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Purpose of this guide:
This presenter’s guide is intended to support the PowerPoint slides by offering
• Suggested background readings;
• Talking points relative to each slide;
• Suggested activities to enhance learning opportunities for participants;
• Tips to facilitate the professional growth experience; and
• Suggested readings for extension of learning.

About the format:
There are three distinct sections of this document, “Preparation”, “Presentation/Process”, and “Supplementary Materials”.

The preparation section begins on the following page and includes:
• Participant objectives;
• Three suggested agenda/timeframes to help you meet the needs of the audience and/or available time allotment;
• Support/background materials the presenter may wish to access prior to preparation for presentation;
• Materials and supplies needed for the presentation; and
• Equipment needed for the presentation.

The presentation/process section follows preparation suggestions and includes:
• Suggested minutes for information sharing and/or suggested activities for each of the key concepts of the presentation, within each section minutes are enclosed in boxes and intended to be highlighted ahead of time dependent on the overall timeframe selected for the presentation;
• Slides in miniature, in sequential order, with talking points,
  o Usually in bulleted format, not intended to be read verbatim, and
  o Presenter is encouraged to interject his/her own style;
• Participant activities to enhance learning opportunities, indicated by a vertical line to the left of each activity,
  o May be carried out as suggested, or
  o Adjusted to audience and time allotment;
• Presenter notes to suggest background information or extension readings, noted in bold italic font;
• Presenter tips to suggest facilitation techniques, noted in bold italic font; and
• Suggested segue comments to bridge between ideas and/or activities, also noted in bold italic font.

The supplementary materials section contains handouts that may be copied and used to support or enhance the presentation.
Objectives:
Participants will increase knowledge relative to
- Basic RtI terminology
- RtI foundations in research and statute

Participants will explore
- A basic model for implementation of RtI
- Current practices that support RTI

Participants will engage in action-planning to move toward local implementation of RtI (expanded sessions)

Agenda/Timing:
120 minutes - Total time for information sharing and learning activities
90 minutes - Total time for sharing of information and abbreviated activities
60 minutes - Total time for sharing of information and Q&A
30 minutes - Total time for abbreviated information only

120 minutes - Total time for information sharing and learning activities
Suggested time allotments:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Activity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10 min</td>
<td>Introduction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 min</td>
<td>Changes in philosophy and statute</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 min</td>
<td>Definition and connection to school improvement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 min</td>
<td>Core principles of, and rationale for, RtI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 min</td>
<td>An example RtI model</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 min</td>
<td>Problem solving in RtI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 min</td>
<td>Moving forward with RtI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 min</td>
<td>Action-planning and summary statements</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

90 minutes - Total time for sharing of information and abbreviated activities
Suggested time allotments:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Activity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7 min</td>
<td>Introduction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 min</td>
<td>Changes in philosophy and statute</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 min</td>
<td>Definition and connection to school improvement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 min</td>
<td>Core principles of, and rationale for, RtI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 min</td>
<td>An example RtI model</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 min</td>
<td>Problem solving in RtI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 min</td>
<td>Moving forward with RtI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 min</td>
<td>Action-planning and summary statements</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
60 minutes - Total time for sharing of information and Q&A
Suggested time allotments:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Activity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5 min</td>
<td>Introduction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 min</td>
<td>Changes in philosophy and statute</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 min</td>
<td>Definition and connection to school improvement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 min</td>
<td>Core principles of, and rationale for, RtI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 min</td>
<td>An example RtI model</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 min</td>
<td>Problem solving in RtI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 min</td>
<td>Moving forward with RtI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 min</td>
<td>Q &amp; A and Summary statements</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

30 minutes - Total time for abbreviated information only
Suggested time allotments:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Activity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 min</td>
<td>Introduction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 min</td>
<td>Changes in philosophy and statute</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 min</td>
<td>Definition and connection to school improvement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 min</td>
<td>Core principles of, and rationale for, RtI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 min</td>
<td>An example RtI model</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 min</td>
<td>Problem solving in RtI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 min</td>
<td>Moving forward with RtI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 min</td>
<td>Summary statements</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Support Materials:
- The IDEA Partnership Website: www.ideapartnership.org
- A Partnership Collection on RtI
- Many Journals, Many Voices
- Results for Kids: Resources

Materials and Supplies:
- PowerPoint slides - or -
- Overheads prepared from the PowerPoint slides
- Handout Masters – to be copied in appropriate numbers
- Chart paper and markers
- Paper and pencils for participants

Equipment:
- Computer and projector -or-
- Overhead projector
- Projection screen

Fundamentals for Educators and their Partners
Presentation/Process

Introduction:

**Presenter Tip:** The introduction should be very brief and garner interest immediately. The following is a starting point; adapt for the particular audience.

---

**Leaving No Child Behind:**
*Response to Intervention*

**Fundamentals for Educators and their Partners**

---

**Response to Intervention**

- It is a term garnering much attention in the field of education today.
- We will spend the next few minutes exploring the fundamentals of the concept/process…
  - Where did it originate?
  - What is it?
  - Why is it important to us in this room? -and-
  - What is necessary to make it work for students and for schools?

