Integrating Tiered Data Based Decision Making to Address Essential Questions in an RTI Process:

District and School Level Decision-Making

Today we will focus on

- Communication among problem solvers across the school/district:
  - Grade level teams
  - Individual student problem solving teams
  - Multi-Disciplinary Teams
  - School RTI Teams
  - District RTI Team
  - School/district RTI teams that inform and are informed by grade level teams

- Using data to identify and prioritize acquisition and allocation of resources (staff, materials) and professional development

- Developing an infrastructure for planning, communicating and responding to students' and educators' needs

- Using RTI information for special education decision-making

- Synergy

DBDM is part of the RTI problem solving process and addresses the following questions

- What do the students know? (What are their needs and what do we need to teach?)
- Are programs in our school effective in meeting student needs? (Are there certain groups whose needs are not being addressed?)
- Who are the students who we prioritize for additional supports? (At this level it may also be teachers, grade levels)
- Is the student making progress? (Do I stay the course or make an instructional adjustment?)
- What do we need to do to improve our educational system for all students? (e.g., materials, scheduling, professional development)

Data needs to be organized and communicated effectively with key audiences

DBDM can be used to support other school/state requirements. Work smart and coordinate these efforts.
Problem Solving Steps (see 5/24/16 webinar)

1. Identify prioritized problem(s)
2. Analyze the problem: What contributes to the problem? (with a well-functioning RTI model, assessments in place should be adequate for ongoing program evaluation)
3. Plan interventions that will address prioritized problems/needs (e.g., Resource acquisition/allocation, professional development, scheduling)
4. Set realistic but ambitious goals
5. Plan how to evaluate outcomes
6. Plan how to support intervention/interventionist, address challenges, and follow up
7. Plan communication with relevant audiences

See accompanying resources: RTI Action Plan 5.30.16

Grade Level Data Meeting Input for School & District Team

School Level RTI Teams

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Members</th>
<th>Purpose</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Four to six times per year or as requested by the Grade Level Data Teams | • Principal  
• Teachers reps (general and special education)  
• Interventionists  
• School psychologist  
• specialists (e.g., literacy coordinator, ESL teacher)  
May consider:  
• Other faculty members*  
• Parents*  
• Community member*  
* as needed | • Coordinate RTI for building.  
• Coordinate assessment and problem solving schedules, and support for teachers.  
• Plan professional development for interventions and strengthening core instruction.  
• Report to the grade levels and district teams |

Response to Intervention (RTI)
A tiered problem solving process in schools might be:

Informal consultation with colleagues (All tiers)

Post Benchmark Data Meetings (All tiers September, January and May/June, but focus primarily on tiers 2 and 3 in January and May/June)

Checkup Data Meetings (efficient and responsive) (Tier 2 and 3 at about the October 10 week and March 10 week points)

Effective problem solving team meetings to identify and understand more complex problems for individual students, plan and evaluate interventions (typically tiers 2b and 3)

Multidisciplinary Team (MDT) meetings - CSE decision making (initial referrals, IEP Goals, annual/re-evaluation review planning)

District/School RTI team meetings - Make decisions concerning resources, decision making and infrastructure.

Purposes of the School Team

• Analyze school screening & progress monitoring data
• Identify needs across grade levels and within subgroups
• Informs acquisition and allocation of necessary resources  
  — Staff  
  — Materials  
  — Schedules  
• Develop a school-wide action plan and goals to address area of need
• Evaluate effectiveness of school-wide plan, including evaluation of core curriculum/ instruction
• Evaluate progress towards school level goals
• Planning and scheduling benchmarks and data meetings
• Works to improve decision making process

See accompanying ‘RTI Action Plan’ adapted from NYS RTI document
School Level RTI Team DBDM Questions
Also informed from information collected at grade level data meetings

See accompanying ‘RTI Action Plan’ adapted from NYS RTI document and Grade Level Data Meeting Feedback for School & District Team

- What percentage of students at each grade are at risk?
- Is risk diminishing over time (across the school year, over multiple years)?
- What are the areas of need? What might be creating or maintaining the problem(s)?
- Are subgroups reaching expected cut scores (e.g. students with disabilities, English Language Learners)?
- Where are our instructional/intervention gaps?

