

Center Cass School District #66



“Striving for Excellence”

**Response to Intervention (RtI)
District Plan**

Table of Contents

| | |
|---|----|
| Key Players to the Implementation of Rtl | 1 |
| Mission Statement, Definition of Response to Intervention (Rtl) | 2 |
| Rationale for Implementation | 2 |
| Roles and Responsibilities of Key Players | |
| • Building Principal | 3 |
| • Classroom Teachers: General Education | 3 |
| • School Psychologist and Social Worker | 3 |
| • Other Certified and Support Staff | 3 |
| • District Leadership Team | 4 |
| • Building Leadership Team | 4 |
| • Parents | 4 |
| Promoting Understanding of Components Needed for Implementation | 4 |
| Action Plan for Implementation | |
| • Timelines | 6 |
| • Professional Development Strategies/Activities | 6 |
| Rtl Benchmarking and Data Entry Schedule | 7 |
| Universal Screeners (Methods of Assessment) | 8 |
| Rtl Multi-Tier Model and Definitions | 9 |
| • Position Statement for Referral to Tier 2 and 3 | 11 |
| • Criteria for Entitlement for Special Education | 13 |
| • Problem Solving/Referral Process | 17 |
| Common Forms and Use for Rtl | 19 |
| Resources | 20 |
| Forms | |

CENTER CASS SCHOOL DISTRICT 66

KEY PLAYERS TO THE IMPLEMENTATION OF RtI

STUDENTS

DISTRICT

Board
Administrators
Professional Development Providers

SCHOOL

Teachers and Principals
Paraprofessionals
SASED
Support Staff/Services

COMMUNITY

Volunteers
Taxpayers
Social Services Agencies

GOVERNMENT

ISBE
USDOE

FAMILY

Parents
Guardians
Caretakers
Siblings

Mission Statement:

“Striving for Excellence”

Definition of Response to Intervention (Rtl)

Response to Intervention (Rtl) is a research/evidence-based instructional and intervention model that identifies students who are having difficulty achieving in the core curriculum.

Rtl is a way to:

- Work with students who are having trouble learning.
- Accurately monitor individual progress.
- Use data to make informed decisions regarding student instruction.
- Make sure that all students can reach their potential.

Rationale for Implementation

Rtl is a result of the:

- Changes in federal and state regulations.
- Need for earlier identification of the diverse educational needs of all students.
- Need to replace the archaic “wait to fail” model of intervention.
- Need to implement effective interventions that are based on research and evidence.

Roles and Responsibilities of Key Players

District Leadership Team

- Provide tangible professional development, resources, and materials
- Communicate understandable common message to participants and the public
- Oversee Leadership Team
- Support stakeholders
- Coordinate and assist in data analysis
- Communicate the Universal Screener (benchmarking) dates and data entry deadlines to the district
- Coordinate consistent, District-wide research and evidence-based instruction/curriculum/intervention

Building Principals

- Schedule and delegate responsibilities
- Communicate to teachers, families, participants
- Support implementation
- Provide and facilitate professional development/ resource
- Insure fidelity of instruction
- Coordinate and assist in data analysis
- Organize the building team

Classroom Teachers (General Education)

- Provide research and evidence based instruction/curriculum/interventions
- Differentiate levels of instruction
- Initiate & maintain fidelity of instruction, assessment, and intervention
- Evaluate students for placement in tiers for instruction and develop flexible Tier 2 and Tier 3 assignments to meet student needs
- Establish performance goals for the student in the targeted area(s)
- Develop a plan that details specific interventions to address the goals and determine how the student's progress will be monitored
- Monitor/assess/document data and student progress
- Communicate and collaborate with all appropriate stakeholders
- Monitor progress according to the ISBE established timelines
- Problem-solve with principal regarding case-by-case questions as they arise

School Social Workers and Psychologists

- Communicate and collaborate with teachers and administrators to disaggregate student data
- Function as a resource for student interventions at all levels
- Participate in Tier 3 problem solving, determining & providing interventions for students, and progress monitoring as appropriate
- Assist with staff development to support the Rtl process as needed
- Communicate & collaborate with all appropriate stakeholders

Other Certified & Support Staff

- Communicate and collaborate with all appropriate stakeholders
- Act as a resource to support the Rtl process
- Provide interventions for students and progress monitoring as appropriate

Building Leadership Teams

- Responsibilities merged with those of the School Improvement Teams
- Establish a structure of implementation of the tiers at each site
- Support respective school staff with implementation
- Analyze fall, winter, and spring universal screener implementation and school-wide data
- Ensure the fidelity of the implementation
- Relay strengths and needs of process to the district leadership team

Parents

- Be an active participant in the Problem Solving meetings
- Be involved in data sharing and decision-making
- Support their child(ren) at home with any interventions that have a home component
- Ask questions; express concerns and offer suggestions

Promoting Understanding of Components Needed for Implementation

The District will be responsible for disseminating information in an attempt to build consensus and deliver a consistent message among all key players in the approach to Response to Intervention.