---

**Presenter Note:** The original presentation was created through collaborative efforts of the National Association of School Psychologists, the National Education Association, and the American Federation of Teachers. This version was revised by a cross-stakeholder group of persons representing administrators, practitioners (teachers and related service personnel), families and policy makers and is provided through the efforts of the IDEA Partnership.
Presenter Tip: The agenda slide is presented as an adult learner organizer tool and should not be omitted. Very little time needs to be spent here for the brief presentations. For the two expanded presentations, the presenter may wish to configure the bullets to come in one at a time and give the participants a sentence or two about each as a preview of what is to come.

Ideas for sharing with the participants:
- Foundations – will discuss foundations in practice, policy, and statute
- Definition – from a practical standpoint
- Core principles – supported by both research and common sense
- Tiered model – one common example of implementation; there are many tiered models being implemented
- Problem-solving – essential to effective implementation
- Moving forward – explore what is needed for next steps

Changes in philosophy and statute:

Presenter Tip: The belief statement slide is intended to give all participants an opportunity to explore and validate the central beliefs about children and learning. For the longer presentations it is an important activity to set the stage and undergird the rationale for change to RtI as a process to improve opportunities for all students.

Presenter Note: For the 60-minute presentation, it is suggested the slide be shown as the statements are orally reinforced. For the 30-minute presentation, it is suggested the slide be omitted.
We believe: depending on number of participants and how conducted, 10 to 15 minutes

Think, Pair, Share Activity

Lead in question:
What is it that we believe about children/students and learning?

Format of activity:
- Take a few moments (30 to 45 seconds for each question – presenter may signal at the end of the allotted time) to silently think about each statement on the slide and if you agree or disagree with each. Then, determine why you believe the way you do. Is there a particular experience or set of experiences that have influenced your beliefs about students and learning?
- Turn to a partner and check in to see if you agree and/or disagree with the same statements.
- At your table, you will then have five minutes to share your rationale for agreeing or disagreeing with each statement. At the end of that time your table will be given a minute to build consensus around the most important points from your discussion.
- Each table will then share their ideas about these belief statements.
- Sharing options:
  - Each spokesperson shares for 2 minutes, 1 minute – dependent on number of tables
  - Each spokesperson shares, careful not to repeat what has been said before and add new insights

Presenter summarizes the statements and moves on to next slide.

Segue: Although we have different experiences and views, we do agree with the three statements on the slide. The belief that all children can and do learn has changed our thinking about education in recent years.

**Shifts in Thinking...**

Over the last 30 years, how we address the needs of students has evolved – we have changed our thinking on how we teach and how children learn. These discoveries have resulted in changes in educational laws and practices.

**Presenter Tip:** For the two expanded presentations, it is suggested that the presenter allow participants to read the slide silently as he/she extends thought with more specifics about how thinking has shifted in the past thirty years. For the two brief presentations, it is suggested the participants read the slide silently as the presenter paraphrases.
Ideas for sharing with the participants:

- How has it been decided that RtI is the right thing to do?
- Since PL 94-142 (original Education of All Handicapped Act of 1975) we know much more about how students learn
- More education research available in the last 30 years
- Increased expectations for all students
- More research behind practice
- As practices become documented, policies change
- Policy changes inform and then there are accompanying changes in statute/law

The impact of practice and policy on federal statute is noted in the most recent reauthorizations of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 2001 (No Child Left Behind) and the Individuals with Disabilities Education Improvement Act of 2004.

**Shifts in the Law...**

- ESEA / NCLB
  - accountability
  - school improvement
  - adequate yearly progress (AYP)
- IDEA 2004
  - effective instruction
  - progress monitoring
  - early intervening services

**Presenter Tip:** For the two expanded presentations, it is suggested the presenter allow participants to read the slide silently as he/she expands thought regarding more specifics about changes in the law using the notes below. For the two brief presentations, it is suggested that the most important note to attend to is the mentioning of AYP applying to all subgroups.

Ideas to expand on the bullets:

- **ESEA/NCLB**
  - Accountability – systems for accountability for all states, all schools, and all learners
  - School improvement – expectations for continuous improvement; a plan in place and action toward meeting the goals of the plan
  - Adequate yearly progress (AYP) – for all children including subgroups [ethnicity/race, low socio-economic status, English language learners, students with disabilities]

- **IDEA 2004**
  - Effective instruction – tied to state standards and delivered by a highly qualified teacher
  - Progress monitoring – ongoing assessments to inform instruction
  - Early intervening services – a reversal of the “wait to fail” model

- Both statutes focus on data-based decision-making
ESEA/NCLB and IDEA 2004

- Companion laws that address closing the achievement gaps
- Underscore importance of high quality, scientifically-based instruction and interventions
- Hold schools accountable for the progress of all students in meeting grade level standards

**Presenter Tip:** Allow participants to read the slide silently as you expand thought regarding more specifics on the connections between the two statutes. For the brief presentations, it is suggested that participants read the slide silently while the presenter paraphrases the concepts.

