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Annual Growth/Catch-up Growth, Tier 3 Intervention Design

YEAR 3, DAY 2 REVIEW

**Review:**

**Annual & Catch-up Growth**

- Each year of instruction in core subject yields one year annual growth
- Students who are behind must achieve annual growth **PLUS**
- Primary driver of catch-up growth is *increased instructional time*
This example was used during Day 2. You may need to remind folks that the “13 percentile points = one year’s growth” is simply something the authors used, based on a unit of measurement within their testing system, to obtain an estimate as to how far behind a student is. In this example, the student is behind by about three years—in other words, he is entering the third grade with the literacy skills of a student entering Kindergarten. Now that we know how many years he is behind, how do we determine daily instructional minutes necessary to catch him up?
Using the example in the previous slide, this provides a way of converting years of growth a student is behind into number of daily instructional minutes. (In this example, reading block lasts 80 minutes).

**Review: Kenewick’s formula (cont.)**

Calculating instructional minutes:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Minutes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Daily minutes for annual 3&lt;sup&gt;rd&lt;/sup&gt; gr. growth</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daily minutes for annual 4&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; gr. growth</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional daily minutes to make three years of catch-up growth</td>
<td>240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total 3&lt;sup&gt;rd&lt;/sup&gt;/4&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; grade daily minutes</td>
<td>400</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Another way to do the math is—knowing Tony must make normal growth each year plus another 1.5 years each year, his direct instructional time must be 1 x 80 minutes for annual growth plus 1.5 x 80 minutes for catch-up growth, or a total of 200 minutes a day during third and fourth grades.

Note: Of course, Tony may learn more quickly as he gains skills and confidence, or with a more skillful teachers or smaller instructional group, etc. Proper assessment will identify actual growth achieved, allowing quick adjustments in instructional time.
Problem Identification and Problem Analysis provide information teams can use to determine what and how students need to be taught—purpose being to match student need to the appropriate intervention. The third bullet reinforces the idea that as instruction becomes more individualized our “evidence-base” is our progress monitoring or response to intervention data.
After instruction and in and examples of intervention design at Tier 3 during Day 2, teams were provided with a blank Comprehensive Intervention Plan document and, using their own student data, asked to complete the first three sections of the plan. Feedback on their performance is then provided as part of the Day 3 module.
Review

Y3D2 Skill Assessment
During Day 3, teams were provided with feedback about their performance on the skill assessment from Day 2. These guiding questions were provided and teams were given time to review their feedback and discuss these questions. A focus of the scoring was “specificity”—how detailed and specific were teams in developing the intervention plan. Specificity leads to increased integrity and increased likelihood that the intervention will take place even if the interventionist is absent. A copy of these questions is included in the Supplemental Materials packet.
Tier 3 Considerations

**INTERVENTION INTEGRITY**
Importance of integrity:

- Rapid and widespread deployment of RtI has made urgent the need to attend to integrity
- Integrity data are essential to making valid conclusions about outcomes
- Issues related to integrity are central to the success of RtI

(Sanetti and Kratochwill, 2009)

*School Psychology Review* (Volume 38, Dec. 2009) devoted almost an entire issue to examining the role of fidelity/integrity within the PS/RtI process. Given the powerful nature of the message of these statements, this slide was used to introduce this section on Integrity. The bullets also provide good opportunity for reflection/discussion.
We emphasized during trainings that we don’t attend to this just because of eligibility decisions or potential eligibility determinations, but because it’s best practice for students to ensure fidelity of the PS process. According to the Gen Ed Intervention Rule, teams must adhere to a problem-solving process before ever considering eligibility. Also, a student may not be determined to be a student with a disability IF the determinant factor is lack of appropriate instruction in reading and/or math. Teams must be able to provide evidence that the student was exposed to appropriate instruction.

Best-practice/legal guidelines:

- Evidence of exposure to appropriate instruction in general education setting
- Adherence to Problem Solving steps
- “Interventions shall be implemented as designed…and with a level of intensity that matches student’s needs.”

(FL Gen. Ed. Intervention Procedures—6A-6.0331)
Best practice/legal guidelines (con’t):

District to provide proof that:
• Research-based instruction/intervention provided at each tier
• RtI process consists of multiple tiers with defined decision points
• Intervention team considers continuous progress monitoring data
• Students provided appropriate instruction in gen. ed. setting delivered by qualified personnel.