The Illinois State Response to Intervention (RtI) Plan

“The Illinois State Board of Education (ISBE) believes that increased student learning requires the consistent practice of providing high quality instruction matched to student needs. Response to Intervention is a general education initiative which requires collaborative efforts from all district staff, general educators, special educators, and bilingual/ELL staff. In a quality educational environment student academic and behavioral needs must be identified and monitored continuously with documented student performance data used to make instructional decisions...” (ISBE, January 1, 2008)

The process of such identification and continuous monitoring are the foundational pieces of a successful system of early interventions. The success of all students toward the Illinois Learning Standards is improved when instructional and behavioral goals are frequently monitored. Data derived from such monitoring should then inform instructional strategies gauged to enhance success. It is important to note that it is through the continuous use of progress monitoring and analysis of student

academic and behavioral growth that proper instructional and curricular responses may be made.

The proposed state framework supporting the development of a system of scientifically, research based interventions is outlined in the remainder of this document. As districts develop their Rtl Plans by January 2009, their plans shall support a fluid model of response to interventions of varying intensity to meet the needs of all students.

Website, Brochures, Newsletters

Any and all information regarding Response to Intervention will be available to all district staff, students and parents via the district website, brochures, newsletters and podcasts. Rtl updates, examples and demonstrations will be presented in the form of visual and auditory podcasts and newsletters with links to resources for all stakeholders.

District Web Site: www.ccsd66.org

Action Plan for Implementation

| AIMSweb Universal Screener K-8 Testing Dates Targets | | |
|--|--|---|
| Fall Assessments | First 2 weeks of school October | 1 st grade-8 th grade Kindergarten |
| Winter Assessments | 2 nd & 3 rd weeks of January | K-8 |
| Spring Assessments | Last month of school | K-8 |

Professional Development Strategies/Activities:

- In-house Rtl trainings
- Attend ASPIRE Module Trainings
- Rtl 2-Day Conference featuring George Batsche
- AIMSweb Training: Overview presentation of using AIMSweb and data collection; K-8
- AIMSweb Maze (Comprehension)
- PBIS Training
- Rtl Demo Schools Site Visits; Elementary /Middle Schools
- Intervention Showcase Workshop
- Institute Day- *"Data Analysis Retreat"*; (2011)
- Standards Aligned Classroom Professional Development; K-8 (2009-Date)
- Summer Trainings; K-8 (Summer 2010 and 2011)
- MAP Data Analysis Retreat grades 2-8 (2010)

Rtl Benchmarking and Data Entry Schedule

The Central Office Administration will be responsible each school calendar year for setting up the AIMSweb Universal Screener/Benchmarking dates, data entry deadlines, and communicating the schedule to the district.

The individual Building Administration and office staff (designated by the principal) will be responsible each school calendar year for enrolling and/or transferring students in/out of the AIMSweb School Management System. They will also be responsible for copying and distributing individual student testing materials to the respective teachers.

Universal Screening

The primary purpose of universal screening is to determine which students need help. The term universal screening applies to a process that is short, quick and easy-to-administer probes that are aligned to the curriculum and measures specific skills a student has achieved. The process of universal screening must occur three times a year: fall, winter, and spring. The fall data should be collected within the first two weeks of the school year, the winter data in January and the spring data in May of the school year. The data should be used for making curriculum decisions and informing instruction for students.

| AIMSweb Universal Screener K-8 Testing Dates Targets | | |
|---|--|---|
| Fall Assessments | First 2 weeks of school October | 1 st grade-8 th grade Kindergarten |
| Winter Assessments | 2 nd & 3 rd weeks of January | K-8 |
| Spring Assessments | Last month of school | K-8 |

Universal Screeners (Methods of Assessment)
Screening and Progress Monitoring Plan for Reading, Writing and Math

Elementary and Middle School Reading Assessments:

AIMSweb Formative Assessment (PreK-8):