Ideas to expand on the bullets:

- **Companion laws** – There are many new references in IDEA 2004 connecting it with NCLB; many of which aim to close achievement gaps for subgroups of students, especially for those with disabilities. Most notably, connected to our discussion of response to intervention today are...

- **Scientifically based instruction/interventions** – both statutes reference scientific-based instruction; practice is clear that the earlier interventions are implemented with struggling learners, there are more opportunities for the student to learn and demonstrate missed skills
  - NCLB sets forth “…holding schools, local education agencies, and States accountable for improving the academic achievement of all students…” and “…promoting schoolwide reform and ensuring the access of all children to effective, scientifically-based instructional strategies…” [PL 107-110 §1001(4) and (9)]
  - Regarding IDEA, Congress stated “…to improve the academic achievement and functional performance of children with disabilities including the use of scientifically based instructional practices, to the maximum extent possible” (20 U.S.C. 1400(c)(5)(E)

- **Holds schools accountable** – in addition to the accountability statements in NCLB, IDEA ’04 requires states to report on “…improving educational results and functional outcomes for all children with disabilities…” [Federal Register §300.600(b)(1)]

**Segue:** Now that we have looked at the foundations for a response to intervention process, what is it?

**Presenter Note:** Handout #4: *RtI Glossary of Terms and Acronyms* is available for distribution at this point in the presentation; or, may be distributed at the end of the presentation.
Definition and connection to school improvement:

RtI is a practice or a process
RtI is a set of processes to ensure opportunity to learn for all students
RtI is monitoring the demonstration of learning (academic and behavioral) for all students
RtI is intervening early for struggling students

Emphasis:

A response to intervention process is about all students achieving to high levels.
- Gifted and talented – meeting their needs and ensuring a year’s progress each year
- Minorities – regardless of culture and or socio-economic status
- English language learners
- Children of low socio-economic status
- Students struggling with social/emotional/behavioral issues
- ALL kids reaching potential

A very important aspect of an RtI process is the connection it has to overall school improvement.

Response to Intervention is...

 Response To Intervention (RtI)

Response To Intervention (RtI)

"The main objective of RtI is not to identify students for special education, but rather to help all students achieve at a proficient level and ultimately [schools] make adequate yearly progress."

Presenter Tip: For the shorter presentations, it is suggested this slide be omitted and the presenter include information appropriate to the audience orally as he/she uses the previous definition slide.
Presenters Tip: For the two expanded presentations, the presenter may wish to configure the bullets to come in one at a time and expand upon each bullet without interference from the rest of the words on the page that have not yet been addressed.

Ideas to expand on the bullets:

- Student achievement and behavior… – Earlier as we addressed our belief statements, we agreed that all children can learn and that we all want to support their learning. **Presenter Note:** Depending on the audience, this is a place to insert references to research. If you know of previous discussions among this group or implementation of research-based programs in use, mention them to connect thinking for the group. Suggested research may include Reading First and Sharon Vaughn’s work or George Sugai’s work with schoolwide behavior supports.

- May be thought of as a process… - As the purpose of an RtI process is to provide high-quality instruction, to constantly monitor student progress, and to provide appropriate high-quality interventions when a learn struggles, with academics and/or behaviors, it is a natural fit with school improvement efforts. The earlier we intervene and provide supports for struggling learners, the more opportunities they have to acquire knowledge and skills; the more knowledgeable and skilled are students, the more improved are the indicators of school success.

- May help reduce disproportionate representation… - Over-representation of minority students in special education services has been on the radar screen for several years now. There is general consensus that many minority students are being identified for special education services not because of low cognition or true learning disabilities, but because of the lack of opportunity to learn, either due to cultural/language issues or lack of appropriate strategies for their particular learning needs. Moving from a wait to fail model to a model of early intervening, may assist professionals in finding the strategies that work much earlier in the student’s career.

Segue: This connection was well stated by the National Research Center on Learning Disabilities in the summer of 2005.
Implementation of a Response to Intervention process within a school and a district is about all children and all content. To be effective it requires the understanding and support of all stakeholders: teachers, administrators, parents, and related service personnel.

**Core principles of, and rationale for, RtI:**

**Core Principles of RtI**
- Unifying Belief: “All kids can learn.”
- Problem-Solving and Problem-Analysis
- Universal screening of academic, behavioral and social emotional indicators of success
- Prevention Focused: academic, behavioral, social emotional

**Core Principles of RtI (continued)**
- Evidence-based interventions with fidelity of implementation
- Ongoing and sensitive progress monitoring of student response to interventions
- Data-based decision making
- Multi-tiered system with increasing levels of intensity

**Presenter Note:** The core principles presented in these two slides are taken from the NASDSE booklet *Response to Intervention Policy Consideration and Implementation*, and adapted for this presentation.

