Overview

The Franklin Pierce Schools has adopted the framework from the National Center on Response to Intervention (http://www.rti4success.org) to guide its implementation of Multi-Tiered System of Supports (MTSS). The framework includes these essential components:

1. Universal Screening
2. Progress Monitoring
3. School-wide multi-tiered prevention system
4. Data-based decision-making for:
    a. Instruction and intervention
    b. Movement within the multi-level system
    c. Disability identification

Core Beliefs underlying the Franklin Pierce Multi-Tier System of Supports

- Every student learns and achieves to high standards.
- A culture reflecting a growth mind-set will be developed and enhanced to create a collective responsibility for student success.
- Change is intentional, coherent, and dynamic.
- Learning includes academic and social/emotional behavioral competencies.
- Every student will be provided effective, explicit, systematic and relentless instruction with a research based core curriculum.
- Academic and behavioral data will be used to inform instructional decisions.
- Evidence-based interventions will be provided at the earliest identification of need, based on decision-making rules.
- District policy regarding MTSS will be based on both evidence-based and research-based practice.
- Every educator will continuously gain knowledge and develop expertise to build capacity and sustain effective practice.
- Resources will be intentionally selected, designed and redesigned to match student needs.
- Research and evidence based practice will be used in planning, implementing and evaluating instructional decisions.
- Educators and parents will be part of the fundamental practice of effective problem solving and instructional decision-making.

Non-Negotiable Elements of the Franklin Pierce Multi-Tier System of Supports

The creation of a sustainable MTSS requires significant leadership and an intense focus on the alignment of all practices and resources. To achieve this, schools must agree to the following non-negotiable conditions:

1. A district leadership team is in place to provides leadership, support and strategic planning

2. Active participation of the building administrator on the building leadership team is necessary to provide leadership, support, and sponsorship to the team.
3. Membership of the school leadership team includes representatives from stakeholder groups such as classroom teachers, special education professionals and support professionals. The MTSS must support the learning of all students.
4. All school staff must embrace the practices required for MTSS implementation.
5. The MTSS teams, at both the building and the district level, are tasked with ongoing evaluation of the MTSS process and implementation, through progress monitoring, fidelity checks, and use of the integrity rubric.
6. Each school will follow the District MTSS Framework.

The School MTSS team has three purposes:

1. To screen and identify students who require additional academic and/or behavior support.
2. To review school-wide behavior and academic data in order to evaluate the effectiveness of core programs.
3. To plan, implement and modify approved interventions for these students. Depending on each student's "response to intervention," a formal referral for special education evaluation may result.

MTSS is intended to be a structured, systematic process involving the following features and activities: 1) core instruction with fidelity, 2) universal screening, 3) school-wide planning, 4) standard-protocol interventions with fidelity 5) progress monitoring, 6) teaming/data-based decision making, and 7) individual problem solving/intensifying interventions (ICEL/RIOT).

Team membership: Leadership by the principal is essential. MTSS Team membership also must include classroom teachers representing grade levels, the Learning Specialist, School Counselor, School Psychologist, Instructional Coaches, and specialists from the Special Education and ELL programs.

MTSS team meetings: Each MTSS team will convene at least every 6 weeks to evaluate the progress of students at each grade level who are involved in core instruction and/or interventions including those students who receive services through Special Education. The team reviews progress-monitoring data for each student, analyzing *aimlines* and *trendlines* (see Decision Rules). Using the decision rules, one of four different decisions may be made at this meeting for each student being reviewed:

1) The group intervention has been successful and the student no longer needs small group instruction,
2) The intervention is working for the student and should be continued and monitored,
3) The group intervention is not working for the student and should be revised or refined; or,
4) The student has not made adequate progress during two intervention periods and/or with at least one change in intervention that is documented and therefore the team will proceed to the Individualized, Intensified Intervention described below.

Tier 1 for all students (School-wide): Three times a year (may be less frequent at secondary level), in fall, winter and spring, MTSS teams will review data on student performance (e.g., Fast Bridge, behavior referrals, attendance to evaluate the effectiveness of the core programs. The MTSS model is predicated on the notion that all students can make adequate growth and that core programs should meet the needs of at least 80% of the student population. If this is not the case, the team should strategize ways to improve the core instruction. This means the School-wide MTSS team must examine core programs/instruction, foster honest conversations about whether the core is meeting the needs of 80% of all major student populations (Ethnicity, ELL, IEPs, etc.). The team should then utilize approved prevention/intervention activities that target areas which data analysis suggests need attention (e.g., professional development, re- teaching of basic skills, re-teaching school rules and expectations consistently, early stage interventions, standard-protocol academic interventions etc.). It is vital to have the building principal on the team to ensure that fundamental organizational decisions can be made, resources can be allocated, instructional delivery is effective, and the program is delivered with fidelity.

Tier 2: Students at each elementary grade level who have below average (25th %tile) academic, behavioral or attendance problems, are listed on the school MTSS intervention record. The school MTSS team will meet every six weeks to review student data. This is usually best accomplished by grade level teacher teams with core members of the MTSS team assisting them. These MTSS teams choose interventions (evidence-based if available) from the appropriate Standard Protocol (Reading, Math, Writing, or Behavior) for groups of students with similar needs and based upon severity of need. The severity of need is determined by a "triage process" using the 25th %tile to 10th %tile for tier 2 and 10th %tile and below for tier 3. They also decide on what progress data to collect and the person responsible for collecting the data. Students in tier 2 intervention groups are progress monitored as defined on the appropriate district progress monitoring protocol using grade level assessments.

Tier 3: Individualizing, Intensifying Intervention: If the student has failed to make adequate progress (see decision rules) after two evidence-based interventions, additional information must be gathered in order to select an intervention that is specifically targeted to the student's needs. MTSS teams should complete the following steps:

1. MTSS Instructional Program Review *(need form)* should be shared and explained to parents, notifying them that the school is beginning to plan for a more individualized intervention for their student. The MTSS Parent Brochure describing how the response to intervention process works should also be sent to parents at this time along with copies of the graphs tracking previous interventions.
2. If the student is an English Language Learner (ELL), obtain information about the child's language development in comparison to the student's cohorts from the ELL teacher.
3. Complete the Individual Problem Solving Worksheet *(need form).* It provides detail on the student's history and is important for designing an effective, individualized intervention.