Benchmarking Schedule for Reading

| Bench- marking Period | KDG | 1st | 2nd | 3rd | 4th | 5th | 6th | 7th | 8th |
|--------------------------------------|---------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|
| FALL | LNF LSF | LSF, PSF | ORF (CBM) | ORF | ORF | ORF | MAPS | MAPS | MAPS |
| WINTER | LNF, LSF, PSF | PSF, ORF (CBM) | ORF (CBM) | ORF | ORF | ORF | MAPS | MAPS | MAPS |
| SPRING | LNF, LSF, PSF | NWF, ORF (CBM) | ORF (CBM) | ORF | ORF | ORF | MAPS | MAPS | MAPS |

AIMSweb Skill Assessments:

LNF- Letter Naming Fluency

LSF- Letter Sound Fluency

PSF- Phonemic Segmentation Fluency

ORF- Oral Reading Fluency (Curriculum Based Measurements)

Additional District-wide Assessments (K-8):

- Running Records
- MAPS (2nd-8th grade)
- Sight Word Assessment (1st grade)
- Common Grade Level Assessments
- DRA (1st and 2nd grade)
- ISEL (kindergarten)
- ISAT (3rd-8th grade)
- AIMSweb Math Assessments
- PBIS Behavior Data

There may be times that additional assessments are needed in order to plan interventions for students. This need might occur when students are performing below the 20th percentile compared to grade level peers on AIMSweb or other indicators of academic performance, or when parents or teachers have concerns about progress. The purpose of the assessment is only for data gathering in order to help inform instruction. Personnel available to do this type of assessment could include a school social worker, school psychologist or any other school employee with training on a particular assessment tool. If a parent has a concern about whether or not his/her child has a disability, CCSD66 Support Staff (psychologist, social worker, director, and/or designee) needs to be notified so special education protocol and requirements are followed.

Progress Monitoring:

- Students receiving Tier II interventions will be monitored every 2 weeks using the progress monitoring tool for data collection.
- Students receiving Tier III interventions will be monitored weekly using the progress monitoring tool for data collection.

Tier 3: Intense Interventions

- Very Small # of Students
- Targeted Interventions

- Small Group Instruction
- Progress Monitored
- In addition to core instruction
- Students will be considered for possible Tier 3 interventions when benchmark or progress monitoring data indicates the need for intensive support (at or below 5%ile locally)

Tier 2: Small Group

- For Some Students
- Academic and Behavior
- Focused Interventions
- Progress Monitored
- In addition to core instruction
- Students who score below grade level standards compared to grade level peers will be considered for possible Tier 2 intervention

Tier 1: Classroom Setting

- For All Students
- Core Curriculum
- AIMSweb Universal Screener
- Appropriate Research-based Instruction
- Differentiation around the core
- MAPS

Position Statement for Referral to Tier 2

- AIMSweb data will be reviewed by the team (i.e. grade level team) after each of the 3 benchmarking windows (Fall, Winter, Spring).
- Any student who scores below the 20th percentile based on the local AIMSweb norms will be flagged as requiring further review.
- All convergent data will be reviewed to determine the level of support/intervention needed and the frequency of progress monitoring.
- Students will be activated for strategic monitoring (which occurs biweekly) on AIMSweb when their benchmarking scores indicate the need for supplemental intervention
- If AIMSweb scores are not below 20th percentile but other data available shows significant delay, then other progress monitoring tools may be more appropriate.
- Data of students receiving Tier 2 interventions will be reviewed approximately every 6 weeks, or as needed, by the grade level team to determine level of intervention needed.

Definition of Interventions to be used at Tier 2

- Small group instruction with focus on specific skill area, 15-30 minutes/day 2-5 days per week
- Direct Instruction by trained professional in area of need and in specific intervention.
- Interventions that are researched-based and evidence-based will be utilized for specific area of need, as found on specific websites such as Intervention Central, FCRR, What Works Clearinghouse, or other resources
- Title I services
- Summer School
- The district will determine specific research-based instructional strategies to be used at each grade level across the district.

Position Statement for Referral to Tier 3

There are two ways a child could be referred for Tier 3 interventions. When relevant data, including AIMSweb and MAP, indicates a need for intense intervention for those students not currently receiving interventions outside of the classroom OR when progress monitoring data indicates inadequate progress with a current intervention, a child could need more intense, consistent intervention like those delivered in Tier 3. Both scenarios are explained below.