Advanced and Ongoing Preparation for the Post-benchmark Meeting (Fall, Winter, Spring)
School/District RTI Team with input from grade level staff complete this intervention resource inventory and update continuously

### Data Meeting Input for School/District RTI Team

| Concerns identified: What contributes to grade level concerns: Possible ideas to address concerns: |
| Possible Barriers: Change strategies: |
| Possible Opportunities: |
| Decision making is an ongoing process for identifying needs, gaps and redundancies in core curriculum and intervention needs. |
| What would grade level like to see happen? (Goal) |

### District RTI Team Membership

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>When</th>
<th>Members</th>
<th>Purpose</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>As needed, but at least twice per year. Perhaps after each benchmark.</td>
<td>Superintendent and/or Assistant Superintendent, Director of Curriculum and Instruction, Pupil Service Director, Special Education Director, Principals, Teacher Reps, Interventionist representative, Support Staff rep.</td>
<td>Determine needs, gaps and redundancies in assessment (considering multiple purposes for assessment – e.g., APPR, RTI, Special Ed., program evaluation) – Examine grade, school, district level needs (including core instruction – these needs should be documented at grade level meeting) – Determine needs, gaps and redundancies in interventions – Determine needs, gaps and redundancies in intervention needs – Schedule coordinated teams/meetings – Develop decision rules (e.g., LD determination) – Determine how information is shared with parents – Support RTI and coordinate with other district initiatives/priorities/policies.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Grade Level Data Meeting Step 1 Examine grade level needs and effectiveness of core instruction (Tier 1)

Look at big picture:
- What % of students at grade are at some risk? At high risk?
- Is risk reducing over time (across the school year, over multiple years)? (Winter and Spring) What works and what doesn’t work?
- Whose risk is reducing/increasing?
- How does your school compare?
- What are possible areas of weakness in core?
Step 1: Problem Identification: Charts used (AIMSweb) at a school/district level to identify proportion of students at risk and evaluate core instruction (Tier 1 program evaluation). Used to plan resource allocation and professional development needs.

AIMSweb example comparing risk at each grade level on one benchmark period. Compare grade 3 with grade 5. Interpretation depends on the time of year the benchmark was taken. If this is fall benchmark, identify potential weaknesses in grade 2 instruction and what grade 4 is doing to accelerate students. Spring? Grade 3 may need some work and grade 5 is doing something right.

Prioritize students for targeted tiered support.

What are the specific areas where many of our at-risk students are deficient (diagnostic data)?

Are there reasons why some students are not making adequate progress with concerns?

YES

Step 2 Analyze/understand the problem: Examine grade level needs and effectiveness of core instruction (Tier 1)

Reflecting on current practice

• What are the specific areas where many of our at-risk students are deficient (diagnostic data)?
• Is there data to suggest what aspects of core instruction need to be addressed?
• Are there reasons why some students are not making adequate gains?

Bring this information to the school/district RTI team.

### Decision Tree: Who’s At-Risk?

(Example: School/District Teams make these decisions)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Low Risk</th>
<th>Slight Risk</th>
<th>Some Risk</th>
<th>High Risk</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students who are in the average range (20th percentile nationally) but below criterion cut score for low risk</td>
<td>Students who are between 20th and 30th percentile locally and below criterion cut score for low risk</td>
<td>Students who are below 20th percentile locally and at high risk based on criterion cut score</td>
<td>Tier 2 (differentiated instruction and supports)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These are examples: School/District RTI team determines

Step 2 Prioritize students for targeted tiered intervention: Decision rules

Addressing needs of only those students below 30th percentile (local norm) may not be enough (especially in ‘low performing’ schools). On the other hand since low risk is associated with the 40th percentile nationally, most schools do not have the resources to pull all students at some or high risk in Tier 2 or Tier 3.

Focused instruction for Tier 2 students is important to improve achievement and readiness for Grade 3. Focused Tier 2 intervention for high risk students is critical to ensure Tier 3 intervention is not needed. On the other hand, high risk students make up a small portion of at-risk students. Tier 3 intervention is focused on the most serious students with significant needs. In the event high risk Tier 3 is not needed, Tier 2 could be increased to provide the needed intervention.

### Step 2 Analyze/understand the problem: Examine grade level needs and effectiveness of core instruction (Tier 1)

Reflecting on current practice

• What are the specific areas where many of our at-risk students are deficient (diagnostic data)?
• Is there data to suggest what aspects of core instruction need to be addressed?
• Are there reasons why some students are not making adequate gains?

Bring this information to the school/district RTI team.

Your School’s decision tree may prioritize all students for Tier 2, 3 intervention based on local norms and then address needs of remaining at-risk students in Tier 1 using grade/classroom based interventions.