Distribute **Handout #1: Core Principles of a Response to Intervention Process.**

The presenter may wish to briefly paraphrase each concept as it appears on the screen. Depending on the roles represented in the audience, some principles may take less, and others more, time.
Segue: Operationalizing these principles at the building level results in closing achievement gaps between and among student groups

Presenter Tip: For the shorter presentations, it is suggested this slide be omitted and the presenter include some of the following information orally as he/she uses the previous school improvement slide.

Ideas to expand the bullets:

- Prevent academic problems – by being responsive in nature, based on an informed “act-now” process, there is the opportunity to intervene early on behalf of any struggling learner which may result in fewer students needing more intense interventions, fewer skill gaps among students at a particular grade level and reduce the number of special education referrals
- Intervene with low performing students – through RtI processes, students who struggle with learning, and do not qualify for special education services will have their needs addressed in a more timely manner
- Assist in identifying – through an RtI process data relative to learning rate an responsiveness to intervention provide solid curriculum-based evidence of learning disability, or solid curriculum-based evidence of no learning disability

Presenter Tip: For the two expanded presentations, the presenter may wish to configure the bullets to come in one at a time and expand upon each bullet without interference from the rest of the words on the page that have not yet been addressed.

Ideas to expand on the bullets:

- Two or more tiers of increasingly intense scientific, research-based interventions - Intensity dimensions include duration, frequency and time of interventions, group size, and instructor skill level
- Individual problem solving model or standardized intervention protocol for
intervention tiers
  o Problem solving - Assumes no given intervention will be effective for all students; is inductive, empirical, and behavioral; generally has four stages (problem identification, problem analysis, plan implementation, and plan evaluation); sensitive to individual student differences; may have difficulty evaluating integrity of intervention implementation
  o Standardized intervention protocol - Use of same empirically validated treatment for all students with similar problems; facilitates quality control; may not be as individualized as use of the problem solving approach

• Explicit decision rules for assessing learners’ progress - e.g., level and/or rate of learning or responsiveness to instruction/intervention
• Implementation of a scientifically-based, differentiated curriculum with different instructional methods – as a part of the norm within the school and all classrooms; attending to the learning needs of all students

An example RtI model:

Although there are models in use that have varying numbers of tiers, the example that we are using today is one that is relatively common as implementation is progressing across the country. The three-tiered model has foundations in public health research of the 1960’s, behavioral research of the 1980’s, recent reading research, and is now being applied in a broader context to RtI which incorporates both academic and behavioral issues.

Academic and behavioral research support an 80-15-5 model of student learning connected to a comprehensive curriculum with quality teaching strategies and materials being used. In other words, with the implementation of a comprehensive curriculum with quality teaching strategies and materials being used, 80% of all students will demonstrate learning, 15% will struggle and be able to proceed with learning when provided with appropriate interventions, and 5% will be in need of more intense interventions to support learning. Translated into a response to intervention model, it may look like this…
Presenter's Tip: As RtI begins with quality instruction for all students, it is preferred that explanation of the graphic begin with Tier 1 and move upward.

Ideas to expand on the model:

- **Distribute Handout #2: An Example Three-Tiered Model of School Supports**

- **Tier 1-UNIVERSAL**: High Quality instructional, behavioral, and social-emotional supports for ALL students in general education. Also called universal interventions or core instruction. The expectation is that 80% of students will become proficient.

- **Tier 2-TARGETED**: Targeted intensive prevention or remediation for some students whose performance and rate of progress lag behind the norm for their grade and educational setting. The expectation is that an additional 15% of students will become proficient by engaging in the core curriculum and additional supplementary focused instruction. This is not the same strategies used for longer periods of time; it is the use of different strategies with more intensity (frequency and duration).

- **Tier 3: INTENSIVE** Comprehensive evaluation by multi-disciplinary team to determine eligibility. Intensive 1:1 interventions for students w/ insufficient response to Tier 1 & 2. Typically, approximately 5% of all students have needs addressed at this tier.

One advantage of using this model as a school/district wide process is that it allows schools to evaluate the effectiveness of their core instruction. That is, they can see how many of their students who receive general education alone are becoming proficient. In cases where too few general education students are becoming proficient based on core instruction alone, a school can work on “robusting up” its core program instead of referring all of these “less than proficient students” for supplemental or intensive programming. This is a great improvement to our historical system where it was difficult to distinguish the difference between students with disabilities and students who were “instructional casualties.”
Ideas to expand the bullets:

- **Step I** –
  - Quality core curriculum and instruction for all students
  - School-wide Positive Behavior Supports and Interventions (PBS, PBIS)
  - Academic and social-emotional/behavioral screening; ongoing informal and formal review of a variety of assessments (e.g., daily work, CBMs, functional behavior assessments)
  - Small group interventions as part of general education core; assures that non-eligible students continue to receive basic supports (e.g., small group reading, Title I services, tutoring)

- **Step II** –
  - Gather and review student performance data. Consider the frequency, intensity, and duration of a concern.
  - Clarify academic/behavioral goal(s) for the student.
  - Brainstorm possible targeted research-based interventions.
  - Select 1-2 targeted interventions. Determine structure and format.
  - Determine dependent variables for measuring student performance changes.
  - Implement interventions (independent variables).
  - Monitor student progress. Document student response to intervention for a period (i.e. up to 6 weeks).
  - Set follow-up meeting. Clarify roles, responsibilities, data to be collected, future directions, etc.