(Zirkel, 2008)

Best practice guidelines help ensure that PS/RtI is truly a substantive service delivery model and NOT just an alternative path to special ed placement. The intent of engaging in PS/RtI is not about special education identification—according to Dave Tilly, that’s the “toenail on the elephant.” Teams need evidence (aka “data”) that a student was provided well-delivered, research-based instruction/intervention that addressed targeted areas of concern and that was provided in the gen ed setting.
The Florida Gen Ed Intervention rule clearly delineates that opportunities for parent involvement must be made available. This includes evidence of ongoing communication, assessment data provided to parents in graphed/easily understandable format, and involving parents in the decisions made for their kids. Discuss their child’s comprehensive intervention plan and any adjustments that are needed, based on data, and document consensus. Parents who feel like partners in educational decisions are less likely to challenge those decisions legally.
Another definition of Integrity:

“Treatment integrity is the extent to which essential intervention components are delivered in a comprehensive and consistent manner, by an interventionist trained to deliver the intervention.”

(Sanetti & Kratochwill, 2009)

Ask participants to compare this definition with earlier, more simple definitions of treatment integrity, such as “implementing interventions as designed.” This more recent definition is more expansive, more comprehensive, and multi-dimensional.
The first three bullets address components of intervention integrity, while the last bullet relates more to “procedural” fidelity—or the fidelity with which teams carry out the problem solving process. Implementation integrity involves not only delivering interventions, across tiers, with integrity, but also to the process used to develop those interventions.
This slide highlights aspects of intervention integrity, such as delivery (interventionist has adequate training to deliver the intervention and delivers the critical steps for an appropriate amount of time), receipt (student is present, engaged, and comprehends content), and effectiveness (acquisition of skills and transfer of those skills to classroom).
As in the previous slide, while both are aspects of integrity, we can make a distinction between the delivery of an intervention by an interventionist and the receipt of the intervention by the student. Another element to consider is the complexity of the intervention. When interventions are simple and straightforward, the most important questions are whether the interventionist carried out the specified steps (adherence) and how often/length of sessions (exposure). But with more complex interventions, quality of delivery may become more of an issue (teacher preparedness, enthusiasm, etc.). This may lead to a distinction between adherence to specified procedures and the ability to adapt the intervention to make the process or content more meaningful for the student(s). And finally we can consider the difference between intentional adaptation and unintentional interventionist “drift”. 
Use of expertise to **intentionally** modify an intervention to meet the needs of a particular student, or group of students.

When might low integrity result in increased outcomes for students?

Key words here are “intentional” and “expertise”. Example includes adapting the content of an intervention in a way that makes it more engaging or understandable for students. If a program is adapted, care should be taken to ensure that the essential elements of the program are maintained. In answer to the question on the slide: when implementation is altered/adapted in a way that makes it more effective. In this case, lower integrity might not suggest that the intervention is weak, only that it is different from the intervention that was planned. If an intervention is adapted, three things are important: that the adaptation is **data-based**, that the change is **documented**, and that the change is **discussed** with the PS team for that student.
Drift is quite different from adaptation and can result from factors completely unrelated to staff expertise or student needs. Examples include forgetting components of an intervention, having limited resources, or believing that the intervention requires too much effort. When intervention integrity is poor, drift would be something teams should attempt to control for, correct, and monitor.

Interventionist “drift”

Unplanned, gradual altering of the implementation of an intervention by the interventionist.

What might contribute to this?
The answers to this question are not always clear. While we’re not sure how far a teacher can deviate from an intervention plan and still obtain desired results, here are some points worth considering:

1) Integrity may not impact performance
2) Poor implementation may cloak effective intervention
3) Intervention components may not be equally important
4) Level of necessary integrity varies
5) Goal should be *effectiveness*

*This remains an area of continued research. Improved documentation of treatment integrity will increase knowledge of what level of integrity is needed for effective implementation and obtaining desired outcomes.*
Evaluation and documentation of intervention integrity are essential to successful implementation of multi-tiered system of support. These are good questions for teams to consider when allocating integrity assessment resources and developing intervention plans.
Included on this slide are various means for assessing intervention or procedural integrity/fidelity. They vary in the reliability of the assessment and resource intensity.