4. Another resource for students with behavioral issues is a Functional Behavior Assessment, which can be completed by the team with support from the counselor and/or school psychologist.

If a student's skill level is well below grade level, then the MTSS team may choose to progress monitor the student at his or her instructional level or use the intra-individual framework goal-setting process. The progress monitoring guidelines contain the recommended procedures.

After 4-6 weeks in the individualized intervention, the team will determine if:

5. The student has improved substantially and so no longer needs to be included in an intervention group.
6. The student has improved substantially and the team reduces the intensity of the intervention and continues to monitor progress.
7. The student is an English Language Learner and is struggling with **reading comprehension** in comparison with his or her ELL Cohort. The intervention designed to improve comprehension will be continued for one additional 6-week period prior to referring to Special Education.
8. A referral for a formal special education evaluation is appropriate. Also consider a referral for special education services for students who have made progress, but the intervention has been intensive and will need to be maintained in order for the student to continue to make progress. While RTI is used only for Specific Learning Disability identification, the information collected may be useful for any special education referral. See the most current Special Education Procedures Manual for details on the special education process.

MTSS Decision Guidelines

- Review of core instruction is necessary when less than 80% of all students are meeting learning targets.
- Students not making adequate progress are provided targeted evidence-based interventions based upon screening results using a triage approach.
- Small group or individual instruction changes:
  - Progress Monitoring data are below the aimline on 4 consecutive data points or at least 9 data points produce a flat or decreasing trend line, school staff should change or intensify the intervention.
- Tier 3 instruction begins when a student fails to progress after two Tier 2 interventions/programs, or when data indicates significant need.

SCREENING	TIER 1	TIER 2	TIER 3
Who: All students **Purpose:** Decide which students may be at risk and which students are not.	Universal screening 3 times per year in reading, mathematics, attendance and behavior. State assessments and credits.	Universal screening 3 times per year in reading, mathematics, attendance and behavior. State assessments and credits.	Universal screening 3 times per year in reading, mathematics, attendance and behavior. State assessments and credits.
FPS Uses:	Fast Bridge district-wide assessments, existing classroom data, in program assessments. State assessments, transcripts, suspensions, office referrals, attendance.	Fast Bridge district-wide assessments, existing classroom data, in program assessments. State assessments, transcripts, suspensions, office referrals, attendance.	Fast Bridge district-wide assessments, existing classroom data, in program assessments. State assessments, transcripts, suspensions, office referrals, attendance.
Who is involved:	Teachers, learning specialists, paraeducators, support staff, counselors, school psychologists.	Teachers, learning specialists, paraeducators, support staff, counselors, school psychologists.	Teachers, learning specialists, paraeducators, support staff, counselors, school psychologist, social worker.

PROGRESS MONITORING	TIER 1	TIER 2	TIER 3
Purpose: Determine whether students are profiting from intervention and if changes are needed	3 times per year. Follow <u>at risk students</u> for 6 weeks. Secondary: 3 times per year	Every 2 weeks Secondary: Monthly	Weekly Secondary: Monthly
We use:	Fast Bridge CBM and in program data, IGDI (pre-K), failure rates, attendance, office referrals, lexile levels.	Fast Bridge CBM and in program data, IGDI (pre-K), failure rates, attendance, office referrals, suspensions, lexile levels.	Fast Bridge CBM and in program data, IGDI (pre-K), failure rates, attendance, office referrals, suspensions, lexile levels.
Who is involved:	Teacher, learning specialists, paraeducators, support staff, counselors, school psych.	Teacher, learning specialists, paraeducators, support staff, counselors, school psych,	Teacher, learning specialists, paraeducators, support staff, counselors, school psych, social worker.
DECISION MAKING	TIER 1	TIER 2	TIER 3
What are the student's instructional needs? Note: we are not diagnosing impairments we are identifying learning problems	Informal problem solving and standard treatment protocol MTSS check point days. Grade Level/Department level PLC. Review screening and in program/ intervention data. RTI/MTSS monthly meetings	Tier 1 Plus: Problem Solving Team (PST) meetings. Review progress monitoring data. RTI/MTSS monthly meetings	Tier 1 Plus: Problem Solving Team (PST) meetings. Review progress monitoring data. RTI/MTSS monthly meetings

We use:	Universal screening, benchmarking, PLC cycle data, in program data, failure rates, attendance, office referrals.	Universal screening, benchmarking in program data. IGDI (pre-k), PLC data cycle, failure rates, attendance, office referrals, suspensions.	Tier 2 plus: Diagnostic analysis and data-based individualization (DBI), PLC data cycle, failure rates, attendance, suspensions.
Who is involved:	Teacher, learning specialists, administrators, support staff, counselors, school psych.	Teacher, learning specialists, administrators, support staff, counselors, school psych.	Teacher, learning specialists, administrators, support staff, counselors, resource room teachers, school psych, social worker.
INTERVENTIONS	**TIER 1**	**TIER 2**	**TIER 3**
Review documented effectiveness, and decide when program / intervention(s) can be adjusted or discontinued	PLC Meetings, teachers in the same content area review summative assessments and review CCSS MTSS check point days.	Tier 1 plus: Support staff/ Admin meetings Problems solving team meetings. MTSS team meetings (every 4-8 weeks)	Tier 1 plus: Support staff/ Admin meetings Problem solving team meetings. MTSS team meetings (every 4-8 weeks)
We use:	Core instruction plus: Flexible grouping, accommodations, scaffolding, explicit instruction, planned discussion.	Core instruction plus: Approved evidence-based standard treatment protocol. Utilize Intervention Case Manager (ICM)	Core instruction/ alternate core instruction. Evidence based interventions. Approved standard treatment protocol. ICM
Who is involved:	Teachers, learning specialists, instructional coach, school psychologists, counselors.	Teachers, learning specialists, instructional coaches, Administrators, support staff, resource room teacher, school psychologist, counselors, ICM.	Teachers, learning specialists, instructional coaches, Administrators, support staff, resource room teacher, school psychologists, counselors, ICM.

<u>Franklin Pierce Schools Format for MTSS Academic Checkpoint Meeting</u>

Prior to coming to the meeting, follow these steps:

Step 1: Administer FastBridge assessments for your entire home room. Bring these scores to the meeting highlighted by Benchmark, Strategic, and Intensive.

