

Tier 1 Problem Solving Worksheet



School: Sunshine Elementary School

Meeting Date: 9/18/24 (Step 1 and 2), 9/20/24 (Step 2 and Step 3), 1/10/25 (Step 4), 5/25/25 (Step 4)

Team Members: Interventionist: Chaney; Instructional Coach: Smith; Classroom teachers: Johnson, Perry, Smith, Lawson, Thomas; ESE Teacher: Abordale

Student Group/Area of Concern: 5th grade ELA

Step 1 – Problem Identification: What is the Problem?

Expected Level of Performance:

Students will score At or Above Benchmark, as measured by Acadience (Reading Composite Score).

Current Level of Performance:

41% of students met or exceeded expected level of performance

59% of students did not meet or exceed expected level of performance

Appropriate Tier of Problem Solving:

- Less than approximately 80% of students are meeting or exceeding expected levels of performance, continue problem solving to develop Tier 1 instructional/intervention plan.
- Approximately 80% or more of students are meeting or exceeding expected levels of performance, consider Tier 2 problem solving for students not meeting expectations.

Notes: Retell and Maze data confirmed that our students demonstrated lower performance on these two measures in addition to, and likely as a result of, the lower level of performance on ORF Accuracy. In light of these data and the fact that reading accuracy is a prerequisite for comprehension, we agreed to focus on improving reading accuracy for our students.

Goal (SMART): By the end of the school year, 70% of students will score At or Above Benchmark, as measured by Acadience (Reading Composite Score).

Step 2 – Problem Analysis: Why is the problem occurring?

Hypothesis #1:

Domain: Instruction Curriculum Environment Learner

Hypothesis: Too few students are scoring at or above benchmark on the ORF Accuracy measure because explicit instruction on word analysis skills is not consistently occurring.

Prediction Statement: If explicit instruction on word analysis skills were consistently provided, then the students' reading accuracy will improve.

Assessment Method(s): Review Interview Observe Test

Specific Data to be Collected: How frequently word analysis skills are explicitly taught.

Validated: Yes No

Through review of lesson plans and interviews with teachers, it was determined that explicit instruction on word analysis skills occurs an average of only once per week. Teachers expressed concerns with reducing the time currently spent on teaching the Reading and Vocabulary standards in order to focus on Foundational Skills.

Hypothesis #2:

Domain: Instruction Curriculum Environment Learner

Hypothesis: Too few students are scoring at or above benchmark on the ORF Accuracy measure because they do not identify and correct their errors when reading.

Prediction Statement: If students had self-monitoring skills to identify and correct their errors when reading, then students' reading accuracy will improve.

Assessment Method(s): Review Interview Observe Test

Specific Data to be Collected: Do students use self-monitoring skills when reading.

Validated: Yes No

A review of the ORF probes revealed that students are not self-correcting errors as they read, even when those errors violate meaning.

Hypothesis #3:

Domain: Instruction Curriculum Environment Learner

Hypothesis: Too few students are scoring at or above benchmark on the ORF Accuracy measure because they don't have access to accessible instructional materials.

Prediction Statement: If students had access to accessible instructional materials, then students' accuracy will improve.

Assessment Method(s): Review Interview Observe Test

Specific Data to be Collected: Do students have access to accessible instructional materials.

Validated: Yes No

Teachers report that students have access to and regularly use accessible instructional materials.

Notes:

Step 3 – Intervention Design: What are we going to do about it?

Intervention plan developed for: All 5 th grade students		Content area/focus of improvement: ELA/Reading - ORF Accuracy	
Validated hypothesis:			
Intervention Plan	Support Plan	Fidelity Documentation	
<p>Who is responsible? 5th grade teachers</p> <p>What will be done? Teach word analysis using FCRR Student Center Activities - Advanced Phonics</p> <p>When will it occur? 10 minutes, Daily, at 9:45 AM, beginning on 9/24/24</p> <p>Where will it occur? All classrooms</p>	<p>Who is responsible? Instructional Coach</p> <p>What will be done? Print and prep weekly materials for each classroom</p> <p>When will it occur? Weekly, beginning on 9/23/24</p> <p>Where will it occur? Smith's office</p>	<p>Who is responsible? 5th grade teachers</p> <p>What will be done? Use Documentation Worksheet to note completion of FCRR activities</p> <p>When will it occur? Daily</p> <p>How will data be shared? Worksheets will be uploaded into OneDrive and issues with implementation will be discussed during grade-level PLC meetings</p>	<p>Who is responsible? 5th grade teachers</p> <p>What data will be collected and when? Mid-year Acadience data in December</p> <p>When will team reconvene to evaluate progress? 1/10/25</p> <p>How will we decide if the plan is effective? Percent of students scoring at or above benchmark (Reading Composite Score)</p> <p>Decision rules: Positive RtI = ≥ 56% Questionable RtI = 42%-55% Poor RtI = ≤ 41%</p>
<p>Who is responsible? 5th grade teachers</p> <p>What will be done? Engage students in 5th grade Peer Assisted Learning Strategies (PALS) focusing on the Partner Reading activity using novel study materials</p> <p>When will it occur? M, W, F during independent reading time within the reading block</p> <p>Where will it occur? All classrooms</p>	<p>Who is responsible? Instructional Coach</p> <p>What will be done? Prepare PALS materials and co-facilitate training of students; then observe students and teachers during PALS and help troubleshoot barriers to implementation (e.g., student pairings, text selection)</p> <p>When will it occur? PALS student training begins 9/25/24</p> <p>Where will it occur? All classrooms</p>	<p>Who is responsible? 5th grade teachers</p> <p>What will be done? Teachers: review student materials for implementation; Instructional Coach: observe instruction, provide feedback, and help troubleshoot barriers to implementation</p> <p>When will it occur? Teachers: weekly; Instructional Coach: observations every two weeks beginning 10/9/24, then monthly starting 11/20/24</p> <p>How will data be shared? Teachers and Instructional Coach: review student materials and observation notes every two weeks</p>	
Notes:			

