



Critical RTI Elements: A Checklist

The elements below are important components of the RTI model. Review each element and discuss how to implement it in your school or district:

Tier 1 Interventions: Evidence-Based & Implemented With Integrity		
<i>Tier 1: Classroom Interventions.</i> The classroom teacher is the 'first responder' for students with academic delays. Classroom efforts to instruct and individually support the student should be documented.		
Adequately Documented?	RTI Element	If this element is incomplete, missing, or undocumented...
<input type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO	Tier 1: High-Quality Core Instruction. The student receives high-quality core instruction in the area of academic concern. 'High quality' is defined as at least 80% of students in the classroom or grade level performing at or above gradewide academic screening benchmarks through classroom instructional support alone (Christ, 2008).	Inadequate or incorrectly focused core instruction may be an explanation for the student's academic delays.
<input type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO	Tier 1: Classroom Intervention. The classroom teacher gives additional individualized academic support to the student beyond that provided in core instruction. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The teacher documents those strategies on a Tier 1 intervention plan. • Intervention ideas contained in the plan meet the district's criteria as 'evidence-based'. • Student academic baseline and goals are calculated, and progress-monitoring data are collected to measure the impact of the plan. • The classroom intervention is attempted for a period sufficiently long (e.g., 4-8 instructional weeks) to fully assess its effectiveness. 	An absence of individualized classroom support or a poorly focused classroom intervention plan may contribute to the student's academic delays.
<input type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO	Tier 1: Intervention Integrity. Data are collected to verify that the intervention is carried out with integrity (Gansle & Noell, 2007; Roach & Elliott, 2008). Relevant intervention-integrity data include information about: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Frequency and length of intervention sessions. • Ratings by the interventionist or an independent observer about whether all steps of the intervention are being conducted correctly. 	Without intervention-integrity data, it is impossible to discern whether academic underperformance is due to the student's 'non-response' to intervention or due to an intervention that was poorly or inconsistently carried out.

Tier 1: Decision Point: Teacher Consultation/Team Meeting		
<i>Decision Points:</i> At Tier 1, the school has set up procedures for teachers and other staff to discuss students who need intervention, to analyze data about their school performance, to design intervention and progress-monitoring plans, and to schedule follow-up meetings on the student(s).		
Adequately Documented?	RTI Element	If this element is incomplete, missing, or undocumented...
<input type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO	Tier 1: Classroom Teacher Problem-Solving Meetings. The school has set up a forum for teachers to discuss students who need Tier 1 (classroom) interventions and to schedule follow-up meetings to evaluate progress. That forum takes one of two forms: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Consultant.</i> The school compiles a list of consultants in the school who can meet with individual teachers or grade-level teams to discuss specific students and to help the teacher to create and to document an intervention plan. • <i>Grade-Level Team.</i> The school trains grade-level teams to conduct problem-solving meetings. Teachers are expected 	If the school does not provide teachers with guidance and support in creating Tier 1 intervention plans, it cannot answer whether each teacher is consistently following recommended practices in developing those plans.



	to bring students to regularly scheduled team meetings to discuss them and to create and document an intervention plan.	
--	---	--