Reading Fast Bridge Assessments	Math Fast Bridge Assessments
Early Literacy Measures	Early Numeracy Measures
Reading CBM	Math Automaticity
Comp Efficiency	MCAP

Step 2: Separate your Progress Monitoring Graphs into 2 Groups
- *One group will be for students making adequate progress – their trend lines are at or above their goal lines*
- *The second group will be made up of students not making progress – their trend lines are below their goal lines*

Step 3: Bring Core Instructional Data as well as Lessons Gained Charts for direct instruction groups. Core instruction data needs to be organized in a way that it can be highlighted and easily shared with the whole group. The format of the data will be decided upon by the grade level PLC. For grade levels that have a mixture of Intervention groups and Core Instruction groups, the data will likely look slightly different. The document camera will be used to display data in order to identify any patterns/trends. Core Instruction Data will include:

Reading	Math
Fluency	Computational
Vocabulary	Problem Solving Skills
Comprehension	

Step 4: As a PLC, create a list of students that are making adequate progress and a list of students that are not making progress to be shared with the entire group at the meeting. PLCs will follow the decision-making rules below.

Step 5: As a PLC, brainstorm a list of possible needs/instructional strategies/support that will be discussed as we work to make sure all students are making progress.

Decision Making Rules

Two questions to guide decisions based on student data:
1. What is the student's goal?
2. How well are they are making progress toward their goal (4 Point Rule)?

	Should an instructional program be modified?	**Should an instructional program change be made entirely?**	**Should there be no instructional program change?**	**Should there be a less intensive instructional program?**
Progress Monitoring	Student's trend line or last 4 consecutive data points are below the goal line for the past 6 weeks.	Student's trend line or last 4 consecutive data points are below the goal line for the past 6 weeks, and when the student was checked 6 weeks prior.	Student's trend line or last 4 consecutive data points are even with the goal line.	Student's trend line or last 4 consecutive data points are above the goal line. If appropriate, consider increasing the goal before moving to less intensive tier.
Classroom/Program Data	Classroom work samples and assessment data indicate that the student is making progress, but not at the expected rate.	Classroom work samples and assessment data indicate that the student is not making progress in the current instructional tier, even after a change has been made.	Classroom work samples and assessment data indicate that the student is making adequate or expected progress.	Classroom work samples and assessment data indicate that the student is making progress above their goal and it does not appear that the current intervention is needed or the goal needs to be increased.

Meeting Protocol

Staff that need to participate: Grade level team members, Principal, Instructional Coach, Learning Specialists, Resource Room Teacher, ELL Teacher, School Psychologist

Step 1: Look at the FastBridge data that shows overall performance of the grade level, which will include an FastBridge Impact report following benchmark testing. Look at the PLC generated list that separates the students into groups of students that are making progress and not making progress.

Step 2: Look at the lists of students that were generated by the PLC prior to the meeting. If an instructional program needs to be modified or changed entirely, then ask the following questions:

1. Has the instruction/intervention been as intense as it could be?
   a. Teacher/Student ratio, materials used, time engaged

2. Has the instruction/intervention been delivered with fidelity?
    a. Implementation reports are provided by the teacher or someone has observed implementation.
3. Is the instruction/intervention evidence-based?
    a. References are provided or someone has checked on this.
4. Has the duration of the instruction/intervention been long enough?
    a. Does the team feel that lack of results is due to not having the intervention in place long enough?

When changing the intensity and nature of instruction/intervention consider:

1. Intervention
2. Duration
3. Frequency
4. Interventionist
5. Group Size

Examples of Changes in Intervention in Elementary Schools

Each of these changes constitutes a new intervention and is decided upon by the MTSS team. These are the options available for academic and behavioral intervention changes.

1. Add 15 or more minutes per intervention session (ex: extra time could be used to pre-teach vocabulary or core content). Reduce group size by 2-3 students.
2. Add a behavior plan and/or attendance intervention to increase instructional time, motivation and/or attention.
3. Change material according to protocol if the current intervention is not addressing the student's needs. This change should be based on additional assessment
4. Add material according to protocol based on additional assessment to provide additional practice on targeted skills.

The team may decide that the student needs more time in the current intervention along with a refinement in the instructional delivery based on the needs of the student by increasing the intensity of the intervention.

ICEL/RIOT Problem-Solving Protocol

Explanation of Terms:

I. Instruction: Instruction is how curriculum is taught. This includes instructional decision making regarding materials and curriculum level. Progress monitoring and the ability to control success rate are also included. Examples of other instructional variables include giving clear directions, communicating expectations and criteria for success, direct instruction with explanations and cues, sequencing lesson designs to promote success and offering a variety of activities and experiences for practice and application.   Once an

appropriate curriculum is implemented, instruction should be examined for effectiveness starting with the whole group. This can be determined by asking the following questions:

- Have the research-based practices been shown to increase student performance?
- Have effective practices have been implemented with fidelity in ways that students will benefit?
- Do materials have documented efficacy?
- Has a sufficient amount of instructional time been allotted for curriculum implementation?
- Is instruction tailored to meet students' current levels of knowledge?

Is instruction organized so that pre-requisite skills are taught sequentially? **II. Curriculum:** Curriculum refers to what is taught. This includes the long range direction, intent, and stated outcomes of the course of study. It also includes the content arrangement, and pace of steps leading to the outcomes. Before instruction can be aligned with student needs, an appropriate curriculum that has been carefully selected should be in place. To assure curriculum alignment you need to:

- Make sure that the curriculum is aligned and matches appropriate state and district standards and benchmarks.
- Be certain that core components are introduced and reinforced at appropriate levels within the curriculum.
  See that the curriculum is taught consistently and explicitly in all of the classrooms.

III. Environment: The environment is where the instruction takes place. This includes all aspects of the classroom setting such as physical arrangement, rules, management plans, routines, and expectations. It may also include out of class variables such as peer and family influence, and job pressure for students at the secondary level. Environmental considerations cover a wide range of factors. The setting, routines and rules should be closely scrutinized. This includes:

- Making sure that the physical environment (seating arrangement, lighting and noise-level) are appropriate; and
- Determining if routines and behavior management plans are conducive to learning.

IV. Learner: The learner is who is being taught. The most important learner variable is his or her current knowledge, sometimes referred to as 'prior knowledge' of the task that they need to learn. This is the last point to consider when planning interventions. Before the student's skills and motivation are called into question, it should be confirmed that the curriculum and instruction are appropriate and the environment positive. Interventions in the student learner domain are not likely to be successful if problems in the other domains are not adequately addressed. Fixed, or unalterable, traits such as a student's 'ability', race, gender or family history are the last domain to consider when planning interventions.

