

Tier I Critical Components Checklist Scoring Rubric

Directions: Criteria for rating each item are provided below and should be applied to available documentation related to meetings in which Tier I instruction and/or interventions are planned and evaluated. A score of N/A (not applicable) may be appropriate for some items, see Notes column.

Item	0 = Absent	1 = Partially Present	2 = Present	Notes and N/A = Not Applicable	Rating
Goal/Problem Identification (What is the goal?) (Items 1-3)					
1. Expected level of performance for all students at Tier 1 was described in observable and measurable terms (i.e., what all students should know or be able to do, based on state or local standards)	Expected level of performance for all students was not described, or the focus was on the problem only (e.g., “students are struggling with reading”)	Expected level of performance for all students was described, <u>but</u> not in observable and measurable terms (e.g., “students will improve comprehension”)	Expected level of performance for all students was described, <u>and</u> was observable and measurable (e.g., “students will comprehend grade-level text, as demonstrated by scoring ‘proficient’ or better on benchmark assessment”)		
2. Data were collected to determine the effectiveness of core instruction for academics, behavior, and/or social emotional skills (e.g., universal screener data, formative or summative assessment data, benchmark assessments, referral, attendance data)	No data quantifying the effectiveness of core instruction for academics, behavior, and/or social emotional skills were collected	Data quantifying the effectiveness of core instruction were collected for <u>one</u> of the following: a) all students b) demographic subgroups of students	Data quantifying the effectiveness of core instruction were collected for <u>both</u> of the following: a) all students b) demographic subgroups of students		
3. Universal screening data were used to make a decision to either modify core instruction OR identify groups of students for whom supplemental intervention (Tier 2) is appropriate, and the decision was defensible based on available data	A decision was made; however, it was unclear what data were used	A decision was made, <u>but</u> was not appropriate based on the available data	A decision was made, <u>and</u> was appropriate based on the available data	A decision to modify core instruction should be made if \lesssim 80% of students or student subgroups are meeting expectations	

Problem Analysis (What are the barriers to success?) (Items 4-7)					
4. Potential reasons (hypotheses) for why students are not meeting benchmarks (e.g., grade level standards, behavior expectations) were alterable and developed across multiple domains (i.e., instruction, curriculum, environment, learner)	Hypotheses were not developed, or the hypotheses developed were unalterable	Alterable hypotheses were developed, but did not span more than one domain (e.g., curriculum domain only)	Alterable hypotheses were developed, and did span multiple domains (e.g., instruction and environment)		
5. Data were collected using RIOT (Review, Interview, Observe, Test) procedures to validate (i.e., support/not support) hypotheses for why students are not achieving expectations, and were appropriately matched to the developed hypotheses	No data was collected to validate hypotheses	Data were collected using RIOT procedures, <u>but</u> data were not appropriate for validating the hypotheses	Data were collected using RIOT procedures, <u>and</u> were appropriate to validate the hypotheses		
6. Alterable and validated (i.e., supported by data) hypotheses for why students are not achieving expectations were clearly identified	No alterable and validated hypotheses were clearly identified	Hypotheses were clearly identified, <u>but</u> were either alterable or supported by data	Hypotheses were clearly identified, <u>and</u> were both alterable and supported by data		
7. A goal, matched to the data used to identify the target skill, was developed and included all of the following necessary components: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Specific (e.g., includes how it will be measured) • Measurable (e.g., includes % of students to meet the expectation) • Ambitious (e.g., higher than current level of performance) • Realistic • Time bound (e.g., date is in the future) 	A goal, matched to the data used to identify the target skill was not developed, or was missing all of the necessary components	A goal, matched to the data used to identify the target skill, was developed <u>but</u> was missing some of the necessary components	A goal, matched to the data used to identify the target skill, was developed <u>and</u> included all of the necessary components		

Intervention Planning and Implementation (What are we going to do?) (Items 8-13)					
8. The comprehensive intervention plan was evidence based and linked to a validated hypothesis	The intervention plan was not evidence-based or linked to a validated hypothesis	The intervention plan was <u>either</u> evidence-based or linked to a validated hypothesis	The intervention plan was <u>both</u> evidence-based and linked to a validated hypothesis		
9. An intervention plan was developed, and included the following necessary components: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What will be done • Who is responsible • When it will occur 	An intervention plan was not developed	An intervention plan was developed, <u>but</u> did not include all the necessary components	An intervention plan was developed, <u>and</u> not included all the necessary components		
10. A plan for providing support to the personnel responsible for implementation of the intervention plan (i.e., intervention support plan) was developed and included the following necessary components: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support to be provided or actions to be taken • Who is responsible for providing support or taking actions • When support provided or actions taken will occur 	No intervention support plan was developed	An intervention support plan was developed, <u>but</u> did not include all the necessary components	An intervention support plan was developed <u>and</u> included all the necessary components		
11. A plan for assessing intervention fidelity was developed, and included the following necessary components: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Who is responsible • What specifically will be documented • How frequently will documentation occur 	No plan for assessing intervention fidelity was developed	A plan for assessing intervention fidelity was developed, <u>but</u> did not include all the necessary components	A plan for assessing intervention fidelity was developed, <u>and</u> included all the necessary components		
12. A plan for monitoring progress was developed, and included the following necessary components: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Who will collect the data • What data will be collected • Frequency of data collection 	No plan for monitoring progress was developed	A plan for monitoring progress was developed, but did not include all the necessary components	A plan for monitoring progress was developed, and included all the necessary components		
13. A follow-up meeting to review data for evaluating progress was scheduled during the initial meeting	No follow-up meeting was scheduled during the initial meeting	A follow-up meeting was generally indicated, but no specific date was provided (e.g., “will meet again during second quarter”)	A follow up meeting was scheduled for a specific date during the initial meeting		

Plan Evaluation (Did it work?) (Items 14-17)					
14. Data matched to the expected level of performance were collected for monitoring progress	No progress monitoring data were collected	Progress was monitored, <u>but</u> was collected less than prescribed in the plan for monitoring progress	Progress was monitored, <u>and</u> was collected as prescribed in the plan for monitoring progress		
15. Data measuring instructional/intervention fidelity were collected and used to determine fidelity of intervention plan implementation	No data measuring intervention fidelity were collected	Data measuring intervention fidelity were collected, <u>but</u> were not used to determine fidelity of intervention plan implementation	Data measuring intervention fidelity were collected, <u>and</u> were used to determine fidelity of intervention plan implementation		
16. A decision to continue, modify, or fade the intervention was evident	No decision to continue, modify, or fade the intervention was evident	A decision to continue, modify, or fade the intervention was evident, <u>but</u> was not consistent with students' response to intervention (i.e., decision was not defensible considering the data)	A decision to continue, modify, or fade the intervention was evident, <u>and</u> was consistent with students' response to intervention		
17. At the follow-up meeting, a subsequent follow-up meeting was scheduled to assess the impact of planned next steps (e.g., modifications to, or continuation of the intervention plan, or development of a new plan)	At the follow-up meeting, no subsequent follow-up meeting was scheduled	At the follow-up meeting, a subsequent follow-up meeting was suggested, however a specific date and time was not scheduled (e.g., "Will meet again during second quarter")	At the follow-up meeting, a specific date and time for a subsequent follow-up meeting was scheduled	N/A if item 13 was scored a 0 and no follow-up meeting occurred	