- **Step III** –
  - Problem Solving Team reviews and analyzes individual student responses to targeted interventions
  - Determination is made to discontinue, fade, continue, change current intervention; based on guidelines and timeframes

- **Step IV** –
  - Problem Solving Team reviews and analyzes individual student responses to more intense interventions
  - Determination is made to discontinue, fade, continue, change current intervention
• Step V –
  o Problem solving team refers student with little or no response to targeted interventions to special education team.
  o Additional assessments may be administered, based on data which may point to a specific learning problem

• Step VI –
  o Within RtI more flexible roles will be the norm for education professionals
  o Progress monitoring will continue for students receiving special education services

Problem solving in RtI:

A critical element of an effective RtI process is effective problem solving based on student data. To be most effective, a team approach is recommended for problem solving with RtI.

Best Practices for Problem-Solving and Problem Analysis Teams

- Multidisciplinary team approach
- Systematic interventions embedded in general education curriculum and instruction
- Ongoing systems that address student needs
  - Intervention to address need
  - Progress monitoring using concrete observable data
  - Data analysis and adjustments to instruction

Ideas to expand on the bullets:

- Multidisciplinary – school-based comprehensive prevention and intervention characterized by a multidisciplinary team approach; drawing on the resources and expertise of a variety of persons
- Systematic interventions embedded - geared toward designing interventions to help all children be successful in general education curriculum; across disciplines and grade levels
- Ongoing systems – that address student problems, intervene, evaluate, and follow-up.
  - Embedded in the classroom and curriculum
  - Concrete observable data to establish need, measure student performance, and assess intervention effectiveness
Continuous and conscious ling of assessment to intervention

Recommended Composition of the RtI Problem Solving Team

- Student’s Classroom Teacher
- Administrator/Designee
- General Educators (2-3 recognized by peers for their expertise)
- Parent
- Student (when appropriate)

Additional Resource Team Members to be included as needed

- Behavior/Mental Health specialist (school psychologist, social worker, nurse and/or counselor)
- Special Education representative (learning specialist or speech pathologist)
- Other Specialists (OT, PT, Adaptive P.E., Vision/Hearing Specialists, Assistive Technology, Transition Coordinator, etc.)

Presenter Note: The above slides are self-explanatory and are intended to be shared with the audience as printed. If time allows, the group may generate examples of when it would be appropriate to include one or more of the additional resource team members indicated on the second slide. At this point, it is appropriate to reemphasize RtI is about early intervening services. When the problem solving team meets it is to intervene early and provide appropriate opportunities for learning.

Moving forward with RtI:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>30 minutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 minutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 minutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 minutes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Presenter’s Tip: Place slide on screen as the activity question is posed. For the shorter presentation versions, omit this slide.
Yesterday and Tomorrow: depending on how conducted, takes 15 to 22 minutes

Triad Brainstorming and Whole Group Share Activity

Lead in question:
What will be the norm with effective implementation of a Response to Intervention process/model in our school?

Distribute Handout #3: Yesterday and Tomorrow

Format of activity:
- Create triads; depending on size of group and time allotment, this activity may be conducted by tables
- Using the Yesterday and Tomorrow handout, which describes common perceptions of yesterday with regard to meeting the needs of struggling students, discuss with your small group and record what you think are the descriptors for schools of tomorrow with effective implementation RtI (8-10 minutes)
- Whole group sharing options:
  - Presenter addresses each of the six items on the handout one at a time and solicits responses from the participants; participants are asked not to repeat; presenter paraphrases and builds consensus on each and moves on to the next item; some items will take 1 minute =, others up to 3 minutes; total of 8-12 minutes
  - Presenter states that we will share for one minute on each item; addresses each of the six items on the handout one at a time and solicits responses from the participants; participants are asked not to repeat; presenter accepts comments and moves to the next item in one minute intervals; total of 6-7 minutes

Presenter summarizes the statements with the next slide.
**Presenter Tip:** For the longer presentations the presenter may wish to configure the bullets to enter on the screen one at a time. For the shorter presentations, this slide may be used to describe a school where implementation of RtI is effective. Descriptors of “yesterday”, found on Handout #4, can be useful in adding to explanations of this slide.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vision for Schools of Tomorrow</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Shared ownership, accountability, and leadership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- All struggling students referred to the RTI PST for support with a prevention focus on academics and social/emotional/behavioral issues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Eligibility considered after intervention and ongoing progress monitoring of response to intervention</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Early intervening services are accessible to any student in need</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Authentic assessments and progress monitoring throughout the curriculum; less focus on standardized assessments to determine eligibility for special ed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Flexible delivery of support services is the norm</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Ideas to expand on the bullets:**