- 1) For students not currently receiving interventions outside of Core Curriculum:

AIMSweb data will be reviewed by the team (i.e. grade level team) after each of the 3 benchmarking windows (Fall, Winter, Spring)

- Any student who scores at or below the 5th percentile based on local norms will be flagged for further review

All convergent data will be reviewed to determine accuracy of AIMSweb data if all data indicates significant delays, weekly progress monitoring will be initiated, and reviewed every 6 weeks Intense interventions will be initiated either in small group or in 1:1 setting focusing on area of skill deficit.

2) For students receiving interventions in addition to Core Curriculum:

Progress monitoring data will be reviewed every 6 weeks (AIMSweb or other appropriate, identified measure)

- If data shows no change or minimal change in progress, a change in intervention should be considered
- If the student is in need of intervention at a level of intensity and frequency that is greater than most of the other students, Tier 3 intervention is indicated. If data indicates adequate progress, student may continue with the intervention that is currently in place
- For Tier 3, weekly progress monitoring should be initiated with frequent review
- Interventions at Tier 3 will be initiated either in small group or 1:1 setting

Definitions of Interventions to be used at Tier 3

- Small group instruction with focus on specific skill area/need
- Direct Instruction by trained professional in area of need and in specific intervention.
- Interventions, that are researched-based for specific area of need.

Reading, Writing, and Math Interventions

The district will determine specific research-based instructional interventions to be used at each grade level across the district.

CRITERIA FOR ENTITLEMENT FOR SPECIAL EDUCATION Learning Disability

Learning Disability Definition:

A disorder in one or more of the basic psychological processes involved in understanding or in using language, spoken, or written, that may manifest itself in an imperfect ability to listen, think, speak, read, write, spell, or do mathematical calculations, including such conditions as perceptual disabilities, brain injury, minimal brain dysfunction, dyslexia, and developmental aphasia. (The term does not include learning problems that are primarily the result of visual, hearing or motor disabilities, of mental retardation, of emotional disturbance, or of environmental, cultural, or economic disadvantage.)

Indicators:

- Records indicate a history of academic difficulties
- Academic deficits are not primarily the result of other factors such as a visual, hearing, or motor disability; cognitive impairment; emotional disturbance; lack of appropriate instruction in reading or math; limited English proficiency; cultural factors; or environmental or economic disadvantage
- Student's skill level and performance in at least one academic area is significantly below that of peers or state-approved grade-level standards despite several scientific research-based interventions and modifications in instruction, curriculum, and environment
- Student demonstrates limited growth in achievement over time compared to prior levels of performance, peer growth rates, and expected performance despite data based interventions

Decision Making Process:

- Information and data must be gathered and documented from a variety of sources including classroom observations
- Information and data must be consistent and convergent
- Documented outcomes resulting from systematic progress monitoring indicates sustained resistance to an intervention plan designed to meet individual student needs
- To maintain and sustain interventions requires resources beyond those available in general education

Clarification of Eligibility Criteria

DISCREPANCY

A significant discrepancy in level and rate of performance compared to expectations

A significant discrepancy in level of achievement has been documented for this student using reliable technically adequate measure or measures of academic achievement/progress. This data could take the form of curriculum based measurement (e.g. AIMSWEB or MAPS progress monitoring data) or in more rare instances when such information is not available, convergent sources of data such as class- wide data or district-wide data could be used in conjunction with commercially available, technically adequate, measures of academic achievement.

A significant discrepancy in rate of performance compared to expectations has been documented for this student using a progress monitoring tool such as curriculum based measurement or other validated progress monitoring tools. A graphic representation indicates that the rate of performance is significantly below that of peers and that the trend line of the plotted data gathered weekly will not intersect with the grade level expectation for the student.

The student is achieving significantly below his/her assigned grade placement (i.e. 10% or below nationally, 5% or below locally)

Assigned grade placement is the grade level that the student is assigned to (e.g. the student is in third grade). Significantly below refers to the student being below the 5% local percentile on the most recent evaluation/progress monitoring data. District level normative data should be used to determine percentile rank performance. **The emphasis of this criterion is that if students are achieving at or near their assigned grade level despite showing signs of a learning disability, the adverse effect on educational performance is not significant and should not require special education services.**

INTEGRITY

Evidence of the integrity of instruction and intervention provided and the problem-solving process record is attached.