Tier 2/3 Interventions: Evidence-Based & Implemented With Integrity		
<i>Tiers 2 & 3: Supplemental Interventions.</i> Interventions at Tiers 2 & 3 supplement core instruction and specifically target the student's academic deficits.		
Adequately Documented?	RTI Element	If this element is incomplete, missing, or undocumented...
<input type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO	<p>Tier 2/3 Interventions: Minimum Number & Length. The student's cumulative RTI information indicates that an adequate effort in the general-education setting has been made to provide supplemental interventions at Tiers 2 & 3. The term 'sufficient effort' includes the expectation that within the student's general education setting:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A minimum number of separate Tier 2/3 intervention trials (e.g., three) are attempted. • Each intervention trial lasts a minimum period of time (e.g., 6-8 instructional weeks). 	<p>A foundation assumption of RTI is that a general-education student with academic difficulties is typical and simply needs targeted instructional support to be successful. Therefore, strong evidence (i.e., several documented, 'good-faith' intervention attempts) is needed before the school can move beyond the assumption that the student is typical to consider whether there are possible 'within-child' factors such as a learning disability that best explain the student's academic difficulties.</p>
<input type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO	<p>Tier 2/3 Interventions: Essential Elements. Each Tier 2/3 intervention plan shows evidence that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Instructional programs or practices used in the intervention meet the district's criteria of 'evidence-based.' • The intervention has been selected because it logically addressed the area(s) of academic deficit for the target student (e.g., an intervention to address reading fluency was chosen for a student whose primary deficit was in reading fluency). • If the intervention is group-based, all students enrolled in the Tier 2/3 intervention group have a shared intervention need that could reasonably be addressed through the group instruction provided. • The student-teacher ratio in the group-based intervention provides adequate student support. NOTE: For Tier 2, group sizes should be capped at 7 students. Tier 3 interventions may be delivered in smaller groups (e.g., 3 students or fewer) or individually. • The intervention provides contact time adequate to the student academic deficit. NOTE: Tier 2 interventions should take place a minimum of 3-5 times per week in sessions of 30 minutes or more; Tier 3 interventions should take place daily in sessions of 30 minutes or more (Burns & Gibbons, 2008). 	<p>Supplemental intervention programs are compromised if they are not based on research, are too large, or include students with very discrepant intervention needs. Schools cannot have confidence in the impact of such potentially compromised supplemental intervention programs.</p>
<input type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO	<p>Tier 2/3 Interventions: Intervention Integrity. Data are collected to verify that the intervention is carried out with integrity (Gansle & Noell, 2007; Roach & Elliott, 2008). Relevant intervention-integrity data include information about:</p>	<p>Without intervention-integrity data, it is impossible to discern whether academic underperformance is due to the</p>



	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Frequency and length of intervention sessions. • Ratings by the interventionist or an independent observer about whether all steps of the intervention are being conducted correctly. 	student's 'non-response' to intervention or due to an intervention that was poorly or inconsistently carried out.
--	--	---

Decision Point for Tier 2: Data Analysis Team

Decision Points: At Tier 2, the school has set up procedures for teachers and other staff to discuss students who need intervention, to analyze data about their school performance, to design intervention and progress-monitoring plans, and to schedule follow-up meetings on the student(s).

Adequately Documented?	RTI Element	If this element is incomplete, missing, or undocumented...
<input type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO	<p>Tier 2: Data Analysis Team. The school has established a Data Analysis Team at Tier 2 to evaluate the school-wide screening data collected three times per year and to place students who need Tier 2 interventions. The Data Analysis Team</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • is knowledgeable of all intervention personnel and evidence-based programs available for Tier 2 interventions. • knows how to identify students who have failed to meet expected screening benchmarks • can use the benchmarks to estimate the risk for academic failure of each student picked up in the screening • is able to match identified students to appropriate interventions while providing students with sufficient instructional support. • can document the Tier 2 intervention set up for each student <p>NOTE: It is also recommended that the Data Analysis Team meet at least once <i>between</i> each screening period to review the progress of students on Tier 2 intervention, to apply screening benchmarks, and to decide for each student whether to maintain the current intervention, change the Tier 2 intervention, move the student to more intensive Tier 3 intervention, or (if improved) discontinue the Tier 2 intervention and transition the student to Tier 1 support alone.</p>	<p>If the school lacks a functioning Data Analysis Team, there are likely to be several important questions left unanswered, such as the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Are screening data being used to bring consistency and objectivity to the selection of students who need Tier 2 intervention? • Are the intervention programs at Tier 2 'evidence-based'? • Is the progress of students receiving Tier 2 intervention reviewed every 6-8 instructional weeks to ensure that students don't remain in ineffective interventions and don't continue to occupy intervention 'slots' after they have closed the academic gap with peers?

Decision Point for Tier 3: RTI Problem-Solving Team

Decision Points: At Tier 3, the school has set up procedures for teachers and other staff to discuss students who need intervention, to analyze data about their school performance, to design intervention and progress-monitoring plans, and to schedule follow-up meetings on the student(s).