- **Shared ownership** – (corresponds to row one on the handout) – all faculty in a building see it as a shared responsibility to see that all students learn and are meeting their highest potential, including the full range of cognitive abilities; special education administrators provide for support systems
- **All struggling students** – (corresponds to rows two and three on the handout) - Students perform at grade level within the general education curriculum; needs of students struggling with a particular skill or concept are addressed through differentiation of the core instructional program; when more supports are needed, the student is then referred to the RtI Problem Solving Team to determine the next set of interventions to meet student needs; applies to both academics and behaviors
- **Eligibility considered** – (corresponds to rows two and three on the handout) – the degree to which a student responds to an intervention indicates when the intervention needs to be faded, continued, or changed; several different intervention strategies may be implemented before the one that best meets a student’s individual needs is found; emphasis in law and regulations with the exclusion factor of lack of instruction for determination of SLD
- **Early intervening** – (corresponds to row four on the handout) – focus of RtI is quality supported/scaffolded instruction; it is ensuring that instructional and behavioral learning strategies are employed so that all children succeed; interventions are not a “hoop to jump through” on the way to testing for special education eligibility; interventions are implemented wherever and whenever student needs indicate
- **Authentic assessment** – (corresponds to row five on the handout) -
- **Flexible delivery** - (corresponds to row six on the handout) -

**Segue:** In order for all stakeholders to understand the concepts of RtI, to embrace changing roles and responsibilities, and to move forward together, quality learning opportunities must be provided for all.
**Presenter Note:** For the shorter presentations, the slide is intended to be used for sharing of information and to highlight that all stakeholders need access to more information about RtI. For the longer presentations, as time allows and as it fits the audience, the presenter may ask for specific types of growth opportunities for the short-term and long-term. Dependent on the specific roles represented among the participants, the choice may be to deal with a specific stakeholder group, more than one, or all groups on the slide.

**Quality growth opportunities to increase knowledge and skills**

**must** be provided for all stakeholders

- Administrators
- Practitioners
- Families
- Higher Education
- Policy Makers

**Action-Planning and/or Summary Statements:**

- 20 minutes
- 15 minutes
- 15 minutes
- 1 minute

**Presenter Note:** This slide is recommended for the longer presentations to generate discussion in the following activity. For the shorter presentations is is suggested that the slide be used to pose critical questions that need to be addressed in subsequent sessions on the topic of RtI.

**Beginning to Build Partnerships**

- Who are the key stakeholders with whom we need to partner?
- What initiatives are in place that connect to RtI and need to connect more closely to one another?
- What do we need to do differently to move forward with RtI implementation?
Building Partnerships: depending on number of participants and how conducted, 15 to 20 minutes

Jigsaw Activity

Lead in statement and questions:
- Presented on the slide

Format of activity:
- Divide participants into small equal groups; four to six persons per group work well; 3, 6, 9 groups work well as each group will be assigned one question
- Assign one question to each group
- Each group discusses and generates responses; 4 to 5 minutes for this activity
- Each group then shares ideas.
- Sharing options:
  - Presenter poses each question in turn, allowing 2 to 3 minutes per question; groups respond and presenter captures key ideas on chart paper
  - One piece of chart paper is posted for each question, with question indicated at the top; participants record key ideas for all to see

Presenter paraphrases and summarizes
**Presenter Note:** Different audiences will produce different responses. The following table may assist in developing guiding questions or context for paraphrasing.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Key stakeholders</strong></th>
<th><strong>Initiatives</strong></th>
<th><strong>To do differently</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cross-stakeholders at local level</strong></td>
<td>Who is missing in this room? Is it important to ensure that other roles are represented in this discussion?</td>
<td>What academic issues are addressed in our school improvement plan? Are behavior issues addressed in our plan?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Role-alike stakeholders at local level</strong></td>
<td>Prompt ideas: paras, parents, school board, central office admin, teachers, specific related service providers</td>
<td>What are we focusing on in Title I, special education services, gifted services?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cross-stakeholders at regional or state level</strong></td>
<td>What education organizations are not represented in this room?</td>
<td>What academic and behavioral issues are being focused upon in our region or state?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Role-alike stakeholders at regional or state level</strong></td>
<td>Prompt ideas: paras, parents, school board, central office admin, teachers, specific related service providers</td>
<td>What academic and behavioral issues are being focused upon in our region or state?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For More Information: IDEA Partnership’s RtI Initiative

Website: [www.ideapartnership.org](http://www.ideapartnership.org)

- A Partnership Collection on RtI
- Many Journals, Many Voices
- Results for Kids: Resources

**Presenter Note:** Handout #4: RtI Glossary of Terms and Acronyms is available for distribution at this point in the presentation, if it was not distributed at the beginning of the presentation.

By accessing the Partnership website, you will find resource information that is updated regularly as well as links to all the partner organizations.
Presenter Note: This slide is recommended for use with the 60-minute presentation. It may also be of value for the two longer presentations if time allows.