The evaluation team needs to document the areas being targeted for intervention and how instructional variables (e.g. instructional strategies, materials, arrangements, time, and/or motivation techniques) have been modified to address the area or areas of discrepancy. This can be facilitated by an Intervention Plan. Progress monitoring graphs showing the student's trend line, aim line, intervention treatments, etc. should also be attached. Evidence/documentation should include a graphic representation of the student's progress over time and the student's Intervention Plan. Interventions should be a minimum of 6 weeks in Tier 2 and Tier 3. Evidence that an intervention has been identified that results in a positive rate of improvement and/or evidence that changes were made to an intervention when data suggested the student was not making adequate progress (ISBE pg.16 B (e)) needs to be present before consideration is given to referring a student for special education eligibility under Specific Learning Disability.

INSTRUCTIONAL NEEDS

Illinois special education regulations require that school districts use an RtI framework as part of the special education evaluation process when a specific learning disability is suspected. Additionally, the RtI framework may be used as part of an evaluation in consideration of other disabilities. Within an RtI framework, school teams are able to use progress monitoring data to document a student's response to research-based interventions as part of the special education evaluation process. Evaluation to determine special education eligibility typically occurs at Tier 3 when a student either does not adequately respond to the most intensive interventions or requires intensive interventions to maintain adequate performance.

- a. Based on RtI outcome data, the factors of the intervention program at Tier 3 that are responsible for the student making progress **and**
- b. Characteristics of the educational program needed in order for the student to make educational progress, including the following:
 - i. Intensity of instruction(e.g., amount and rate of practice and feedback, how explicit the instruction is),
 - ii. Time delivered(e.g., amount of time weekly the intervention is delivered), **and**
 - iii. Size of group (e.g., individualized or small group). (ISBE pg. 16 (C))

RESEARCH/EVIDENCE-BASED INTERVENTIONS

A research--based intervention is an intervention that proves to be effective for the majority of the students for which it is used.

An example of a research-based intervention: Seven students received six weeks of small group (7:1), 30 minutes per day using X materials/X curriculum/X techniques. At the end of six weeks, five of the students were making good progress with the gap between their performance and peer performance decreasing. Two of the students continued to have significant differences between theirs and peer performance and were not making faster progress than before the intervention. Since the intervention was effective for the majority of the students for which it was used, we have evidence of its effectiveness and therefore, it is a research-based intervention.

An example of an intervention that is not evidence-based: Seven students received six weeks of small group (7:1) 30 minutes per day using X materials/X curriculum/X techniques. At the end of six weeks, two of the students were making good progress with the gap between their performance and peer performance decreasing. Five of the students continued to have significant differences between theirs and peer performance and were not making faster progress than before the intervention. For this intervention, we do not have evidence that it was an effective intervention for the type of problem identified, so we do not have an evidence-based

intervention in place and therefore, need to revise the intervention plan for these students to find one more effective.

EXCLUSIONARY FACTORS

Vision Disability

The student has passed a vision screening. If not, the team must document why it believes that vision problems are not the primary cause of learning problems.

Hearing Disability

The student has passed a hearing screening. If not, the team must document why it believes that hearing problems are not the primary cause of learning problems.

Motor Disability

Gross or fine motor difficulties are not the primary cause of learning problems.

Environmental Factors

In the team's judgment, the discrepancy documented is not primarily caused by numerous school transfers (at least three moves) or absences (absent at least 25% of the time in the grading period for reasons other than verified personal illness). The discrepancy is not primarily caused by a significant traumatic event in the child's life affecting learning. Extreme disruption or disorganization in the family unit is not the primary cause of the learning problems.

The discrepancy noted is not primarily caused by limited experiential background (e.g. lack of opportunity to acquire basic learning skills, lack of exposure to school environments, classrooms, lack of opportunities to interact with peers and adults). Other environmental factors to be considered include negative neighborhood influences or exposure to violence or other inappropriate behaviors.

Factors related to the classroom environment must also be considered. The discrepancy noted is not primarily caused by inadequate matching of teaching styles with individual learning styles.

Cultural Factors

The discrepancy noted is not primarily caused by differing school expectations as defined by the student's culture. The discrepancy noted is not primarily caused by limited experiences of social interaction with mainstream culture or to limited experiences which stimulate cognitive/academic growth and fund of knowledge. Cultural factors to be considered may include behavioral expectations, family involvement/support in schools, etc.

Economic Factors

The discrepancy noted is not primarily caused by economic factors such as low income family, unemployed parents, limited facilities, and limited school supplies. Economic

factors include lack of resources such as money, medical care, phone, and transportation.