Adequately Documented?	RTI Element	If this element is incomplete, missing, or undocumented...
<input type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO	<p>Tier 3: RTI Problem-Solving Team. The school has established an 'RTI Problem-Solving Team' to create customized intervention plans for individual students who require Tier 3 (intensive) interventions. The RTI Problem-Solving Team:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • has created clear guidelines for when to accept a Tier 3 student referral. • follows a consistent, structured problem-solving model during its meetings. • schedules initial meetings to discuss student concerns and follow-up meetings to review student progress and judge whether the intervention plan is effective. 	<p>The RTI Problem-Solving Team is the 'decision point' in the school that ensures that students with Tier 3 academic or behavioral needs receive interventions that are well-documented, well-implemented, and sufficiently intensive to match the student's serious deficits. Most Special Education Eligibility Teams use Tier 3</p>



	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • develops written intervention plans with sufficient detail to ensure that the intervention is implemented with fidelity across settings and people. • builds an 'intervention bank' of research-based intervention ideas for common student academic and behavioral concerns. 	<p>Problem-Solving Teams as a quality-control mechanism and gate-keeper that prevents students from being referred for possible special education services until the school has first exhausted all general-education service options.</p>
--	--	--

School-Wide Academic Screenings: General Outcome Measures and Skill-Based Measures		
<i>Peer Norms:</i> The school selects efficient measures with good technical adequacy to be used to screen all students at a grade level in targeted academic areas.		
Adequately Documented?	RTI Element	If this element is incomplete, missing, or undocumented...
<input type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO	<p>Selection of Academic Screening Measures. The school has selected appropriate grade-level screening measures for the academic skill area(s) in which the target student struggles (Hosp, Hosp & Howell, 2007). The selected screening measure(s):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Have 'technical adequacy' as grade-level screeners—and have been researched and shown to predict future student success in the academic skill(s) targeted. • Are general enough to give useful information for at least a full school year of the developing academic skill (e.g., General Outcome Measure or Skill-Based Mastery Measure). • Include research norms, proprietary norms developed as part of a reputable commercial assessment product, or benchmarks to guide the school in evaluating the risk level for each student screened. 	<p>Academic screening measures provide a shared standard for assessing student academic risk. If appropriate gradewide academic screening measure(s) are not in place, the school cannot efficiently identify struggling students who need additional intervention support or calculate the relative probability of academic success for each student.</p>
<input type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO	<p>Local Norms Collected via Gradewide Academic Screenings at Least 3 Times Per Year. All students at each grade level are administered the relevant academic screening measures at least three times per school year. The results are compiled to provide local norms of academic performance.</p>	<p>In the absence of regularly updated local screening norms, the school cannot easily judge whether a particular student's skills are substantially delayed from those of peers in the same educational setting.</p>

References

Burns, M. K., & Gibbons, K. A. (2008). *Implementing response-to-intervention in elementary and secondary schools*. Routledge: New York.

Christ, T. (2008). Best practices in problem analysis. In A. Thomas & J. Grimes (Eds.), *Best practices in school psychology V* (pp. 159-176). Bethesda, MD: National Association of School Psychologists.

Fuchs, L. (2003). Assessing intervention responsiveness: Conceptual and technical issues. *Learning Disabilities Research & Practice, 18*(3), 172-186.

Gansle, K. A., & Noell, G. H. (2007). The fundamental role of intervention implementation in assessing response to intervention. In S. R. Jimerson, M. K. Burns, & A. M. VanDerHeyden (Eds.), *Response to intervention: The science and practice of assessment and intervention* (pp. 244-251). New York: Springer Publishing.



Hosp, M. K., Hosp, J. L., & Howell, K. W. (2007). *The ABCs of CBM: A practical guide to curriculum-based measurement*. New York: Guilford Press.

Howell, K. W., Hosp, J. L., & Kurns, S. (2008). Best practices in curriculum-based evaluation. In A. Thomas & J. Grimes (Eds.), *Best practices in school psychology V* (pp.349-362). Bethesda, MD: National Association of School Psychologists.

Roach, A. T., & Elliott, S. N. (2008). Best practices in facilitating and evaluating intervention integrity. In A. Thomas & J. Grimes (Eds.), *Best practices in school psychology V* (pp.195-208).

Shapiro, E. S. (2008). Best practices in setting progress-monitoring monitoring goals for academic skill improvement. In A. Thomas & J. Grimes (Eds.), *Best practices in school psychology V* (pp. 141-157). Bethesda, MD: National Association of School Psychologists.

Witt, J. C., VanDerHeyden, A. M., & Gilbertson, D. (2004). Troubleshooting behavioral interventions. A systematic process for finding and eliminating problems. *School Psychology Review*, 33, 363-383.