Q&A: depending on time available, takes 10 to 15 minutes

Whole Group Discussion Activity

Lead in statement and questions:
Now that we have spent the past half an hour in overview of the foundations and elements of Response to Intervention…
  • What issues are coming to the forefront for you?
  • What questions are uppermost in your mind?

Format of activity:
  • Open the floor for discussion
  • Paraphrase and repeat whenever clarity is needed
  • Answer questions that are answerable
  • Record
    o Questions for which there are no answers at this time
    o Issues to explore
    o Concerns about implementation
    o Suggestions for moving forward
  • Facilitate so that all may share in the discussion. Should one or two persons seem to be dominating the discussion, ask for a response from a specific table or from a specific person.

Trainer Tip: Capture key ideas on chart paper. Visual recording for all to see indicates that there will be something done after the discussion and that this is not an exercise in futility.

Presenter paraphrases and summarizes the discussion. He/she indicates where the responses from the discussion will go from here.
Handout #1: Core Principles
Handout #2: Example Three-tiered Model
Handout #3: Yesterday and Tomorrow
Handout #4: RtI Glossary of Selected Terms and Acronyms
### Core Principles of a Response to Intervention Process

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Principle</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Unifying belief that all kids can learn</strong></td>
<td>RtI practices are founded on the assumption and belief that all children can learn. Identification of the curricular, instructional, and environmental conditions that enable learning is essential. RtI can be an effective process within the system to ensure instruction to meet the needs of each and all learners.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Problem solving and problem analysis</strong></td>
<td>Research has supported the effectiveness of using a clearly defined method to determine student need and to develop and evaluate interventions. The problem-solving method is guided by four interrelated questions: (1) Is there a problem and what is it? (2) Why is it happening? (3) What are we going to do about it? (4) Did our intervention work? This thinking process can be applied to all students in a system, to small groups of students and to individual students.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Universal screening</strong></td>
<td>Universal screening, for all children at each grade level, is the first and primary set of tools used to determine which students are making academic or behavioral progress at expected rates; and, identifying which students may be in need of additional interventions to keep pace with the learning rate of classmates.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Prevention focus / intervene early</strong></td>
<td>Intervening early with learning and behavior problems, when problems are relatively small, is both more efficient and more successful than working with more intense and severe problems.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Evidence-based interventions</strong></td>
<td>NCLB and the IDEA 2004 both require use of scientifically-based curricula and interventions. The purpose of this requirement is to ensure that students are exposed to curriculum and teaching that has demonstrated effectiveness for the type of student and the setting.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Progress monitoring</strong></td>
<td>Progress monitoring to determine if academic or behavioral interventions are producing desired effects is important to maximize the impact of that intervention for the student. The use of assessments that can be collected frequently and that are sensitive to small changes in student behavior is recommended.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Data-based decision making</strong></td>
<td>Decisions in RtI practice are based on professional judgment informed directly by student performance data. Both ongoing data collection systems and use of resulting student data to make informed instructional decisions are necessary to an effective RtI process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Multi-tiered system</strong></td>
<td>To achieve high rates of student success for all students, instruction must be differentiated in both nature and intensity. To efficiently differentiate instruction for all students, tiered models of service delivery are used in RtI systems.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

National Association of State Directors of Special Education

Handout #1: Fundamentals for Educators and their Partners

*RtI Fundamentals Presenter’s Guide*

The IDEA Partnership located at the National Association of State Directors of Special Education is sponsored by the U.S. Department of Education Office of Special Education Programs
An Example Three-Tiered Model of School Supports

ACADEMIC SYSTEMS

TIER 3 Intensive, Individual Interventions
- Individual students
- Assessment-based
- High intensity
- Of longer duration

TIER 2 Targeted Group Interventions
- Some students (at-risk)
- High efficiency
- Rapid response

TIER 1 Core Instructional Interventions
- All students
- Preventive, proactive

Source: Response to Intervention Policy Considerations and Implementation, 2005, p. 22. National Association of State Directors of Special Education

BEHAVIORAL SYSTEMS

TIER 3 Intensive, Individual Interventions
- Individual students
- Assessment-based
- Intense, durable procedures

TIER 2 Targeted Group Interventions
- Some students (at-risk)
- High efficiency
- Rapid response

TIER 1 Core Instructional Interventions
- All settings, all students
- Preventive, proactive

Students
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ownership / Accountability / Leadership</th>
<th>Yesterday</th>
<th>Tomorrow</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Parallel systems of general education and special education; &quot;My kids and your kids&quot;; building principals lead and are accountable for general education students; special education administrators lead and are accountable for special education students</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Academically Struggling Students       | Referred for testing for special services; possible learning disability or cognitive delay |          |
|                                        |                                                                                          |          |

| Behaviorally Struggling Students       | Referred for testing for special services; possible emotional disability |          |
|                                        |                                                                                          |          |

| Intervention Teams                     | Considered as pre-referral process for special education |          |
|                                        |                                                                                          |          |

| Assessment Data                        | All students assessed for state and federal reporting; special education students progress monitored for progress toward IEP goals |          |
|                                        |                                                                                          |          |

| Special Education Services             | Struggling students must meet eligibility requirements to access additional supports |          |
|                                        |                                                                                          |          |
RtI Glossary of Selected Terms and Acronyms

AYP - Adequate Yearly Progress
A statewide accountability system mandated by the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 which requires each state to ensure that all schools and districts make Adequate Yearly Progress as defined by states and approved by the US Department of Education.