Step 4 – Response to Instruction/Intervention: Is it working?

Review Date: 1/10/25

Team Members: Interventionist: Chaney; Instructional Coach: Smith; Classroom teachers: Johnson, Perry, Smith, Lawson, Thomas; ESE Teacher: Abordale

Progress Monitoring Data:

56% of students met or exceeded expected level of performance

64% of students did not meet or exceed expected level of performance

Data-based decision making based on pre-determined decision rules:

POSITIVE

Goal is *not* met: Continue plan as designed *or* Increase intensity of current plan (document all changes or adjustments)

Goal *is* met: Fade intervention and monitor *or* Identify new goal, modify plan (document all changes or adjustments, complete new PSW if appropriate)

QUESTIONABLE

Fidelity concerns: Address fidelity, continue plan as designed and monitor (document adjustments to address fidelity)

No fidelity concerns: Increase intensity of current plan and monitor *or* Return to earlier steps of problem solving (document all changes or adjustments, complete new PSW if appropriate)

POOR

Fidelity concerns: Address fidelity, continue plan as designed and monitor (document adjustments to address fidelity)

No fidelity concerns: Return to earlier steps of problem solving to consider replacing the intervention (still addressing validated hypothesis), revisiting other viable hypotheses, or reassessing problem identification (document all changes or adjustments, complete new PSW if appropriate)

Changes or adjustments to the plan: How will we decide if the plan is effective? Percent of students scoring at or above benchmark (Reading Composite Score)

New Decision rules:

Positive Rtl = $\geq 70\%$

Questionable Rtl = 57%-69%

Poor Rtl = $\leq 56\%$

Next Meeting Date: 5/19/25

Notes:

Step 4 – Response to Instruction/Intervention: Is it working?

Review Date: 5/19/25

Team Members: Interventionist: Chaney; Instructional Coach: Smith; Classroom teachers: Johnson, Perry, Smith, Lawson, Thomas; ESE Teacher: Abordale

Progress Monitoring Data:

68% of students met or exceeded expected level of performance

32% of students did not meet or exceed expected level of performance

Data-based decision making based on pre-determined decision rules:

POSITIVE

Goal is *not* met: Continue plan as designed *or* Increase intensity of current plan (document all changes or adjustments)

Goal *is* met: Fade intervention and monitor *or* Identify new goal, modify plan (document all changes or adjustments, complete new PSW if appropriate)

QUESTIONABLE

Fidelity concerns: Address fidelity, continue plan as designed and monitor (document adjustments to address fidelity)

No fidelity concerns: Increase intensity of current plan and monitor *or* Return to earlier steps of problem solving (document all changes or adjustments, complete new PSW if appropriate)

POOR

Fidelity concerns: Address fidelity, continue plan as designed and monitor (document adjustments to address fidelity)

No fidelity concerns: Return to earlier steps of problem solving to consider replacing the intervention (still addressing validated hypothesis), revisiting other viable hypotheses, or reassessing problem identification (document all changes or adjustments, complete new PSW if appropriate)

Changes or adjustments to the plan: By 5/31/25, we will identify and add vocabulary building activities to our single sign-on pages for students to access during the summer. Activities will target 6th grade academic vocabulary.

Next Meeting Date: This was the last Tier 1 problem solving meeting for this school year. We will meet again next year on 8/6/25 to review data and plan Tier 1 for our incoming 5th graders.

Notes: We reviewed ORF Accuracy, Maze, and Retell data. Significant improvement in ORF accuracy (46% to 82%). Retell had less improvement (37% to 56%) as did Maze (44% to 59%). This suggests that students continue to struggle with low-level comprehension. Vocabulary instruction will be a focus moving forward.