Review/Interview/Observation/Test: RIOT

The Franklin Pierce School District encourages the requirement to collect additional information and assessment data be addressed through what is commonly called the RIOT (Record review, Interviews, Observation, and Testing) process, which is typically an integral part of the early intervening period. Below are examples of data sources and evaluation tools in each of these four categories that might be included in a full and individual evaluation. The collection of this information and data may occur during the MTSS/RTI process and/or after the special education evaluation period begins.

- Record Review: Student work samples, grades, office referrals, etc.
- Interviews: Of teachers, parents, counselors, the student, and others involved in the student's education
- Observation: Of the student in specific, relevant settings and of the learning environment
- Testing: Universal screening, CBMs (depending on tier), classroom tests, district-wide and state tests, functional behavior assessments, etc.

The following is a list of some of the evaluation tools that might be included in a full and individual evaluation:
- Interviews
- Observation of the student in specific, relevant settings
- Error analysis of work samples
- CBAs/Functional Academic Assessments, including CBMs and CBE
- Progress monitoring data
- Results from state and local assessments
- Functional Behavioral Assessments
- Behavior Rating Scales
- Vocational assessments
- Developmental, academic, behavioral, and functional life skills checklists
- Standardized (norm-referenced) assessments

SLD Eligibility Procedures Using MTSS/RTI Data
in a Comprehensive Evaluation

Child Find Obligations within the Franklin Pierce MTSS/RTI System
Implementing a MTSS/RTI system does not alter the obligation of the Franklin Pierce School District to identify students with disabilities ("child find"). Parents, teachers, or anyone else can initiate a referral at any time. District personnel should be aware that a parent has the right to make a special education referral even for students who have not yet demonstrated a lack of responsiveness to an intervention. The district may continue MTSS/RTI interventions if they have already been initiated while processing the referral and determining whether or not the student is a candidate for special education evaluation within required timelines.

Parent Participation
Involving parents at all phases is a key aspect of a successful MTSS/RTI program. As members of the decision making team, parents can provide a critical perspective on students, thus increasing the likelihood that MTSS/RTI interventions will be effective. For this reason, Franklin Pierce Schools shall make a concerted effort to involve parents as early as possible, beginning with instruction in the core curriculum. This shall be done by notifying parents of student progress within the RTI system on a monthly basis.

Because MTSS/RTI is a framework of delivering the general education curriculum for all students, written consent is not required before administering universal screenings. However, when a student fails to respond to interventions and the decision is made to evaluate a student for special education eligibility, written consent must be obtained in accordance with special education procedures.

Special Education Referral Procedures:
A special education referral for a student suspected of having a Specific Learning Disability may be deemed necessary after the student has received tiered interventions, and the interventions provided were not successful in closing the achievement gap. A student may be referred during Tier III, but eligibility will not be determined until interventions have been implemented with fidelity. Fidelity will be monitored as described in tier 2 and tier 3 procedures.

- The student's Tier 1 general education core instruction provided the opportunity to increase the rate of learning.

- Two or more intensive research-based interventions (not necessarily different materials) were implemented with fidelity and for sufficient duration to establish that the rate of learning did not increase at a rate higher than a typical peer's ROI and is closing the achievement gap.

- The duration of the intensive research-based interventions was long enough to gather

sufficient data points below the aimline (at least 4 consecutive data points per intervention phase) through progress monitoring before changing the intervention.

Data-based decisions will be made at each tier using a minimum of 8-10 data points (if progress monitoring every other week) *OR* 10-15 data points (if progress monitoring weekly). Furthermore, a change in intervention (4 consecutive data points below the aimline are required to change the intervention) will be considered within each tier before moving to the next tier of intervention. The intervention must have empirical evidence supporting its use in remediating the area of suspected disability (i.e., Basic Reading Skills), and the progress monitoring tool selected must be able to provide evidence that the student did not make a sufficient amount of progress in the area of suspected disability. It is the district's responsibility to document that the student received intervention and was progress monitored.

Student screening: Students may be screened by a specialist (e.g., school psychologist or learning specialist) at any time within the Tiers to provide instructional and/or program planning information. For example, the student's phonological processing or academic skills may be screened to provide additional information to inform instruction and/or intervention. All screenings will be conducted in accordance with the examiner's manual with regard to standardization. Prior to a special education referral, this screening information may only be used to help identify the needs of the student and to assist with instructional program planning. Furthermore, this information will not be used to predetermine the student's ability or lack thereof to make progress. If a student fails to make adequate progress after receiving intervention at all levels, the information obtained from any screenings completed during the intervention process may be used *as part of* the eligibility determination following informed written parental consent. Screenings conducted for instructional programming may be necessary but are not sufficient to document underachievement in the event a special education referral is made.

If, within the RTI process, the team suspects that a student may be evidencing a disability other than a Specific Learning Disability, then the referral/evaluation process for that disability must be followed. It is important to note that the MTSS/RTI process is not required or appropriate for all areas of suspected disability. For example, a student who is suspected of having an Intellectual Disability may be referred prior to the completion of the MTSS/RTI process. Any information collected through the screening/progress monitoring process will be vitally important when making these decisions. None of these procedures will conflict with the U.S. Office of Special Education Programs Memorandum 11---07.

Data management is also crucial within a MTSS/RTI system. Schools that use MTSS/RTI for SLD eligibility will need to identify the person or persons responsible for ensuring that data are properly obtained and analyzed. As students' needs advance to more intensive interventions, school psychologists, special education teachers, counselors, speech/language pathologists, or other specialists may be called upon to manage, interpret or synthesize student data to support decision-making teams.

2/7/2019

Goal Setting in a Multi-Tiered Model (MTSS):

The Franklin Pierce School District will use two types of goal setting strategies as described in the table below.

Key terms:

- Time Frame: when the goal is to be reached.
- Grade Level Material: the assessment material in which the student is expected to be successful at this time.
- Goal Material: the assessment material in which the student is expected to be successful at the end of the intervention and in which progress will be measured.
- Present Level of Performance: the assessment material in which the student is currently successful.
- Criterion for Acceptable Performance (CAP): how successful performance will be judged.