**Direct observation:** Conducted by an outside observer during the delivery of the intervention. Most reliable, but also most resource intensive.

**Behavior rating scales:** This is conducted by an outside observer, but generally assesses the entire intervention, instead of individual components, and can be completed after the fact.

**Self-report:** This is quick and easy, but as with any self-report assessment, it has limitations re: reliability. If integrity is a problem, it would be best to pair this with another form of assessment.

**Permanent products:** These are naturally occurring by-products, or footprints which provide evidence that the intervention occurred. Examples are behavior charts, student work, computer-based intervention documentation.
The next four slides simply provide a visual example of some of the integrity assessments described on the previous slide. This first one is a direct observation form, obtained as a free download on the Heartland website.
Self-report example.

Self-report Example
(Lane & Beebe-Frankenberger, 2004)

Independent Group Contingency Plan with a Response Cost Component

Teacher: Date: Grade Level: 

Lesson #: Number of Students Present: 

Intervention Level: ___ Primary ___ Secondary ___ Tertiary 

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Components</th>
<th>Low Integrity</th>
<th>High Integrity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. I clearly stated and explained the rules and expectations to the students.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. I distributed a 4 x 6 index card to each student or taped the card on their desk.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. I allocated points by placing a tally mark on the student’s index card.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. I took away points by crossing out a tally mark if student refused to participate or exhibited negative behavior (e.g., shouting or derogatory comments). Note: This should be rarely done and students should NEVER earn negative points for the week.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. At the end of the week, students who met the</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Self-report example. Handout provided in Supplemental Materials.
Example of permanent products assessment.

### Permanent Products

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intervention Step</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>TH</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>Component Strategy</th>
<th>Permanent Product</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>This revision activity is organized and has needed materials</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1. Store, type, type revision sheet, headnotes, letter, and final grade (per week different content grades for readers), student folder with grades for essentially final test.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With a story and a tape</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2. Student revise story and self-correct in a log or notebook.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prior knowledge</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3. Student's group (or similar) on tape check out larger task books.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

Note: If this step is not applicable, write N/A and do not include in the submission of fidelity.
Resources:

- [http://www.aea11.k12.ia.us/idm](http://www.aea11.k12.ia.us/idm)
  integrity assessment checklists—available for download

Certain situations may dictate the type of integrity assessment to use. For example, for a new intervention, or for someone using an intervention for the first time, direct observation may be better than self-report to assess integrity, and prevent poor integrity. Also, when student RtI data is positive, a self-report assessment may be a sufficient method for documenting integrity. However, when student RtI data is poor, teams would not want to rely solely on self-report data.

Gresham (1989) discusses practical considerations in using direct observation to assess intervention integrity. One consideration is the number of observation sessions to be used. Gresham suggests that a reasonable guideline might be to conduct three to five observation sessions of 20-30 minutes in duration. Another practical consideration is the potential for the intervention to be implemented differently (that is, with more integrity), because of the observer’s presence in the classroom combined with the teacher knowing that the observer is there to measure the integrity of the intervention.

Best practice indicates that integrity assessment would involve a combination of methods. According to Lane and Beebe-Frankenberger (2004), assessing integrity from multiple sources is best, but not always feasible. They recommend assessing integrity as directly as possible, but also taking into account time and resource constraints.
Performance feedback is a process which pairs an interventionist with someone who via observation and/or consultation provides feedback related to implementation, barriers to implementation, methods for improving intervention implementation, etc. Typically, these sessions can be short in nature (5-7 minutes, unless an observation is involved), and involve reviewing graphed data—integrity data and student outcome data—and discussion re: ways to improve implementation. This process can easily be incorporated into the Support Plan component of the Comprehensive Intervention Plan, and illustrates the importance of providing support and feedback to interventionists as a way to build skill levels, improve integrity, and increase effectiveness of interventions.
This slide provides a discussion opportunity to team members to analyze current practices related to assessing integrity at the individual student level.
Progress monitoring data provides teams with information about a student’s response to instruction/intervention. Meaningful interpretation of these data assumes that interventions have been developed and delivered with fidelity. Now that we have examined intervention integrity at the Tier 3 level, we can begin to look at how that intersects with assessment of student RtI.
Planning for Data Use

“Research has found that up-front planning helped make data collection and use more efficient in many case study schools by clarifying what data were needed, aiding with integration of multiple data sources, and ensuring that data collection processes were on track (Keeney, 1998; Lachat, 2001).”


