

RESPONSE TO INTERVENTION: *What & Why?*

Neither a fad nor a program, but rather the practice of using data to match instruction and intervention to changing student need

BY JUDY ELLIOTT

Everyone is talking about response to intervention. But what is RTI, really, and why should we care? After all isn't this just another new educational reform that sounds like a good idea but will soon fade from the scene?

Response to intervention is the practice of providing high-quality instruction and intervention matched to student need, monitoring progress frequently to make decisions about changes in instruction or goals and applying student response data to important education decisions.

This approach is not about placing the problems within the student, but rather examining the student's response to instruction and/or intervention. In essence, RTI expands the practice of looking at students' risk of learning and behavioral failure beyond the student and takes into consideration a host of factors. Effective implementation of RTI requires leadership, collaborative planning and implementation by professionals across the education system.

RTI as a framework or model should be applied to decisions for general, remedial and special education, creating a well-integrated system of instruction and intervention guided by student performance data that is close to the classroom.

Today in public education, we are faced with more diversity and challenges than ever before. Too often, fields

within education work in isolation — from our English language learners and gifted students to our special education students. We hear about “special ed” and we hear about “general ed,” but it is really about “every ed.” With scarce resources available, both fiscal and human capital, we need to align our education system to meet the learning needs of everyone in the education system.

The No Child Left Behind Act has brought the issues of student learning and accountability for that learning front and center. Education systems must necessarily account for the learning of “every ed.” However, national and local data continue to show achievement gaps for students of color and those with disabilities. We know more about what works in instruction than ever before; yet we still have gaps in student learning and achievement.

Those continuing gaps beg these questions: Is robust, effective instruction taking place in our classrooms? Are we differentiating instruction based on students' talents and needs? Are we working from the model of one size fits all? Are we providing tiered or increasingly intense interventions for students who, based on data, show they need more strategic and intensive academic and behavioral instruction?

In the school systems where I've worked — Long Beach, Calif., Unified School District and the Portland, Ore., Public Schools and most recently Los Angeles Unified School

District — we began our journey by looking at data, examining core instruction and identifying interventions, both systemically and at the school site. We moved toward building a system of instruction that provided more time and increasingly intense interventions for students who were struggling. RTI provides the vehicle to examine an entire system of student learning at the district, classroom and individual student performance levels.

Access Issues

One major challenge in improving the outcomes of our students involves providing access to what services and support they need to succeed. That is, moving away from a one-size-fits-all approach and moving toward differentiation based on talent and need. However, the historical silo structures of our schools have gotten in the way of systemically making this happen for all students.

In most school districts, resources are organized by categorical programs or funding stream — Title I, English language learners, talented and gifted, special education, etc. Unfortunately, knowing that a student qualifies for Title I tells us nothing about that student's specific learning needs. In most cases, when a student does not progress at the expected rate, she or he is placed under the microscope. In other words, the psychopathology is

within the student, and often the student is referred for special education testing.

Seldom does an evaluation of the student's classroom learning environment take place to examine what factors may be related to the reported lack of progress. Without a comprehensive evaluation of students within the context of the instructional environment, it is often difficult to reliably and validly indicate the true cause of poor student progress. It is imperative we include an analysis of variables directly related to academic success such as academic engaged time, opportunities to respond, teacher presentation style, teacher-student monitoring procedures, academic learning time and teacher expectations, to name just a few. Effective instruction is at the heart of RTI.

The systemic work of leadership involved in implementing RTI cannot be underestimated. First and foremost, it requires creating a culture and deep belief that all students can learn irrespective of disability, race, primary language and/or socioeconomic status.

Second, it requires the vision and intentional message that instructional reform efforts and resources must be aligned to ensure growth in student achievement and

A teacher at Lynnville-Sully Elementary School in Sully, Iowa, guides students through a reading lesson.



PHOTO BY STEVE POPE

that the delivery of quality professional development, for both teachers and administrators, is systemic. RTI does not require more resources per se, but rather a reallocation and examination of current practices that are working and discontinuing those that are not.

Third, it requires the knowledge, appreciation and continual use of data in making instructional and programmatic changes that are second nature to all consumers in the system — administrators, teachers, parents and the community.