Goal Format:

<Student> <Behavior> <CAP> <Goal Material> <Time Frame>

<Time Frame><Student> <Behavior> <CAP> <Goal Material>

<Goal Material> <Student> <Behavior> <CAP><Time Frame>

Goal Example:

<Sue> <Will Read> <115 Words Correctly (WRC) with 3 or fewer errors> <from a randomly selected Grade 4 Standard Reading Passage> <by the end of the 2013 school year>

<Sue> <Will Earn a score of greater than 35 points> <on a randomly selected Grade 5 Mathematics Applications Probe> <in 1 Year when his IEP expires>

Tier	Time Frame	Goal Material	CAP Outcome	PM Frequency
IEPs	IEP Annual Review Date	Individualized to Reduce the Gap	Significantly Reduces the Gap/Local Norms	1-2 times per week
Tier 3	End of school year	Expected grade level or some cases at goal material level (between present level of performance and grade level as determined by the goal and supported by an adequate/rigorous ROI	Significantly Reduces the Gap/Local Norms	1 time per week
Tier 2	End of school year	Expected grade level	Reduces the gap/local norms	Benchmark assessment monthly or bi-weekly
Tier 1	End of school year	Expected grade level	Passing state assessment	Benchmark screening

Special Education Referral Information:

A referral to **special education** will include (at a minimum):

- *Parent Input* to include any pertinent familial information, family/student medical history, and etc.;

2/7/2019

- *Teacher Input* to include an indirect observation, work samples, documentation of differentiated instruction, etc.;
- *Documentation of the Problem* to include classroom-based performance assessments, standardized testing results, and other relevant assessment data;
- *A Detailed Description of the Intervention Process* to include interventions used, attendance, frequency of implementation, duration of implementation, and fidelity monitoring; and
- *Progress Monitoring* data indicating a lack of responsiveness to intervention.

Comprehensive Evaluation

Use of an MTSS/RTI process does not replace the requirement for a comprehensive evaluation. Even with MTSS/RTI, the evaluation must include a variety of data gathering tools and strategies, which includes the results of MTSS/RTI activities.[1] It has been noted that IDEA requires students to be assessed in all areas related to the suspected disability, including if appropriate, the eight specified areas. The IEP team (and other qualified professionals, as appropriate) use this standard to identify the particular areas of review for the student. Therefore, the determination of "comprehensiveness" is based on each student's individualized needs. The following is guidance for this determination process.

> In the past, the required "comprehensive evaluation" was interpreted by most to mean a common battery of assessments for all students suspected of having a particular disability. Now it is anticipated that the data gathered during the MTSS/RTI process, related directly to the student's performance in the learning context, should reduce the need for the "common battery" approach to assessments.

> In conducting an evaluation, the team may not use any single measure or assessment as the sole criterion for making a disability determination and for determining an appropriate educational program. While a student's response to scientific, research-based intervention is crucial to disability identification and educational planning, other types of information and assessment data must also be collected throughout the MTSS/RTI process. See below.

> The U.S. Department of Education, in the final IDEA regulations (Source: Federal Register/Vol. 71, No. 156. Page 46651) in 2006 directly addressed the question of the necessity of a cognitive processing assessment:
>
> "Discussion: The Department does not believe that an assessment of psychological or cognitive processing should be required in determining whether a child has an SLD. There is no current evidence that such assessments are necessary or sufficient for identifying SLD. Further, in many cases, these assessments have not been used to make appropriate intervention decisions."

---

[1] OSEP Letter to Prifitera (March 1, 2007). Retrieved from https://www2.ed.gov/policy/speced/guid/idea/letters/2007-1/prifitera030107eval1q2007.doc.

"Concerns about the absence of evidence for relations of cognitive discrepancy and SLD for identification go back to Bijou (1942; [4] see Kavale, 2002) [5]. Cronbach (1957) [6] characterized the search for aptitude by treatment interactions as a ''hall of mirrors,'' a situation that has not improved over the past few years as different approaches to assessment of cognitive processes have emerged (Fletcher et al., 2005; Reschly & Tilly, 1999)"

The Franklin Pierce School District encourages the requirement to collect additional information and assessment data be addressed through what is commonly called the RIOT (Record review, Interviews, Observation, and Testing) process, which is typically an integral part of the early intervening period. Below are examples of data sources and evaluation tools in each of these four categories that might be included in a full and individual evaluation. The collection of this information and data may occur during the MTSS/RTI process and/or after the special education evaluation period begins.

- **Record Review:** Student work samples, grades, office referrals, etc.
- **Interviews:** Of teachers, parents, counselors, the student, and others involved in the student's education
- **Observation:** Of the student in specific, relevant settings and of the learning environment
- **Testing:** Universal screening, CBMs (depending on tier), classroom tests, district-wide and state tests, functional behavior assessments, etc.

The following is a list of some of the evaluation tools that might be included in a full and individual evaluation:
- Interviews
- Observation of the student in specific, relevant settings
- Error analysis of work samples
- CBAs/Functional Academic Assessments, including CBMs and CBE
- Progress monitoring data
- Results from state and local assessments
- Functional Behavioral Assessments
- Behavior Rating Scales
- Vocational assessments
- Developmental, academic, behavioral, and functional life skills checklists
- Standardized (norm-referenced) assessments

MTSS/RTI-Based SLD Identification Process

The Franklin Pierce MTSS/RTI-based SLD identification process is in compliance with the Federal regulations found at 34 CFR 300.307-300.311 and the Washington State Administrative Code at 392-172A-03055 to 392-172A-03080. These procedures provide guidance on meeting the six components contained in the regulations referenced above.

1. Failure to meet age or grade level State standards in one of eight areas when provided appropriate instruction.
2. Lack of sufficient progress in response to scientific, research-based intervention.
3. Findings are not primarily the result of a visual, hearing, or motor disability, an intellectual disability, emotional disturbance, cultural factors, environmental or economic disadvantage or limited English proficiency.
4. Underachievement is not due to lack of appropriate instruction in reading or math.
5. Observation of student's in the learning environment documents academic performance and behavior in areas of difficulty.
6. Specific documentation for eligibility determination includes required components.

