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Response to Intervention

Workshop PPTs and Handout Available at:

http://www.interventioncentral.org/AWSA
HELPS Reading Fluency Program

www.helpsprogram.org
HELPS Program: Reading Fluency
www.helpsprogram.org

- HELPS (Helping Early Literacy with Practice Strategies) is a free tutoring program that targets student reading fluency skills. Developed by Dr. John Begeny of North Carolina State University, the program is an evidence-based intervention package that includes:
  - adult modeling of fluent reading,
  - repeated reading of passages by the student,
  - phrase-drill error correction,
  - verbal cueing and retell check to encourage student reading comprehension,
  - reward procedures to engage and encourage the student reader.
“Risk for reading failure always involves the interaction of a particular set of child characteristics with specific characteristics of the instructional environment. Risk status is not entirely inherent in the child, but always involves a “mismatch” between child characteristics and the instruction that is provided.” (Foorman & Torgesen, 2001; p. 206).

Reading Interventions

Focus of Inquiry: How can our school find intervention programs or ideas to address reading delays?
Reading: Five Components

1. Phonemic Awareness
2. Alphabetic Principle
3. Fluency with Text
4. Vocabulary
5. Comprehension

Using Peer Tutors as Vehicle for Instructional Delivery: PALS

“Peer-Assisted Learning Strategies (PALS) is a peer-tutoring program. According to the developer’s website, it is designed to be incorporated into the existing curriculum with the goal of improving the academic performance of children with diverse academic needs. Teachers train students to use PALS procedures. Students partner with peers, alternating the role of tutor while reading aloud, listening, and providing feedback in various structured activities. PALS is typically implemented three times a week for 30 to 35 minutes. Although PALS can be used in different subject areas and grade levels, this intervention report focuses on the use of PALS to improve reading skills of students in kindergarten through third grade.”

Peer-Assisted Learning Strategies (PALS)

Research Findings

“PALS was found to have potentially positive effects on alphabetics, fluency, and comprehension.”

FreeReading
http://www.freereading.net

This ‘open source’ website includes free lesson plans that target writing instruction and intervention.
What Works Clearinghouse
http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/

This website reviews core instruction and intervention programs in reading/writing, as well as other academic areas.

The site reviews existing studies and draws conclusions about whether specific intervention programs show evidence of effectiveness.
Best Evidence Encyclopedia
http://www.bestevidence.org/

This site provides reviews of evidence-based reading and math programs.

The website is sponsored by the Johns Hopkins University School of Education's Center for Data-Driven Reform in Education (CDDRE).
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National Center on RTI
Instructional Intervention Tools Chart

Sponsored by the National Center on RTI, this page provides ratings to intervention programs in reading, math, and writing.

Users can streamline their search by subject and grade level.
Response to Intervention

Reading Interventions

Focus of Inquiry: How does our school or district define Tier 2 vs. Tier 3?
Tier 1: Universal interventions. Available to all students in a classroom or school. Can consist of whole-group or individual strategies or supports.

Tier 2 Individualized interventions. Subset of students receive interventions targeting specific needs.

Tier 3: Intensive interventions. Students who are ‘non-responders’ to Tiers 1 & 2 are referred to the RTI Team for more intensive interventions.
Increasing the Intensity of an Intervention: Key Dimensions

Interventions can move up the RTI Tiers through being intensified across several dimensions, including:

• Type of intervention strategy or materials used
• Student-teacher ratio
• Length of intervention sessions
• Frequency of intervention sessions
• Duration of the intervention period (e.g., extending an intervention from 5 weeks to 10 weeks)
• Motivation strategies


Complementary RTI Models: Standard Treatment & Problem-Solving Protocols

“The two most commonly used RTI approaches are (1) standard treatment and (2) problem-solving protocol. While these two approaches to RTI are sometimes described as being very different from each other, they actually have several common elements, and both fit within a problem-solving framework. In practice, many schools and districts combine or blend aspects of the two approaches to fit their needs.”

RTI Interventions: Standard-Treatment vs. Problem-Solving

There are two different vehicles that schools can use to deliver RTI interventions:

**Standard-Protocol (Standalone Intervention).** Programs based on scientifically valid instructional practices (‘standard protocol’) are created to address frequent student referral concerns. These services are provided outside of the classroom. A middle school, for example, may set up a structured math-tutoring program staffed by adult volunteer tutors to provide assistance to students with limited math skills. Students referred for a Tier II math intervention would be placed in this tutoring program. An advantage of the standard-protocol approach is that it is efficient and consistent: large numbers of students can be put into these group interventions to receive a highly standardized intervention. However, standard group intervention protocols often cannot be individualized easily to accommodate a specific student’s unique needs.