Good reminder to teams of the importance of planning for data collection and mapping assessment resources.
This discussion slide provides teams with a chance to think about how they are planning for and using data collection at the Tier 3 level.
This is a multiple-click slide:
(Click 1) As we provide more intensive services for individual students, we will find fewer evidenced-based interventions in the research literature. In many cases, we create our own “evidence base” with our progress monitoring data. As such, the need for more in-depth Problem Analysis increases, so that we are also increasing the likelihood that the intervention we develop will result in the appropriate instructional match for the student.
(Click 2) We know that we’ll need to increase the amount of direct instructional minutes for a Tier 3 intervention—students who are behind need extra minutes of direct instruction, proportional to their level of deficiency.
(Click 3) High levels of procedural fidelity, including use of content experts, is required to make Tier 3 interventions have higher probability for success. Perhaps one of the greatest tasks for a PS team working at Tier 3 is the decision-making about the links between the instruction, assessment, and curriculum.
(Click 4) Assessments at Tier 3 may need to narrow in focus based on a more narrowed skill deficit focus.
(Click 5) Assessments at Tier 3 may need to become more precise – perhaps more of a mastery measurement like percent correct, as opposed to General Outcome Measures like FAIR, CBM, DIBELS which measure indicators predictive of the skills measured on state and national measures.
(Click 6) As we increase the intensity of interventions for individual students we will need to increase the frequency of our assessments in order to minimize impacts of potentially ineffective interventions or low fidelity of PS, and/or to maximize the resources being used to help the student.
The big ideas of progress monitoring are the same at Tier 3 as they are in Tiers 1 and 2. Progress monitoring, at any tier, allows us to see if what we’re providing to students is having the intended effect. Additionally, progress monitoring at Tier 3 allows us to see if the increased focus and intensity of Tier 3 intervention is supporting goals at Tier 1 and Tier 2. Students are initially identified as needing additional support due to lack of skill/performance within core instruction. Progress monitoring at Tier 3 helps us to better understand how to remediate in order to improve student performance at Tier 2 and Tier 1.
Tier 3 progress monitoring (PM) planning depends on the team’s purpose of instruction/intervention at Tier 3. Remind teams that just because they move from Tier 2 to Tier 3 support for a student, building on what they already have in place at Tier 2 may be most appropriate. Providing Tier 3 intervention and monitoring progress at that level may only require minor adjustments, such as increasing dosage and increasing frequency of progress monitoring. On the other hand, depending on the focus of instruction/intervention at Tier 3, we may need a different measure for progress monitoring. If the student is working on a very narrow and specific skill, then mastery measurement may be most appropriate. Additionally, consider how a Tier 3 progress monitoring measure coordinates with and supports a Tier 1 general outcome measure and/or what’s being targeted and assessed at Tier 2.
This slide, and the following slide, can either be viewed simply in the context of progress monitoring at Tier 3, or could be used as actual team activities, in which they work on completing an assessment map.

At tier 3, do SBLTs see in the schedule opportunities for using and discussing student performance on at least a bi-weekly basis? And are there enough resources to collect/summarize/and disseminate data for approximately 5% of students at that rate? Will teams have a standard day of the week when any student requiring “a data point” is given the appropriate assessment by whom ever is “on deck” for that week? (e.g., every other Wednesday?). Or, will data collection be flexible for any day of any week using a core team of people who will coordinate those activities?

**Planning Data Collection**

- Resource Map/Assessment Map
- School Calendar and Daily Schedule
- Existing infrastructure for Tiers 1 and 2
- Scheduling Data school-wide (and keeping it sacred):
  - Examples:
    - Tier 1: 1 week after assessment windows close
    - Tier 2: 1st Wednesday of every month;
    - Tier 2: Every 20 instructional days
    - Tier 3: Bi-weekly on Wednesdays
- Identifying personnel to manage data
Link this with the previous slide. Again, this can be introduced and completed as an actual activity during a training session, or the concept of an assessment map can be explained and teams then encouraged to complete on their own. Assessment maps can be developed for each tier, or across tiers.