Component 1: Failure to meet age- or grade-level State standards in one of eight areas when provided appropriate instruction:

- Oral expression
- Listening comprehension
- Written expression
- Basic reading skill
- Reading fluency skills
- Reading comprehension
- Mathematics calculation
- Mathematics problem solving

The eight areas are not specifically defined in Washington State WAC. The following provide generally accepted definitions of the eight areas of achievement:

Oral expression is the ability to convey wants, needs, thoughts, and ideas in a meaningful way using appropriate syntactic, pragmatic, semantic, and phonological language structures. It relates to a student's ability to express ideas, explain thinking, retell stories, categorize, and compare and contrast concepts or ideas, make references and problem solve verbally.

Listening comprehension refers to the understanding of the implications and explicit meanings of words and sentences of spoken language. This includes following directions, comprehending questions, and listening and comprehending in order to learn (e.g., auditory attention, auditory memory, and auditory perception). Listening comprehension also includes the ability to make connections to previous learning.

Written expression is the communication of ideas, thoughts, and feelings. Required skills include using oral language, thought, grammar, text fluency, sentence construction and planning to produce a written product. Spelling difficulties alone cannot be considered to represent a specific learning disability in written expression.

Basic reading skill includes phonemic awareness, sight word recognition, phonics, and word analysis. Essential skills include identification of individual sounds and the ability to

manipulate them; identification of printed letters and sounds associated with letters; and decoding of written language.

Reading fluency skills refer to the ability to read words accurately, using age appropriate chunking strategies and a repertoire of sight words, and with appropriate rate, phrasing and expression (prosody). Reading fluency facilitates reading comprehension.

Reading comprehension refers to the ability to understand and make meaning of written text and includes a multifaceted set of skills. Reading comprehension is influenced by oral language development including new vocabulary acquisition, listening comprehension, working memory, application of comprehension monitoring strategies and understanding of text structure including titles, paragraphing, illustrations and other details. Reading comprehension is significantly affected by basic reading skills.

Mathematics calculation is the knowledge and retrieval of mathematical facts and the application of procedural knowledge in computation.

Mathematics problem solving is the ability to use decision-making skills to apply mathematical concepts and understandings to real world situations. It is the functional combination of computation knowledge and application knowledge and involves the use of mathematical computation skills and fluency, language, reasoning, reading, and visual-spatial skills in solving problems. Essentially, it is applying mathematical knowledge at the conceptual level.
(Source: Wisconsin Specific Learning Disabilities (SLD) Rule)

A student needs to meet this criterion in only one of the eight areas to be eligible for an IEP. The school team should identify the area(s) of concern during its review of existing data. The area(s) of low achievement should be what prompted referral for evaluation for the possible presence of a Specific Learning Disability. To make this determination the school team should use existing data from a variety of sources. These sources may include:

- Performance on Washington State assessments.
- Universal screening. Benchmark testing of all students, administered three times per year, focusing on foundational skills.
- Formative assessments linked to grade level CCSS standards
- Progress monitoring. It is expected that most students will learn when provided with the general education curriculum as verified by progress-monitoring data based on CBM.
- Classroom-based observation(s)
- One or more observations by teachers (other than the student's teachers) and related services providers in the instructional environment(s) and during instruction of the area of concern.

- Information provided by the student's parents through prior evaluations, developmental history questionnaires, other information, etc.

An evaluation of Oral Expression and Listening Comprehension shall be completed pursuant to the Speech or Language Impairment eligibility standards. If a student has been evaluated by a Speech Language Pathologist and does not qualify as Language Impaired, then the IEP team may consider a Specific Learning Disability in either Oral Expression or Listening Comprehension if either continues to be a suspected area of disability; however, the rigorous intervention and progress monitoring standards must be met.

Component 2: Lack of sufficient progress in response to scientific, research-based intervention.

Franklin Pierce Dual Discrepancy Requirement:
Dual discrepancy refers to both a performance discrepancy and an improvement discrepancy.

a. A student will have a performance discrepancy if his/her performance on a validated screening tool is at the 10th percentile or less. The evaluation team may verify the 10th percentile with another data source such as the individually administered achievement test.
b. A student will exhibit an improvement discrepancy when progress on CBM is below the Rate of Improvement (ROI) that significantly reduces the severe achievement discrepancy when Tier 3 intervention is of appropriate intensity and delivered with fidelity.

Determining the extent of student underachievement can be accomplished using curriculum-based measurement (CBM). In some cases, norm-referenced tests may also be used to gather additional data on the student's academic achievement. In order to substantiate inadequate achievement, an individual, standardized, and norm-referenced measure of academic achievement may be administered after initial consent is obtained in the area of suspected disability (i.e., Basic Reading Skills, Reading Fluency, Reading Comprehension, Written Expression, Mathematics Calculation, and Mathematics Problem Solving). The decision to include other assessment data is an evaluation team decision.

Intensive intervention must occur within the tiers before inadequate classroom achievement can be assessed. The score from a standardized achievement test administered prior to receiving intensive intervention may not be used to determine inadequate classroom achievement. The team will select assessment instruments that are sensitive to floor effects and developmental levels, especially for students in the primary grades.
The goal is to determine the magnitude of difference between the student's current skills from what is expected for his or her age and grade (Deno 2013).

Progress Monitoring Requirements:

A lack of sufficient progress in one or more areas (i.e., Basic Reading Skills, Reading Fluency, Reading Comprehension, Written Expression, Mathematics Calculation, Mathematics Problem Solving) based on the student's responsiveness to scientific, research-based intervention shall be documented using the following criteria:

Tier of Instruction and Intervention	Guidelines of Tier	Screening and Progress Monitoring	Frequency	Duration
Tier 1	Tier 1: Defined in the Tier 1 guidelines	FastBridge skills based universal screening	K-5: 3 times per year in the fall, winter and spring	Ongoing assessment
Tier 2	Tier 2: Defined in the Tier 2 guidelines	3 times per year universal screening plus progress monitoring in target area that is validated to be sensitive to change and provides ROI	Every other week	Minimum of 8-10 data points to make a data-based decision to change to Tier 3.
Tier 3	Tier 3: Defined in Tier 3 guidelines	3 times per year universal screening plus progress monitoring in target area that is validated to be sensitive to change and provides ROI	Weekly	Minimum of 10-15 data points with Tier 3 interventions to make a data-based decision to refer for special education consideration

A measure of cognition is <u>not required</u> for all students referred to special education based on a suspected Specific Learning Disability. Only when the team suspects the student may be evidencing another disability (e.g. Intellectual Disability or Functional Delay) will a comprehensive measure of the student's intelligence be administered.