Cognitive Disability

A student cannot be eligible for both Cognitive Disability and Specific Learning Disabilities. If a student meets the criteria for Cognitive Disability, the student is not eligible for under Specific Learning Disability.

Emotional Disturbance

The noted discrepancy is not primarily caused by depression, immaturity, recent life changes, unwillingness to complete work, or emotional trauma.

Limited English Proficiency

The discrepancy noted is primarily not caused by lack of proficiency in the English language.

Center Cass Special Education **Problem Solving/Referral Process**

Purpose

There are many reasons for learning problems in the classroom. It is essential to have a plan for studying children systematically before referring them for intensive evaluations. The Problem Solving Process emphasizes a preventative approach with research/evidence-based interventions to help students who are experiencing difficulty. Prior to referring a child for a Case Study Evaluation, this process allows for the use of collaborative problem solving in developing alternative research/evidence-based intervention strategies for use in the school setting in order to increase student performance. The process takes advantage of existing professional skills and helps to address problems that may be related to factors other than disability conditions. This model is consistent with Federal and State mandates.

This process should not be used or misinterpreted as an approach for delaying the provision of services for students with disabilities. In fact, the purpose of this problem solving process is to expand available assistance to students in the regular classroom in a timely manner, not to deny needed services.

Before initiation of a case study evaluation and determination of eligibility for special education **services, it is required that there be dated and signed documented evidence of intensive interventions that are research/evidenced-based and data driven indicating a discrepancy from the peer group performance** The results of these interventions should be used as the basis for making decisions regarding further educational interventions and/or establishing the need for initiating a referral for consideration of a Case Study Evaluation.

Process

A. Request for Problem Solving-Tier 3

1. This will include Tier 1 and Tier 2 data with documented parent involvement. For Tier 3 students who do not make adequate progress the grade level team will consider a referral for individual problem solving.

2. Problem Solving Request is reviewed and an individual problem solving team is created as warranted.

3. Additional intense research/evidence-based interventions may be implemented and progress monitored with data documented in graph form over a minimum of 6 weeks in Tier 3.

4. At a scheduled follow-up meeting, the data is reviewed.

- If the interventions are effective, the decision may be made to:
 - Continue with the plan
 - Gradually phase out the plan
 - Extend the intervention to other settings
 - Design additional strategies for other problem areas of learning (to recycle the problem solving steps)
 - Refer for Case Study Evaluation (interventions too intense to continue without special education)
- If the interventions are not effective, the decision may be made to:
 - Reconsider working hypothesis
 - Increase amount of instruction/intervention
 - Gather more data
 - Refer For Case Study Evaluation

The following components are required for a referral for consideration of a Case Study Evaluation for students in the Tier 3 Intervention Process:

Discrepancy Data/Integrity

Progress monitoring graphs showing the student's trend line, Student's skill level and performance in at least one academic area is significantly below that of peers or state-approved grade-level standards despite several research/evidence-based interventions and modifications in instruction, curriculum, and environment.

- Student demonstrates limited growth in achievement over time (trend line), compared to prior levels of performance (baseline), peer growth rates (local comparisons), and expected performance (aim line) despite data based interventions OR has shown growth, but only because of the intensity of the intervention.
- When compared to same grade peers, the student is performing below the 5th percentile on local norms and below the 10th percentile on either state or national norms OR would be without the level of intensive interventions that are in place.
- 80% of the peer group is meeting expectations in the area of concern.
- The student has received intense (greater than that provided for 90% of grade level peers) research/evidence-based interventions for a minimum of 6 weeks.

- Progress monitoring graphs showing the student's trend line, aim line and response to intervention are present.

The Rtl Process will not be used as a reason for refusing a parent's request for a CSE

Case Study Evaluation

If problems are severe and resistant to interventions a request by the problem solving team for a Case Study Evaluation may be initiated.

1. Referral for Case Study Evaluation Form is completed, signed by referring teacher and principal.
2. The problem solving team including the parent completes ISBE 34-57 B/C.
3. Parent/Guardian provides written permission for case study evaluation or declines consent in writing on ISBE 34-57B.
4. Parents are given copies of ISBE 34-57A, 34-57B and 34-57B/C along with a copy of Explanation of Procedural Safeguards (ISBE 34-57J).

The referral form and parent consent are forwarded to the Special Services Office.