Example, teams can choose a target area (reading, e.g.), and then identify when all screenings/benchmarks are given in the year for reading K-5. Then ask teams to identify in the schedule when staff meet in professional meetings (e.g., grade level mtgs, staff mtgs) in response to those assessment periods. Consideration can also be given to diagnostic tests that may be used to gather additional information. What is being used to monitor progress for small group interventions, and is it possible to collect and discuss student performance at least once a month for approximately 20% of students? Similar questions were provided for Tier 3 assessments in the previous slide.

Encourage teams to think of all aspects of assessments at their school including who collects, how assessment data is collected, how used/graphed, and how frequently administered. Encourage them to identify a header that might be missing from the above, or that might be particularly relevant for their school.
The following two slides are links to progress monitoring resources. In trainings, an option, if a number of folks have laptops available, is to assign links to teams and have them quickly review the site and share out.

- [http://www.studentprogress.org/chart/chart.asp](http://www.studentprogress.org/chart/chart.asp)
- [http://www.rtinetwork.org/Essential/Assessment](http://www.rtinetwork.org/Essential/Assessment)
- [http://www.studentprogress.org/library/Webinars.asp#RTI](http://www.studentprogress.org/library/Webinars.asp#RTI)
- [http://www.rtinetwork.org/Essential/Assessment/Progress/ar/LinkingMonitoring/1](http://www.rtinetwork.org/Essential/Assessment/Progress/ar/LinkingMonitoring/1)
- [http://www.aea11.k12.ia.us/spedresources/ModuleFour.pdf](http://www.aea11.k12.ia.us/spedresources/ModuleFour.pdf) (see Chapter 7, “Intervention Progress Monitoring”)
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PM Resources

- http://www.rtitools.com/Progress_Monitoring/Tools/


Evaluating a Student’s RtI

PLANNED DECISION MAKING
Some “food for thought”. When Tier 2 is not effective for a student, and we move toward providing Tier 3 support, we need to dig deeper to answer these questions. Best practice would be to return to the problem solving model. Was the intervention implemented as designed? Did we develop the right intervention? Does the intervention need to be adjusted, or do we need something different, or both? Problem analysis is especially important when making Tier 3 decisions.
This is a multi-click slide, and some changes to the slide occur without any clicks!

(Click1) Evidence based interventions are designed based on verified hypotheses about why the student is struggling. Evidence based interventions are implemented. Data are collected on the student and data are collected on the process of implementing the intervention. Both of these data are then used in making decisions.

There are three general types of decisions we can plan ahead for:…..

(Click2) +SO and +TI = Continue Intervention
(Click3) – SO and –TI = Re-implement with fidelity
(Click4) – SO and +TI = Modify or change the intervention.
(Click5) ….(*this just removes all the boxes except the three decision options*)
(Click 6) Of these three decision options… the first two are pretty straightforward,

(Click) But making plans for how to modify or change the intervention will require data-based problem solving
This is another multi-click slide and the previous slide actually moves right into this one.

Modifying or changing the intervention of course is not a new idea for us…we go back to problem solving. But….

(Click1) What does your data suggest is needed?
(Click2) Did you ID the right problem?
(Click3) Are there any previously validated hypotheses that need to be re-visited for intervention design?
(Click4) And/or are there any new hypotheses to consider to redesign the intervention?
(Click5) …Will you just tweak the current plan or give it a complete overhaul?
(Click6) If just tweaking the current plan, will you increase the dosage?
(Click7) Does the intervention match the students identified needs?
Many teams have seen this representation before. Good reminder of the importance of graphed data and the basic components of a graph. For a positive response (Click 1), the gap will be closing, resulting in an eventual intersection of the observed trajectory and expected trajectory. With a questionable response (Click 2), there is improvement, but the gap is not closing. And with a poor response (Click 3), the gap actually widens. The three responses to intervention will entail different decisions for teams to consider.
This is pretty straightforward—might want to ask teams under what conditions they would choose one of the three options.
Emphasize with this slide that when student response to intervention is not positive, the first question to ask is whether the intervention was implemented as intended. Additional discussion and decisions for teams would be how can integrity be assessed and monitored, how can poor integrity be prevented, and how can implementation be improved.
Decisions
What to do if RtI is:

• Poor
  – Was intervention implemented as intended?
    • If no - employ strategies in increase implementation integrity
    • If yes -
      – Is intervention aligned with the verified hypothesis or are there other aligned interventions to consider? (Intervention Design)
      – Are there other hypotheses to consider? (Problem Analysis)
      – Was the problem identified correctly? (Problem Identification)