<u>Component 3:</u>
Within the special education evaluation process, these factors must be ruled-out as the <u>primary</u> reason for the student's underachievement.

a. A visual, hearing, or motor disability;
b. Intellectual disability;
c. Emotional disturbance;
d. Cultural factors;
e. Environmental or economic disadvantage; or
f. Limited English proficiency.

Exclusionary Factor	Source of Evidence
Vision, Hearing, Motor Disability	Vision and hearing screenings, medical records, observation
Intellectual Disability	Classroom performance, academic skills, language development, adaptive functioning, IQ
Cultural Factors	Level of performance and rate of progress compared to students from same ethnicity with similar backgrounds
Environmental or Economic Factors	Level of performance and rate of progress compared to students from similar economic backgrounds, situational factors that are student specific
Limited English Proficient	Measures of language acquisition and proficiency (BICs and CALPS)
Excessive Absenteeism	Attendance records, number of schools attended.

Component 4: Ensure that underachievement is not due to lack of appropriate instruction in reading or math.

"To ensure that underachievement in a child suspected of having a specific learning disability is not due to lack of appropriate instruction in reading or math, the group must consider, as part of the evaluation described in §300.304 through 300.306—
(1) Data that demonstrate that prior to, or as a part of, the referral process, the child was provided appropriate instruction in regular education settings, delivered by qualified personnel; and
(2) Data-based documentation of repeated assessments of achievement at reasonable intervals, reflecting formal assessment of student progress during instruction, which was provided to the child's parents." §300.309

Adequacy of Core Instruction in Reading and Math
Since MTSS/RTI requires universal screening, data to evaluate the adequacy of core instruction should be readily available to the school team. A review of the number and

percentage of students (in a class/grade/school) that are performing below the benchmark should be undertaken as part of Component 4.

If it is found that large numbers of students are performing at or below the benchmark it should be concluded that there is a class/grade/school issue with core instruction. In the face of such a finding, the core instruction issue should be addressed before individual students are moved into Tier 2 and Tier 3 interventions.

The Center for Educational Effectiveness, Inc., conducted a study of recent educational literature and existing rubrics/frameworks that focus on the practice of effective teaching. From this analysis came the following list of six core, essential practices of high quality teaching and learning that cut across all content areas and grade levels. The teacher:

- Designs effective, standards-based instruction;
- Delivers high-quality, student-centered instruction;
- Promotes high levels of student engagement;
- Uses assessment for student learning;
- Uses a positive behavior management strategy; and
- Has clear evidence that students are learning.

(Source: R. MacGregor, the Essential Practices of High Quality Teaching and Learning, 2007)

The University of Oregon Center for Teaching and Learning lists the following as indicators of research-based instruction:

- Models instructional tasks when appropriate

- Provides explicit instruction

- Engages students in meaningful interactions with language

- Provides multiple opportunities for students to practice

- Provides corrective feedback and initial student responses

- Encourages student effort

- Students are engaged in the lesson during teacher-led instruction

- Students are engaged in the lesson during independent work

- Students are successfully completing activities to high criterion levels of performance

    (Source: Thomas-Beck, 2006. University of Oregon Center for Teaching and Learning)

Component 5: Observation

The Franklin Pierce School District must ensure that the child is observed in the student's

learning environment (including the general education classroom setting) to document the student's academic performance and behavior in the areas of difficulty.
a.   Systematic observation of routine classroom instruction, and
b.   Systematic observation during intensive, scientific research-based or evidence-based intervention.

There are many types of classroom observations. While the regulations do not prescribe the type of observation to be conducted, the following methods may be appropriate:

- Behavioral observation procedures (e.g., event recording, time sampling, interval recording) that result in quantifiable results;
- Informal or anecdotal recordings that address referral questions, instructional practices and instructional fidelity.

Most importantly, the observation should provide information that is data driven, empirical and objective. The observation should be sufficient to produce a detailed analysis of the instructional process, the classroom environment, and the student's level and type of engagement. Simple narratives do not provide adequate or objective information. Observations across instructional settings (e.g., different classes) are especially valuable, as are observations by different team members. In all cases the observation must not be conducted by the person delivering instruction.

Questions the school team might consider regarding the results of an observation include:

- Was the student's performance and behavior in the area of concern "typical" during the observation compared with how the student performs at other times?
- What learning skills were difficult for the student?
- What student strengths were noted during the observation?
- Was the student engaged and cooperative during instruction?
- Did the student's behaviors interfere with learning to such an extent that they might be the primary reason the student is not making sufficient progress?
- Did the student have the prerequisite skills to perform the tasks being observed?
- Are the data collected during the observations consistent with other formal and informal data about the student in the area(s) of concern?
- What is the relationship between the targeted student's performance and behavior to other students?

(Adapted from Wisconsin's Specific Learning Disabilities (SLD) Rule)

In the case of a student who is in a placement outside of the Franklin Pierce School District, a team member must observe the student in an environment appropriate for a student of that age.

Component 6: Documentation (WAC 392-172A-03080)

The documentation of the determination of eligibility must contain a statement of:

(a) Whether the student has a specific learning disability;

(b) The basis for making the determination, including an assurance that the determination has been made in accordance with WAC 392-172A-03040;

(c) The relevant behavior, if any, noted during the observation of the student and the relationship of that behavior to the student's academic functioning;

(d) Any educationally relevant medical findings;

(e) Whether:

(i) The student does not achieve adequately for the student's age or meet state grade level standards in one or more of the areas described in WAC 392-172A-03055(1); and

(ii) (A) The student does not make sufficient progress to meet age or state grade level standards when using a process based on the student's response to scientific research-based interventions consistent with WAC 392-172A-03060; or

(B) The student meets eligibility through a severe discrepancy model consistent with WAC 392-172A-03070; and

(C) If used as part of the eligibility determination under (A) or (B) of this subsection, a discussion of the student's pattern of strengths and weaknesses in performance, achievement or both, relative to age, state grade level standards, or intellectual development.

(f) The determination of the group concerning the effects of a visual, hearing, or motor disability; intellectual disability; emotional disturbance; cultural factors; environmental or economic disadvantage; or limited English proficiency on the student's achievement level; and

(g) If the student has participated in a process that assesses the student's response to scientific, research-based intervention:

(i) The instructional strategies used and the student- centered data collected in accordance with the district's response to intervention procedures; and

(ii) The documentation that the student's parents were notified about:

(A) State and school district policies regarding the amount and nature of student performance data that would be collected and the general education services that would be provided;

(B) Strategies for increasing the student's rate of learning; and

(C) The parents' right to request an evaluation.