**RtI Decision Tree for Universal Screening and Progress Monitoring**

- **Slight Risk**
  - If student is in the average range (20th percentile nationally) but below criterion cut score for low risk, provide Tier 2 supports.
  - If student is between 20th and 30th percentile locally and below criterion cut score for low risk, provide Tier 2 supports.
  - If student is below 20th percentile locally and at high risk based on criterion cut score, provide Tier 3 supports.

- **High Risk**
  - If student is in the average range (20th percentile nationally) but below criterion cut score for low risk, provide Tier 2 supports.
  - If student is between 20th and 30th percentile locally and below criterion cut score for low risk, provide Tier 2 supports.
  - If student is below 20th percentile locally and at high risk based on criterion cut score, provide Tier 3 supports.

**Step 2 Analyze/understand the problem: Examine grade level needs and effectiveness of core instruction (Tier 1)**

Reflecting on current practice

• What are the specific areas where many of our at-risk students are deficient (diagnostic data)?
• Is there data to suggest what aspects of core instruction need to be addressed?
• Are there reasons why some students are not making gains?

Bring this information to the school/district RTI team.

Your School’s decision tree may prioritize all students for Tier 2, 3 intervention based on local norms and then address needs of remaining at-risk students in Tier 1 using grade/classroom based interventions.
When determining if a student has a learning disability, the data from multiple sources indicates that the student, when provided appropriate instruction:

- does not adequately achieve grade level standards in the areas of reading and/or mathematics; and
- exhibits a pattern of strengths and weaknesses in performance and/or achievement relative to age or grade level standards as found relevant by the CSE; and
- has learning difficulties that are not primarily the result of a visual, hearing or motor disability; mental retardation; emotional disturbance; cultural factors; environmental or economic disadvantage; or limited English proficiency.

(Bold/color/italicize added)
2) Discrepancy or 'Gap' in 'Expected Progress'

"Progress monitoring data that describes how a student responded to particular interventions of increasing intensity..."  "evaluative data including CBM regarding a student's performance that is useful and instructionally relevant."

- Typical ROI Fall to Winter for 2nd graders in Jonesville = .9
- Typical rate of improvement AIMSweb 2nd grade norms = 1.2
- Jose's RTI goal 1.5
- District identified criteria for insufficient progress = \leq .7

Jose's intervention slopes:
1) .32  2) .24  3) .43  4) -.29  5) .40

### Expected Progress Monitoring: Inadequate Growth

**Example of STAR Progress Monitoring: Inadequate Growth**

- **District (LEA) needs to develop a consistent policy RTI goals set for students:**
  - Expected Rate of Improvement (ROI) for RTI: Accelerated growth rate (e.g., 75th percentile rate of improvement)
  - Expected progress norm: 50th percentile growth
  - Reach ___ criteria by the end of the year

  **But: What is expected/sufficient progress???**

  Local Education Agency (your district) decides

- Some Pptions for 'Less than Sufficient Progress':
  - Below the RTI rate of improvement goal (e.g., 75th percentile ROI). (This will include many students – probably too many 'false positives')
  - Any score below the average rate of improvement for a student in that grade. (Based on the assumption that if they are receiving exceptional and additional instruction we should expect exceptional progress).
  - A rate of improvement that is 1 standard deviation or one SEM from the average rate of improvement
    - (e.g., Average ROI FastBridge 2nd graders CBMReading = 1.36 words per week; SD = .38; Less than sufficient progress is \leq .98 per week growth).
    - AIMSweb lists SEM for RCBM at .5

- ROI growth norms to determine 'expected growth' and 'below expected growth'?
  - Some districts may determine expected growth as 50th percentile ROI and below expected growth as 1 standard deviation below that rate.

- ROI growth norms to determine 'expected growth' and 'below expected growth'? Some districts may determine expected growth as 50th percentile ROI and below expected growth as 1 standard deviation below that rate.

- AIMSweb Example:

  **DBDM: Progress Monitoring**

  - **Winter-S** Fall-Spring
  - **Fall-W** Fall-Spring

  - For 2nd grade CBMReading, average weekly growth, fall to spring, is 1.36 words. The standard deviation is .38. Therefore, a student is making less than .38 words per week growth, that rate is below what would be expected
Using RTI Process to Rule In/Rule Out Learning Disabilities

In addition to the aforementioned ‘Dual Discrepancy’, several other factors must be considered (e.g., Was RTI implemented?) See accompanying resources for considerations:

• Referral checklist - Academic
• Referral Checklist - Social Emotional Behavioral

Other helpful resources:
www.rtinetwork.org/getstarted/sld-identification-toolkit

Thank you!

seth.faldrich@gmail.com