



## **IDEA Partnership Collaborative Work on Response-to-Intervention Resource Development Project**

### **Partner Feedback on Grounding Assumptions and Guiding Principles**

**November 1, 2006**

#### **Grounding Assumptions**

- 1) Some elements of response-to-intervention have been used informally in practice for many years with varying degrees of success.
- 2) Implementation of a response-to-intervention model may require some fundamental restructuring of these elements into a new systemic process.
- 3) Theoretical and knowledge bases for response-to-intervention models are still developing and ideas will continue to evolve as implementation becomes more widespread and data collection and research are made available for peer review.
- 4) There are and will continue to be variations on response-to-intervention models developed and implemented at state, local and building levels. To understand what distinguishes an '*effective response-to-intervention model*' rigor in the varying models must be examined.
- 5) A process of responsiveness to intervention is referenced in federal law:
  - a) NCLB requires periodic, data-based accountability to measure school, district, and state progress toward grade level academic achievement. Universal screening and progress monitoring tools used within a response-to-intervention model may be some of the same tools used to measure school improvement and accountability.
  - b) NCLB focuses on implementation of "scientifically-based" practices, strategies, and interventions with struggling students to assist low performing schools to meet state academic standards. A response-to-intervention process designed to meet the needs of a diverse student population includes the implementation of practices, strategies, and interventions that are proven reliable through scientifically-based education research.
  - c) IDEA provides an opportunity for "use of a process that determines if a child responds to scientific, research-based intervention as a part of the evaluation process" for specific learning disability within a state and/or district.
- 6) An effective response-to-intervention model and its implementation is critically dependent on:
  - a) shared engagement and collaboration among all education stakeholders (e.g., general and special educators, school and district administrators, parents, related service providers);

- b) consideration of the intended and unintended changes that a response-to-intervention process will bring to current and future practices of all education stakeholders; and
  - c) understanding and acceptance by all education stakeholders with regard to their roles and responsibilities in serving each and every student.
- 7) A response-to-intervention approach has the potential to connect in a powerful way to the School Improvement process under NCLB by:
- a) using a problem-solving team decision-making process to meet diverse student needs; and
  - b) implementing levels of intensity of instructional interventions and assessment to monitor student progress.
- 8) Effective response-to-intervention models and implementation have the potential to affect general education and special education service delivery efficiency and outcomes. Some possible effects include:
- a) improvements in meeting the needs of all students, including the gifted and talented;
  - b) the possible reduction of disproportionate representation of minority students in special education; and
  - c) improvement of the process of identification of students with specific learning disabilities and emotional/behavioral disabling conditions.

### **Guiding Principles**

As the IDEA Partnership develops and shares materials on response-to-intervention every effort is made to ensure:

- 1) non-duplication of stakeholder efforts and integration of relevant existing initiatives and tools;
- 2) inclusive treatment of materials, with federally vetted sources clearly prominent and noted;
- 3) acknowledgement and explanation of various perspectives without bias and provision of additional informational sources relevant to these different perspectives, to assist stakeholders in understanding the evidence base and rationale for varying perspectives;
- 4) connection back to organizations and states for context, depth, and sustainability; and
- 5) speaking to response-to-intervention in the broader context of support for all learners rather than only to students with learning disabilities.