Each group member must sign the document as to whether the report reflects the member's conclusion. If it does not reflect the member's conclusion, the group member must submit a separate statement presenting the member's conclusions.

The group members should be those who have been involved in the RTI process and are familiar with the student's data. Ultimately, the school team must make a determination of the existence of SLD and the need for special education through a careful evaluation of

multiple sources of data. Special education eligibility is a high-stakes decision for students. As such, it must be made in a comprehensive manner. The team may use additional assessments as necessary to assist in appropriate decision-making for the student.

Re-evaluations

All re-evaluations for students with a Specific Learning Disability will be grounded in progress monitoring data. For students who qualified for services using the discrepancy model, it is assumed that the initial eligibility process was valid. Existing student---centered data including ongoing assessments of progress and focused/diagnostic evaluations will be reviewed through the re-evaluation report to determine if additional information is needed. Again, a gap analysis will be completed and the student's ROI will be calculated in order to determine the amount of services/intervention required to close his or her achievement gap. The level of service required (special education versus general education) will be used to negate or substantiate continued eligibility.

Transfers

When a student with a SLD transfers from one Washington school district to Franklin Pierce, the school psychologist will conduct a records review to ensure that all eligibility components were met.

When a referred student transfers from one Washington State school district to Franklin Pierce before an eligibility determination is made, Franklin Pierce must facilitate the timely completion of the requested evaluation. The previous school district should send all relevant assessment information to Franklin Pierce as soon as possible so that the evaluation and eligibility determination processes are not delayed. If additional time is needed to establish the student's eligibility for services, then the school psychologist may submit a request to extend the evaluation timeline. This may be accomplished by using the formal extension process, which requires any extension of the timeframe be amended by mutual written agreement between the student's parents and a group of qualified professionals.

Consistent with previous Franklin Pierce procedures, all out-of-state transfers will be reviewed to determine if the student meets Washington State special education evaluation criteria and Franklin Pierce MTSS/RTI criteria.

For students with an SLD who were made eligible using a model other than RTI, whose pre-referral intervention and/or progress monitoring data are missing, or whose previous evaluation does not meet Franklin Pierce criteria, it is assumed that the student did not respond to general education intervention; however, at the time of the next re-evaluation, a comprehensive re-evaluation (i.e., progress monitoring and achievement data collection) will be completed for eligibility purposes. The student's responsiveness to intervention as indicated by progress monitoring data shall be collected, based on services (intervention) provided through the IEP. Again, a gap analysis will be completed and the student's ROI calculated in order to determine the amount of services/intervention required to close his

or her achievement gap. The level of service required (special education versus general education) will be used to negate or substantiate continued eligibility. All information will be collected and an eligibility determination will be made within the Washington State evaluation timeframe.

Parent Request for Evaluation
The regulation allows a parent to request an initial evaluation at any time to determine if a child is a child with a disability. The use of RTI strategies cannot be used to delay or deny the provision of a full and individual evaluation to a child suspected of having a disability. If the district does not suspect that the child has a disability, and denies the request for an initial evaluation, the district must provide written notice to the parents explaining why the district refuses to conduct an initial evaluation and the information that was used as the basis for the decision.

Extending the Evaluation Timeline
The district and the student's parent(s) may agree to extend the evaluation timeline to allow for the collection of necessary data. For example, the school team and the parent(s) may agree to allow additional time to complete an intensive intervention and collect progress monitoring data. In accordance with Federal regulations, this agreement must be made in writing. Federal regulations do not limit the amount of time an evaluation can be extended.

Timeline extensions may not, however, be used to unnecessarily delay special education evaluations. (§300.309 (c))

Progress Monitoring and Intervention Procedures in Special Education.
Students who qualify for special education with a Specific Learning Disability will be assigned services by their Individualized Education Program (IEP) team. Special education services will be the most intensive level of intervention. To the greatest extent possible and while still making progress towards goals, the student will remain in the core instruction (Tier I) and will have access to tiered intervention within the general education curriculum. The same problem solving approach used in the general education RTI process will be used in special education. Furthermore, interventions will be tailored to the student in the area of identified disability, and progress toward their IEP goals will be monitored one or two times per week. When students fail to respond to intervention as a result of the provision of special education services, an IEP team meeting will be reconvened.

Dismissal from Special Education
If the IEP team has sufficient data to consider exiting a student from special education services, the IEP team will recommend that a re-evaluation be conducted to consider and recommend dismissal from services.

SLD Eligibility using an RTI Model (WAC 392-172A-03055)

Must **rule out** as primary reason for disability:
1. A Visual, Hearing, or Motor Disability
2. Intellectual Disability
3. Emotional Disturbance
4. Cultural Factors
5. Environmental or Economic Disadvantage
6. Limited English Proficiency
7. Lack of Appropriate Instruction in Reading and Math

Must ensure:
1. Student given scientific, evidence-based intervention(s) with fidelity
2. Data-based documentation of repeated assessments of achievement
3. Student progress has been shared with parents

Then, Dual Discrepancy:
1. Performance Discrepancy: Student **does not achieve** adequately (**below the 10%ile**) in any of these areas:
    a. Oral Expression
    b. Listening Comprehension
    c. Written Expression
    d. Basic Reading Skills
    e. Reading Fluency Skills
    f. Reading Comprehension
    g. Mathematics Calculation
    h. Mathematics Problem Solving

2. Progress discrepancy: student **does not improve** at an adequate rate **compared to same age peers (50%ile)**.
    a. 5th: Reading = 0.89 WRC, Writing = 0.33 CWS, Math Comp = 0.50, Math PS = 0.08
    b. 4th: Reading = 0.89 WRC, Writing = 0.28 CWS, Math Comp = 0.92, Math PS = 0.17
    c. 3rd: Reading = 1.11 WRC, Writing = 0.33 CWS, Math Comp = 0.94, Math PS = 0.22
    d. 2nd: Reading = 1.22 WRC, Writing = 0.33 CWS, Math Comp = 0.67, Math PS = 0.39
    e. 1st: Reading = 1.5 WRC, Writing = 0.25 CWS, Math Comp = 0.83