Again, with poor response, the first thing to consider is intervention integrity. If the intervention was implemented as developed, then with a poor response, the appropriate decision would be to return to the problem solving process.
Let’s Look at Some Examples

- Reading Fluency with DIBELS (CBM)
- MATH CBM
- FAIR TDI Tasks
The next three slides illustrate different ways to display Tier 3 progress monitoring data. In this case, 10 minutes of repeated readings 4-5x per day was the implemented intervention. The progress monitoring tool was grade-level DIBELS oral reading fluency. However, in the absence of DIBELS, another one-minute reading WCPM measure or the ORF OPM would yield similar data. Let the training group decide—good, questionable, or poor response?

Student’s 2nd Grade Reading Fluency

![Graph showing progress over weeks with baseline and repeated readings with graphing.]
The student was provided one-on-one math instruction using Touch Math for 30 mins., three times a week. The team used the Curriculum-Based Assessment Math Computation Probe Generator on the CBM Warehouse site to develop weekly PM probes. The time required for administration of the probe ranged from 1-2 min.

Additional info.: The team used *The ABCs of CBM* and the Aimsweb norms (available at CBM Warehouse) to determine norms.

Good, questionable, or poor response?
This graph demonstrates an example of how FAIR data could be used for progress monitoring. The assessment is the Targeted Diagnostic Inventory. Since the number of items (8) is finite, comparisons can be made from one assessment period to the next. Team will need to decide on the benchmark—8 out of 8? 7 out of 8?
Review the Randy case study with participants: Repeating third grade, history of reading difficulties. Continued struggles in spite of small group intervention. On DIBELS ORF, Randy’s level of performance was 76% accuracy, while peers were 96%. Validated hypothesis: Randy does not apply appropriate self-correcting/self-monitoring strategies (Day 1 Module). Intervention and support plan were developed (Day 2 Module). Intervention consisted of 30 minute sessions, MWF, with reading interventionist. Randy’s teacher providing support to interventionist.

Refer to following “Randy” documents in Supplemental Materials:
- Comprehensive Intervention Plan—Intervention Planning Form
- Intervention Documentation Worksheet
- Graph—Oral Reading Accuracy
- Graph—Oral Reading Fluency
- Student Success Worksheet—Step IV
Completed Intervention Plan for Randy now includes a plan for assessing integrity (Intervention Documentation—column 4) and a plan for progress monitoring (column 5).

Integrity will be assessed using the Intervention Documentation Worksheet, with the interventionist recording after each intervention session. Interventionist will also be collecting PM data every Friday and the graphed data (along with the integrity documentation) are to be reviewed at an individual student data meeting. At that time, Randy’s RtI will be evaluated as Positive, Questionable, or Poor.
Invite participants to examine the integrity documentation worksheet and the two progress monitoring graphs for Randy. Based on the data, what would their decision be as to Randy’s response to the intervention? The Student Success Sheet for Randy is also provided, in which a Positive response is noted, justification provided, the decision made to begin fading supports, and another review meeting scheduled.
Using their own student data, teams/participants are now instructed to complete the final two sections of the Comprehensive Intervention Plan—planning for integrity assessment and progress monitoring. Remind them to be detailed and specific in their plan elements, and refer them to the completed plan for Randy as an example.
Step 4 Student Success Worksheet - Your Student

Student Success Worksheet

Step IV - Response to Instruction/Intervention

Attach graphed data for each review date:

Review Date:

Is the response to instruction/intervention: Positive, Questionable, or Poor?

If Positive:

- Continue current instructional support
- Adjust goal upward
- Triple supports

Comments/Actions:

If Questionable:

Were intervention/instruction implemented as planned? Yes, No

If No, what strategies will be utilized to increase implementation?

Comments/Actions:

If Yes, increase intervention intensity? Yes, No

Comments/Actions:
Perceptions of Practices Survey

Your project ID is:
• Last 4 digits of SS#
• Last 2 digits of year of birth

This is included in Supplemental Materials
Personnel Satisfaction Survey

Your project ID is:

- Last 4 digits of SS#
- Last 2 digits of year of birth

This is included in Supplemental Materials.
THANK YOU!