Common Forms and Use for Rtl

- Form 1: Instructional Planning Form
- Form 2: Summary Worksheet
- Form 3: Individual Student (Tier 3) Problem Solving Request
- Form 4: Plan Development
- Form 5: Problem Analysis Worksheet
- Form 6: Problem Identification

RESOURCES:

- Illinois State Board of Education www.isbe.net
- CORE: Teaching Reading Sourcebook www.corelearn.com
- Council of Exceptional Children www.cec.net
- The Florida Center for Reading Research www.fcrr.org
- U.S. Dept of Education Institute of Education Sciences:
What Works Clearinghouse <http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc>
- Intervention Central- Response to Intervention Resources
www.interventioncentral.org
- Total RtI <http://thertisite.learningtodayonline.com>
- National Center on Response to Intervention www.RtI4success.org
- The National Center for Learning Disabilities www.NCLD.org
- Council of Administrators of Special Education: www.casecec.org/rti.htm
- The IRIS Center: www.iris.peabody.vanderbilt.edu
- National Association of State Directors of
- National Center on Response to Intervention www.RtI4success.org
- The National Center for Learning Disabilities www.NCLD.org
- Parenting www.parenting.org

- Family Education www.familyeducation.com

- The Starfall Store www.starfall.com

- Reading Rockets www.readingrockets.org/families/buildskills

- Math Online www.math.com

- AplusMath www.aplusmath.com

Problem Solving Checklist

Date When
Done

○ **Problem Identification**

An initial **discrepancy was defined** in observable measurable terms and was quantified. (list all concerns, prioritize one, collect data to determine a discrepancy)
Documented Data from at least two sources converge to support the discrepancy statement. (i.e., interview + observation, or test data + observation)
Student baseline data in the area of concern is collected using a measurement system with sufficient technical adequacy for ongoing frequent measurement, and includes a minimum of 3 data points with standardized procedures for assessment. **Baseline data are graphed.**

○ **Problem Analysis**

Data from a **variety of sources (RIOT) and domains (ICEL)** were collected to consider multiple hypotheses for the cause of the identified discrepancy. These data are documented.
A **single hypothesis** for the cause of the discrepancy was selected. At least two pieces of data converge to support this hypothesis. At least one of these is quantitative.

○ **Plan Development**

A **data-based goal** was established that describes the learner, conditions (time and materials for responding), expected performance, and a goal date. The goal is indicated on a graph.
The intervention selected meets federal definition of scientifically research-based intervention. The selected intervention directly addresses the specific identified problem and the hypothesis for the cause of the discrepancy.
A **written intervention plan** was clearly defined that explicitly describes what will be done, where, when, how often, how long (per session), by whom, and with what resources.
A written description of the **progress-monitoring plan** was completed and includes who will collect data, data collection methods, conditions for data collections, and schedule.
A **decision making rule** was selected for use.

A plan evaluation **meeting was set** for no more than 8 weeks after the plan is established.
A **direct observation of the intervention** was completed at least one time. Any discrepancies between the written plan and the intervention in action were noted and resolved. Observations continued until the intervention being delivered and the written intervention plan matched. Written documentation of each observation was made.
Data were collected and graphed as stated in plan. The required number of data points were collected under the same intervention conditions after integrity was established.

○ **Plan Evaluation**

Team documented agreement that the **plan was carried out as intended.**

Team determined and documented whether the **pre-intervention discrepancy decreased, increased, or stayed the same** during the plan implementation phase.
Team decided to **continue** the plan unmodified, **modify, fade, or terminate the plan.**
Team documented this decision.

Problem Identification

Student: _____

Date: _____

| Problem Behaviors |
|--|
| List problem behavior(s) and prioritize: |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |

| Statement of Problem | |
|----------------------|--------------------|
| What is Expected | What is Occurring? |
| | |

| Data Collection Plan | | | | | | | |
|--|-----|-----------|-----|---------|-----|------|-----|
| How do You Know? Determine what data exists or if any additional data is needed to support Problem Statement | | | | | | | |
| Review | | Interview | | Observe | | Test | |
| What | Who | What | Who | What | Who | What | Who |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| By When: _____ | | | | | | | |

Problem Analysis Worksheet

Using RIOT and ICEL

Student or Group: _____ Date Completed: _____

_____ **Because:** _____
Statement of Problem

| | Hypotheses | Review | Interview | Observe | Test |
|-------------|------------|--------|-----------|---------|------|
| Instruction | | | | | |
| Curriculum | | | | | |
| Environment | | | | | |
| Learner | | | | | |

Plan Development

Student or Group: _____ Date: _____

Hypothesis: _____

BECAUSE: _____

Statement of Problem

Goal: In **(timeframe)** weeks, when **(condition)** occurs, **(group/individual)** will **(behavior)** to **(criterion)**

