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Overview

- Timeline of RTI (ish) implementation
- Current status of particular districts around the nation
- Where are we headed next?
- How will schools that are part of the FSSM be poised to continue?
## Timeline of RTI (ish) implementation

| Early 70’s | Institute on Research in Learning Disabilities (IRLD) is funded at the University of Minnesota with the purpose of studying DBPM (data-based progress monitoring) |
| 1970’s-1980’s | Initial research is completed on curriculum-based measures in reading, writing, mathematics, and written expression. Many researchers are associated with the IRLD |
| | Seminal article by Deno (1986, *School Psychology Review*) on the use of the problem solving model |
| | Heartland, IA begins using a problem solving approach for eligibility decision-making |
| Early 90’s | Lynn and Doug Fuchs study computerized applications of CBM |
| | Minneapolis Public Schools receives a waiver to identify students using a problem solving model |
| | 1994—Virginia Berninger and Robert Abbott publish a chapter on Redefining learning disabilities. Moving beyond aptitude-treatment discrepancies to failure to respond to validated treatment protocols. |

## Timeline of RTI (ish) implementation, cont.

| Late 90’s | Lynn and Doug Fuchs publish an article discussing treatment validity as a way to reconceptualize identification of learning disabilities |
| 2000-2004 | Articles are published on treatment nonresponders (i.e., Fuchs, Fuchs, McMaster, Yen, & Svenson, 2004) |
| 2004 | Federal regulations for RTI are released as part of the 2004 revision of IDEA |
| 2007 | Missouri guidelines for RTI are posted on the DESE website |
So.....

- Response-to-Intervention is not really a “new” thing! The name is new, but some states and districts have been conducting RTI’ish activities for awhile

Examples of districts and states that are implementing RTI (large scale) and keys to success

- Minneapolis Public Schools (see Marston, Muyskens, Lau, & Canter, 2003)
  - Training and development of problem-solving teams
  - CBM was “an integral part of the process” (p. 187)
- Heartland (IA; see Fuchs, Mock, Morgan, & Young, 2003)
  - Well-defined, four-level problem-solving model
  - Throughout the process, data about student responsiveness is the “driving force”
  - Multiple data sources are utilized, with the primary being CBM
Examples of districts and states that are implementing RTI (large scale) and keys to success, cont.

- Ohio’s Intervention Based Assessment (IBA; see Fuchs, et al. 2003)
  - Combines a problem-solving approach with collaborative consultation
- Pennsylvania’s Instructional Support Teams (IST”s; see Fuchs, et al. 2003)
  - “Best known statewide prereferral intervention program in the nation” (p. 162)
  - Use CBA for academic concerns and behavioral assessment for behavior concerns within a collaborative problem-solving model

Other examples outside of MO...

- Providence, RI—worked with school psychologists and interventionists
- Indiana—numerous trainings on CBM, RTI, problem-solving, and extensions (most recently to secondary)
- Pennsylvania—significant interest in extensions (most recently, early numeracy).
- Nebraska—unique situation in that the size of the schools is an issue AND no state test
And examples in your backyard...

- North Kansas City, MO
  - Well-developed problem-solving teams/process
  - Trained all general education teams on CBM (including principals) in Year 1 and special educators in Year 2
- Joplin, MO
  - Has been conducting school-wide screening at the elementary level for 3 years or more
  - Middle school uses CBM, but mainly in special education
- Springfield, MO
  - Interest is building!

A well-detailed example...

- Field Elementary, Columbia, MO
  - Administrator and staff buy-in
  - Use CBM for school-wide screening and progress monitoring
  - VERY attentive to evidence-based core program and interventions
  - RTI and schoolwide Positive Behavior Supports (PBS) are both implemented
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Student demographics

• 290 students Preschool-5th grade
• 2 classes per grade level with 18-25 students per class
• 79% F/R lunch
• 50% minority
• 13% special ed
• 20% ESL
• 58% mobility
Field Elementary Discipline Data 04-05

- Students with 6+ Referrals: 6.4%
- Students with 2-5 Referrals: 16.8%
- Students with 0 or 1 Referrals: 76.8%

Field Elementary School Literacy Data, 2004-05

- Tier III Intensive: 44% (108 students)
- Tier II Strategic: 26% (65 students)
- Tier I Benchmark: 30% (74 students)
Other Data Sources Used

- Developmental Reading Assessment (DRA & DRA-2)
- Scholastic Reading Inventory (SRI)
- District Writing Assessments
- Dynamic Indicators of Basic Early Literacy Skills (DIBELS)
Field’s perceptions after examining existing data...