**Problem-solving (Classroom-Based Intervention).** Individualized research-based interventions match the profile of a particular student’s strengths and limitations. The classroom teacher often has a large role in carrying out these interventions. A plus of the problem-solving approach is that the intervention can be customized to the student’s needs. However, developing intervention plans for individual students can be time-consuming.
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Tier 2: Supplemental (Standard-Protocol Model)

Interventions

Tier 2 interventions are typically delivered in small-group format. About 15% of students in the typical school will require Tier 2/supplemental intervention support.

Group size for Tier 2 interventions is limited to 4-6 students. Students placed in Tier 2 interventions should have a shared profile of intervention need. The reading progress of students in Tier 2 interventions are monitored at least 1-2 times per month.

The Data Analysis Team can make placements of students into Tier 2 services, depending on school-wide screening results.

Scheduling Elementary Tier 2 Interventions

Option 3: ‘Floating RTI’: Gradewide Shared Schedule. Each grade has a scheduled RTI time across classrooms. No two grades share the same RTI time. Advantages are that outside providers can move from grade to grade providing push-in or pull-out services and that students can be grouped by need across different teachers within the grade.

Anyplace Elementary School: RTI Daily Schedule

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Classroom 1</th>
<th>Classroom 2</th>
<th>Classroom 3</th>
<th>Time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9:00-9:30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9:45-10:15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10:30-11:00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12:30-1:00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1:15-1:45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2:00-2:30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Response to Intervention

Tier 3: Intensive Individualized Interventions (Problem-Solving Model)

Tier 3 interventions are the most intensive offered in a school setting. About 5% of a general-education student population may qualify for Tier 3 supports. Typically, the RTI Problem-Solving Team meets to develop intervention plans for Tier 3 students.

Students qualify for Tier 3 interventions because:

– they are found to have a large skill gap when compared to their class or grade peers; and/or
– They did not respond to interventions provided previously at Tiers 1 & 2.

Tier 3 interventions are provided daily for sessions of 30 minutes. The student-teacher ratio is flexible but should allow the student to receive intensive, individualized instruction. The academic or behavioral progress of students in Tier 3 interventions is monitored at least weekly.

Response to Intervention

Avg Classroom Academic Performance Level

Discrepancy 1: Skill Gap (Current Performance Level)

Discrepancy 2: Gap in Rate of Learning (‘Slope of Improvement’)

‘Dual-Discrepancy’: RTI Model of Learning Disability (Fuchs 2003)
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Reading Interventions: Matching Students to Interventions

Focus of Inquiry: How can a Data Analysis Team help schools to make efficient placements of students into Tier 2 (and perhaps Tier 3) using objective school-wide screening data?
RTI: Creating a Data Analysis Team to Match Students to Tier 2/3 Interventions
RTI ‘Pyramid of Interventions’

**Tier 1: Universal interventions.** Available to all students in a classroom or school. Can consist of whole-group or individual strategies or supports.

**Tier 2: Individualized interventions.** Subset of students receive interventions targeting specific needs.

**Tier 3: Intensive interventions.** Students who are ‘non-responders’ to Tiers 1 & 2 are referred to the RTI Team for more intensive interventions.

Data Analysis Team

www.interventioncentral.org
The Data Analysis Team (DAT) is the gatekeeper for Tier 2/3 services.

The DAT meets at least 3 times per year, after fall, winter, and spring school-wide academic screenings, to review screening results and to select students for Tier 2/3 intervention services.

Optionally, the DAT also meets periodically between screenings (e.g., once per month) to review the progress of students on Tier 2/3 intervention. If appropriate, students can be moved into, across, and out of Tier 2/3 groups between screenings if the data support such moves.
Data Analysis Team: Objectives

The DAT’s objectives during fall/winter/spring reviews of screening data are to:

1. Review with classroom teachers whether at least 80% of students reached benchmark/proficiency
2. Brainstorm core instructional strategies that can help to address patterns of weakness found at the Tier 1 group level.
3. Sort students found to be at risk into two groups:
   - Mild risk: Classroom teacher can provide interventions and progress-monitor at Tier 1
   - More severe risk: Student is placed in supplemental (Tier 2/3) intervention.
Data Analysis Team: Skillset

Core members serving on the DAT should be knowledgeable about:

- The interpretation of RTI screening and progress-monitoring data.
- The range of Tier 2/3 programs/groups in the school (and any available slots within those programs/groups).
- The setting of academic performance goals for individual students.
- Strong instructional practices that support groups (core instruction) and individual students (classroom or supplemental intervention).
Tier 2/3 Data Analysis Team:
The Data
Data Analysis Team: Data Preparation

In preparation for a DAT screening data meeting (Fall, Winter, Spring):

• Building-wide screening data are entered into electronic format to facilitate storage and retrieval (e.g., Excel spreadsheet, RTI-M Direct, AIMSWeb).