INTERVENTION

| | |
|---|--|
| Brief Description: | |
| Description of Needed Materials: | |
| Intervention Implementer: | |
| When: | |
| Where: | |
| How Often: | |

MEASUREMENT SYSTEM

| | Progress Monitoring | Intervention Integrity |
|-------------------------------|---------------------|------------------------|
| Data Collection System: | | |
| Data Collector: | | |
| What Will Be Recorded? | | |
| Frequency of Data Collection: | | |
| When will Data be Reviewed? | | |

DECISION MAKING RULE

| | |
|--|---|
| When will you review the data to make decisions? (how many data points or what period of time) | Modification Criteria: What level of performance should you see? If not at |
|--|---|

Intervention Start Date:

Review Date: _____ Time: _____ Place:

INTERVENTION DETAILS

Provide a detailed description of the intervention:

Plan Evaluation

Student or Group: _____

Date: _____

#

REVIEW INTERVENTION

Intervention Plan Intervention delivered as planned

Intervention revised. Attach revised intervention plan

Intervention Integrity Attach completed integrity checks:

Intervention Integrity

Teacher self-report/Logs

Ratings scales

Permanent Products

Observations/Walkthroughs

PROGRESS TOWARDS GOAL

- As a result of this intervention implementation:
 - Goal was met
 - Trend line shows that the student is on track to meet or exceed goal
 - Trend line shows that the student is not on track to meet or exceed the goal
 - Insufficient Data

- For concern that is not on track to make goal: (others skip to item 3)
 - Trend line shows that performance improved
 - Trend line shows that performance got worse

- In the team's opinion, was the plan responsible for any change?
 Yes No Not sure

- The next steps for the team will be to:
 - Discontinue intervention – goal met
 - Maintain or generalize current plan
 - Select a new problem (New Problem ID & Analysis Form)
 - Select a new hypothesis for the same problem (Revise RIOT ICEL Matrix to reflect new problem analysis work)

- Retain current hypothesis, but modify the intervention plan (New Intervention Plan Form)

- Is a referral for a special education evaluation being considered at this time?

Yes

No

Next Meeting Date: _____

(If none is needed, information should be placed in the student's cumulative record).

#

Instructional Planning Form

| Student Names |
|---------------|
| 1 |
| 2 |
| 3 |

Teacher Name _____ Date _____

Goal _____

Plan Evaluation Dates _____

| Skill | Teaching Strategy | Materials | Arrangement | Time | Motivational Strategies | Assessment Procedures |
|-------|-------------------|-----------|-------------|------|-------------------------|-----------------------|
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |

Extra Practice Plan:

INDIVIDUAL STUDENT (Tier 3) PROBLEM SOLVING REQUEST

Student's Name: _____

School/Grade: _____ / _____ DOB: _____ Gender: M F

Parent(s)/ Legal Guardian(s) Name: _____

Phone Number: _____

Additional Contact Information (e.g. alt. phone, email, etc.): _____

Vision Screening _____ P/F Glasses Hearing Screening _____ P/F

Child's Primary Language: _____ Parent's Primary Language: _____

Health Concerns/Medical Diagnoses: _____

Current medications? Y/N If yes, please list medication and dosage:

Have any rating scales been completed on this child? Y/N (please attach)

List any services the child is currently receiving or has received in the past (Reading or Math Intervention, Counseling, Speech, etc.) and attach benchmark and/or progress monitoring data, and most recent report card

Service Description

Reason for Referral (Rank Primary Concerns 1-3):

___ Behavioral/Emotional

___ Off-task ___ Task Refusal ___ Physical Aggression

___ Withdrawn ___ Non-Compliance ___ Verbal Aggression

___ Other: _____

Please list your baseline data for the area of concern (example: Mary disrupts instruction 5 times per day, Tommy is getting out of his seat on average of 10 times in 30 minutes)

Please describe specifically what you would like the student to be able to do:

Please list any behavioral interventions that have been tried and the results:

What information have you obtained about your concerns through parent and/or student

interviews? _____

Parent(s): Date parent(s) contacted: _____

What days and times during the week prior to the problem solving meeting can someone come to observe the student in the area of difficulty?

Who will observe? _____

Date parent(s) agreed to observation and initiation of problem solving process. _____

If unable to contact parent(s) document the attempts to contact prior to the meeting.

Date

Teacher Signature

