3: continue + repeated reading strategy
Using DIBELS in a Systems-Wide RTI Standard Protocol + Problem-Solving Approach

- Benchmark assess all students 3 times per year.
- Review effectiveness of system of support/intervention each benchmark period.
- Identify (and validate) students needing additional support each benchmark period.
- For students needing additional support, implement & monitor response to a predetermined research-based intervention.
- If response is not adequate, develop & implement an intervention designed for the individual needs of the student.
- If response is not adequate, modify intervention and continue implementation.

- If response continues to be inadequate, student may need special education support.
- Continue to modify intervention and evaluate responsiveness until the desired outcomes are achieved.
Summary: RTI – A Viable Alternative

• An emerging alternative to traditional eligibility models that is encouraged (but not required) by the recent reauthorization of IDEA.
  – “Must permit the use of a process that determines if the child responds to scientific, research-based interventions as part of the evaluation procedures”

• Logic: Serious, sustained, stubborn lack of adequate progress when provided with generally effective instruction/intervention is indicative of a serious learning difficulty requiring special education support.
Outcomes Driven Model and RTI

Implement a Research-Based Intervention

Increase intensity of Intervention:
1) Increase intervention fidelity
2) Increase time
3) Smaller Group Size

1. Identify Need for Support
2. Validate Need for Support
3. Plan and Implement Support
4. Evaluate and Modify Support
5. Review Outcomes – Eligible

Individual Problem Solving with a pupil support team

Substantial Individualized Support with Special Education Resources

Mid-year cutoff low risk

Nonsense Word Fluency

RTI or PORTEI?

• RTI logic requires that the intervention is effective – otherwise it indicates a teaching problem rather than a learning problem.

• Requires expertise in instruction and intervention as well as in assessment.

• We need to spend as much time assessing the quality of instruction as we spend assessing the response to the instruction.
## Dynamic Indicators of Basic Early Literacy Skills
### Summary of Effectiveness by District

**District:** Test District  
**School:** All Schools  
**Date:** 2001-2002  
**Step:** Beginning of 1st Grade to Middle of 1st Grade

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Instructional Recommendation to Benchmark Status on NWF</th>
<th>Intensive at Beginning of Year</th>
<th>Strategic at Beginning of Year</th>
<th>Benchmark at Beginning of Year</th>
<th>Benchmark Status on NWF in Middle of First Grade (Totals)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Beginning of First**  
| **Instructional Recommendation** to **Middle of First**  
| **Benchmark Status on NWF** | **Mid-Year Deficit** | **Mid-Year Emerging** | **Mid-Year Established** | **Mid-Year Deficit** | **Mid-Year Emerging** | **Mid-Year Established** | **Mid-Year Deficit** | **Mid-Year Emerging** | **Mid-Year Established** | **Mid-Year Deficit** | **Mid-Year Emerging** | **Mid-Year Established** |
| **Test District**  
| **Count** | 49 | 101 | 256 |  
| **% of Instructional Recommendation** | 32.7% | 19.9% | 13.2% |  
| **% of Total** | 3.9% | 4.4% | 3.7% |  
| **Adams**  
| **Count** | 5 | 18 | 50 |  
| **% of Instructional Recommendation** | 20% | 60% | 20% |  
| **% of Total** | 1.4% | 4.1% | 1.4% |  
| **Carfield**  
| **Count** | 5 | 12 | 34 |  
| **% of Instructional Recommendation** | 9.8% | 40% | 21.4% |  
| **% of Total** | 3.9% | 4.0% | 2.0% |  
| **Jefferson**  
| **Count** | 14 | 26 | 36 |  
| **% of Instructional Recommendation** | 20.6% | 5.2% | 11.1% |  
| **% of Total** | 4.4% | 4.3% | 64.3% |  
| **Lincoln**  
| **Count** | 10 | 17 | 45 |  
| **% of Instructional Recommendation** | 13.9% | 23.0% | 12.8% |  
| **% of Total** | 3.0% | 4.0% | 3.0% |  
| **McKinley**  
| **Count** | 10 | 12 | 33 |  
| **% of Instructional Recommendation** | 18.2% | 23.8% | 21.8% |  
| **% of Total** | 4.2% | 5.6% | 4.2% |  
| **Washington**  
| **Count** | 5 | 24 | 58 |  
| **% of Instructional Recommendation** | 5.2% | 5.2% | 15.7% |  
| **% of Total** | 2.3% | 3.4% | 0% |  
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CSI Report – Identify Targets of Opportunity

• Core Curriculum and Instruction – Benchmark Students
  – Strength – 95% of Benchmark Students Achieve Goal
  – Relative Strength – Upper Third
  – Needs Support – Middle Third
  – Needs Substantial Support – Lower Third

• Supplemental Instruction – Strategic Support Students
  – Strength – 80% of Strategic Students Achieve Goal
  – Relative Strength – Upper Third
  – Needs Support – Middle Third
  – Needs Substantial Support – Lower Third

• Intensive Intervention – Intensive Support Students
  – Strength – 80% of Intensive Students are Emerging or Achieve Goal
  – Relative Strength – Upper Third
  – Needs Support – Middle Third
  – Needs Substantial Support – Lower Third
Meaningful Differences in Effectiveness of Core Curriculum and Instruction

- Schools differ in the percent of Benchmark Students who achieve literacy goals.
- Consistent and robust finding: Odds are in favor of achieving goals for benchmark students, but sometimes more in favor.
- 82% District wide
  - 82% Adams
  - 79% Garfield
  - 78% Jefferson
  - 80% Lincoln
  - 67% McKinley
  - 95% Washington
RTI or PORTEI?

• Most appropriate in a prevention-oriented framework.
• Previous disability models have been reactive and not proactive.
  – Wasted time, effort, and resources before investing in interventions for children
• Consistent with a continuum of support across general and special education like a three tier model.
• Rapidly escalating support.
• Focus on the level of support and resources to make adequate progress.
Prevention-Oriented Response to Intervention

- Identify Need for Support
- Validate Need for Support
- Plan Support
- Evaluate Effectiveness of Support
  - Assess strengths/needs
  - Progress monitoring
- Implement Support
- Evaluate Effectiveness of Support
- Review Outcomes
- Screening (Benchmark Assessment)
- Additional information as needed
- Outcome Assessment (Benchmark Assessment)
Additional References

Additional References


• *Learning Disabilities Research & Practice* (2003), Volume 13 Special Issue on RTI