• Reports are generated listing students at risk (below benchmark)—organized by ‘strategic’ (moderate risk) and ‘intensive’ (higher risk).

• Copies of benchmark criteria (e.g., DIBELS NEXT) are brought to the DAT meeting.
## Benchmark Example: DIBELS NEXT Grade 3

### Third Grade Benchmark Goals and Cut Points for Risk

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Score Level</th>
<th>Likely Need for Support</th>
<th>Beginning of Year</th>
<th>Middle of Year</th>
<th>End of Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DIBELS</td>
<td>At or Above Benchmark</td>
<td>Likely to Need Core Support</td>
<td>220 +</td>
<td>285 +</td>
<td>330 +</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Composite Score</td>
<td>Below Benchmark</td>
<td>Likely to Need Strategic Support</td>
<td>180 - 219</td>
<td>235 - 284</td>
<td>280 - 329</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Well Below Benchmark</td>
<td>Likely to Need Intensive Support</td>
<td>0 - 179</td>
<td>0 - 234</td>
<td>0 - 279</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DORF</td>
<td>At or Above Benchmark</td>
<td>Likely to Need Core Support</td>
<td>70 +</td>
<td>86 +</td>
<td>100 +</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Words</td>
<td>Below Benchmark</td>
<td>Likely to Need Strategic Support</td>
<td>55 - 69</td>
<td>68 - 85</td>
<td>80 - 99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Correct</td>
<td>Well Below Benchmark</td>
<td>Likely to Need Intensive Support</td>
<td>0 - 54</td>
<td>0 - 67</td>
<td>0 - 79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DORF</td>
<td>At or Above Benchmark</td>
<td>Likely to Need Core Support</td>
<td>95% +</td>
<td>96% +</td>
<td>97% +</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accuracy</td>
<td>Below Benchmark</td>
<td>Likely to Need Strategic Support</td>
<td>89% - 94%</td>
<td>92% - 95%</td>
<td>94% - 96%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Well Below Benchmark</td>
<td>Likely to Need Intensive Support</td>
<td>0% - 88%</td>
<td>0% - 91%</td>
<td>0% - 93%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Tier 2/3 Data Analysis Team: Structuring Screening-Data Meetings
Data Analysis Team: Structure of Screening Data Meetings

During screening data meetings, the DAT meets with teams of grade-level teachers to:

– systematically look at the impact of core instruction (goal: at least 80 percent of students reaching the screening benchmark)
– offer recommendations for classroom instructional practice to boost student performance at Tier 1
– identify those students who need supplemental (Tier 2/3) intervention services.

Data Analysis Team: Meeting Structure/Script

Schools can use a Data Analysis Team Script (Kovaleski et al., 2005) to structure their Data Analysis Team meetings.
Integrity of Tier 2/3 Reading Interventions

Focus of Inquiry: How can we measure the ‘intervention integrity’ of reading interventions at Tier 2 or 3?
Supplemental Methods to Collect Data About Intervention Integrity

Teacher Self-Ratings: As a form of self-monitoring, directing interventionists to rate the integrity of their own interventions may prompt higher rates of compliance (e.g., Kazdin, 1989). However, because teacher self-ratings tend to be ‘upwardly biased’ (Gansle & Noell, 2007, p. 247), they should not be relied upon as the sole rating of intervention integrity. One suggestion for collecting regular teacher reports on intervention implementation in a convenient manner is to use Daily Behavior Reports (DBRs; Chafouleas, Riley-Tillman,, & Sugai, 2007).

Sources:
### Teacher Intervention Integrity Self-Rating

To what degree were you able to carry out the intervention as designed?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not at all</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fully</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Time Start</th>
<th>Time End</th>
<th>AM/PM</th>
<th>Students Attending</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Intervention Contact Log

Staff Member(s) Implementing Intervention: ____________
Classroom/Location: ____________
Intervention Description: ____________

Students implementing intervention: ____________
7. ____________
8. ____________
9. ____________

Date: ____________
Time Start: ____________ AM/PM
Time End: ____________ AM/PM
Students Attending: ____________