Curriculum Based Assessment (CBA)
Measurement that uses direct observation and recording of a student's performance in the local curriculum as a basis for gathering information to make instructional decisions.

Early Intervening / Early Intervening Services (EIS)
Early intervening services are the preventive components of No Child Left Behind and the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act of 2004.

*From NCLB:*
An LEA will provide training to enable teachers to teach and address the needs of students with different learning styles, particularly students with disabilities, students with special learning needs (including students who are gifted and talented), and students with limited English proficiency; and to improve student behavior in the classroom and identify early and appropriate interventions to help these students.

*From IDEA:*
An LEA may use up to 15% of its IDEA Part B funds in any fiscal year, less any funds reduced from its local fiscal effort, to develop and implement coordinated, early intervening services. Coordinated early intervening services may include interagency financing structures (for students in K-12 with a particular emphasis on students in K-3) who have not been identified as needing special education or related services but who need additional academic and behavioral support to succeed in a general education environment.

When it has been determined that significant disproportionality with respect to the identification of children as children with disabilities, or the placement in particular educational settings of such children, the SEA shall require the to reserve the maximum 15% of IDEA Part B funds to provide comprehensive coordinated early intervening services to serve children in the LEA, particularly children in those groups that were significantly over-identified.

EIS Activities could include:
- Professional development for teachers and other school staff to deliver scientifically-based academic instruction and behavioral interventions, including scientifically-based literacy instruction, and, where appropriate, instruction on the use of adaptive and instructional software; and
• Providing educational and behavioral evaluations, services and supports, including scientifically-based literacy instruction.

Fidelity of Implementation
Implementation of an intervention, program, or curriculum according to research findings and/or on developers’ specifications

Functional Assessment
*Behaviors:* Process to identify the problem, determine the function or purpose of the behavior, and to develop interventions to teach acceptable alternatives to the behavior

*Academics:* Process to identify the skill gap, strategies that have and have not been effective, and to develop interventions to teach the necessary skill(s)

IDEA - Individuals with Disabilities Education Improvement Act of 2004 also referred to as IDEA ‘04
Original passage in 1975; latest reauthorization in 2004; federal statute relative to public education and services to students with disabilities ages 3 through 21

IDEA Partnership
IDEA Part D federal grant; collaboration of 55 plus national organizations, technical assistance providers, and State and local organizations and agencies, together with the Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP),

Integrity of intervention implementation
See Fidelity

Learning Disability/Specific Learning Disability (SLD)
As defined in regulatory language:
The child does not achieve adequately for the child’s age or to meet State-approved grade-level standards in one or more of the following areas, when provided with learning experiences and instruction appropriate for the child’s age or State-approved grade–level standards:

(i) Oral expression.
(ii) Listening comprehension.
(iii) Written expression.
(iv) Basic reading skill.
(v) Reading fluency skills.
(vi) Reading comprehension.
(vii) Mathematics calculation.
(viii) Mathematics problem solving.

NCLB/ESEA – No Child Left Behind/Elementary and Secondary Education Act
See ESEA/NCLB
Problem-solving Approach to RtI
Assumes that no given intervention will be effective for all students; generally has four stages (problem identification, problem analysis, plan implementation, and plan evaluation); is sensitive to individual student differences; depends on the integrity of implementing interventions

Progress Monitoring
A scientifically based practice used to assess students’ academic performance and evaluate the effectiveness of instruction. Progress monitoring can be implemented with individual students or an entire class. Also, the process used to monitor implementation of specific interventions.

Response to Intervention / Response to Instruction / Responsiveness to Intervention (RtI)
Practice of providing high quality instruction and interventions matched to student need, monitoring progress frequently to make changes in instruction or goals and applying child response data to important educational decisions.

Scientifically-based Research
Education related research that meets the following criteria
• Analyzes and presents the impact of effective teaching on achievement of students
• Includes large numbers of students in the study
• Includes study and control groups
• Applies a rigorous peer review process
• Includes replication studies to validate results

Scientific, Research-based Instruction
Curriculum and educational interventions that have been proven to be effective for most students based on scientific study

Screening – See Universal screening

Specific Learning Disability
See Learning Disability

Standard Protocol Intervention
Use of same empirically validated intervention for all students with similar academic or behavioral needs; facilitates quality control

Systematic Data Collection
Planning a timeframe for and following through with appropriate assessments to set baselines and monitor student progress

Tiered Instruction
Levels of instructional intensity within a tiered model
Tiered Model
Common model of three or more tiers that delineate levels of instructional interventions based on student skill need

Universal screening
A process of reviewing student performance through formal and/or informal assessment measures to determine progress in relation to student benchmarks; related directly to student learning standards