- After a review of the data it was clear that we had to change our way of doing business. The research told us that struggling readers must have a structured, explicit, research-based core literacy program to meet their needs.
- We chose Houghton-Mifflin 2005 based on recommendations from the University of Oregon study of programs designed around the big five.

Structure

- ALL students receive 90 minutes of the Core reading program. No one is pulled out during that time.
- Tier I students have scored at benchmark on the DIBELS.
- Tier II students need strategic intervention
- Tier III students need intensive intervention.
• Regular classroom teachers teach the core and the Tier I and Tier II groups.
• Reading specialists, Sp Ed, ELL, Sp. Lang, all teach the Tier III intervention groups.
• Intervention groups meet four days for 45 minutes with the fifth day reserved for providing individual intervention.

**Core Reading and Intervention Schedule**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Core</th>
<th>Intervention</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td>9:00-10:30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1&lt;sup&gt;st&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>9:00-10:30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>10:00-11:30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>11:00-12:30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1:45-3:15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>1:00-2:30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Programs**

- Tier I students receive enrichment based on the themes of the core program.
- Tier II students receive strategic intervention using Reading Mastery or Soar to Success.
- Support for Tier III students has come through the adoption of standard protocol: SRA Reading Mastery for K-2 and Wilson Reading Systems for grades 3-5.

**Data collection**

- Collecting benchmark data occurs three times per year: fall, winter and spring. Progress monitoring for Tier II and III students occurs every other week. CBM allows us to assess the effectiveness of our system as well as individual students’ response to the interventions.
Data tells the story

How does Field’s CBM reading data relate to other data they’re collecting?

- 1st grade spring Oral Reading Fluency (ORF) and the spring Developmental Reading Assessment—correlation of .96**
- 3rd grade fall ORF and spring Scholastic Reading Inventory (SRI)—correlation of .80 (ORF and DRA, spring--.91**)
- 5th grade fall ORF and spring DRA—correlation of .87**
How does Field’s CBM reading data relate to other data they’re collecting? (cont)

• Validity of measures administered at the same time (concurrent)
  • MAP communication arts, spring 2006 and ORF, spring 2006 (n=110)--.75**
• Predictive validity
  • MAP communication arts, spring 2006 and ORF, spring 2005 (n=70)--.74**

How do we get there?

• Literacy:
  • prioritized time for literacy
  • a structured, research-based core literacy curriculum
  • a three-tiered approach to intervention
  • consistent and monitored implementation
  • support for effective implementation
  • support for strategic and intensive interventions as needed
  • progress monitoring to insure effectiveness of system
  • collaboration time
Collaboration is critical

- All interventionists meet twice monthly with the grade level teachers to discuss best practice, observations and student progress.

Where are “we” headed next with respect to RTI?

- Data on effectiveness of the model
  - For example, see Burns, Appleton, & Stehouwer, 2005
- More options at the secondary level
  - Screening and progress monitoring tools
  - Interventions
- Combined models of RTI and PBS
  - Already some “buzz” about this in our state and in your districts
- More specifics on RTI and eligibility (think cut scores for rate and slope)
How will schools that are part of the FSSM be poised to continue?

• You’re addressing issues of implementation head-on by asking questions and having continued dialogue
• Your districts are providing continued professional development
• You have foundational information that is needed
• Problem-solving teams are in place

Next steps...

• Continue to seek out information. This is critical to all stakeholders.
  • Seek out answers to your questions utilizing evidence-based sources
• Continue to have active dialogue.
• Reliable and valid data should become the norm as educational decisions are made.
• Involve parents, staff, and students in the process.

You are well-positioned at this point! Keep a positive outlook in the coming months!
References