Core Principles

The core principles on which RTI is based are supported both by research and common sense. Research provides the evidence demonstrating the general effectiveness of RTI practices. Common sense keeps our attention focused



A reading teacher at Lynnville-Sully Elementary School in Sully, Iowa, which uses response to intervention.

on what is most important: student learning.

► **BELIEVE THAT WE CAN EFFECTIVELY TEACH ALL CHILDREN.** All RTI practices are founded on the assumption and belief that all children can learn. The corollary is that it is our responsibility to identify the curricular, instructional and environmental conditions that enable learning. We then must determine the means and systems to provide those resources.

► **INTERVENE EARLY.** It is best to intervene early with learning and behavior, when problems and concerns are relatively small. Early intervention does not mean K-5, but rather preK-12. Early intervention programs are established at elementary and secondary levels for students who are not being successful, either academically or behaviorally.

► **USE A MULTITIERED MODEL OF SERVICE DELIVERY.** To achieve high rates of student success for all students, instruction in the schools must be differentiated in both nature and intensity. To efficiently differentiate instruc-

tion for all students, tiered models of intervention are used in RTI systems.

► **USE A PROBLEM-SOLVING METHOD TO MAKE DECISIONS WITHIN A MULTITIERED MODEL.** At its core, this method requires answering four interrelated questions: (1) Is there a problem and what is it? (2) Why is it happening? (3) What are we going to do about it? and (4) Did our intervention work? The problem-solving method can be applied to all students in a preK-12 system, including small groups and individual students.

In Long Beach schools, the problem-solving model is the first step used at the student-success-team or building-team level. From here, interventions, either behavior, or instructional, are prioritized and put in place in the classroom. Ongoing progress monitoring is done to ensure interventions are robustly implemented.

At the district level, the problem-solving method enables central-office personnel to look at data and ascertain whether in fact a school district program, instructional methodology, intervention and/or professional development is working for the students it is intended to help. Use of data is key.

Three Components

Implementation of RTI requires three essential components: (1) multiple tiers of intervention, (2) a problem-solving method and (3) an integrated data collection/assessment system to inform decisions at each tier of service delivery.

RTI uses a three-tiered model to allocate resources where they are most effective. For the sake of illustration, RTI can be thought of as a pyramid with three levels of interventions. Embedded in each tier is a set of unique support structures and instruction that help teachers implement evidence-based curricula and instructional practices at levels of fidelity designed to improve a student's achievement. Ongoing assessment within each tier is essential to determine a student's proficiency on critical academic and/or behavioral skills. This assessment or progress monitoring is used to inform instruction at each tier and to identify in a timely fashion the increasingly intense level of instruction a student needs.

The base of the pyramid, or Tier 1, represents core instruction all students should have equitable access to. Typically, we want 75-85 percent of students successfully learning the core curriculum.

Tier 2 of the pyramid, also known as strategic interventions, is for about 10-15 percent of students who need targeted instruction, or what I call "an extra scoop" of instruction, to learn successfully. Strategic instruction is provided to students who display poor response to group instructional procedures used in Tier 1. Tier 2 instruction is in addition to the Tier 1 core instruction.

Tier 3 of the pyramid, also known as intensive instruction, is for an estimated 5-10 percent of students who need intensive, individual and/or small-group instruction that is highly targeted. Tier 3 typically includes use of a

continues on page 14

continued from page 12

different program or instruction from Tier 1 or 2 because those data show students are not making progress given previously tried interventions.

A note of caution: Tier 3 is not simply special education. Rather, it is where interventions are tailored to likely include long-term intensive instruction that may or may not include special education services. For example, a student whose diminished performance is the result of lack of instruction may need to be provided ongoing, intensive instruction delivered in more substantial blocks of time to help him or her catch up to peers. Another example might include a student whose performance problems are directly related to limited English proficiency. Again, the student may need a longer-term set of interventions that do not include special education.

In both Long Beach and the Portland Public Schools, we started by examining the success of students in core instruction. If you find when looking at your data that 50 percent of students are not at proficiency in Tier 1, or

core instruction, you do not simply put these students in Tier 2 interventions. You must go back and examine the instruction in your core. If you have high rates of students referred for special education or in special education, you must look at core instruction and ask: Is it the instruction or is it the student?

Problem Solving

A second essential component of RTI is the use of the problem-solving method. The problem-solving model provides educators a consistent step-by-step process to identify problems, develop interventions and evaluate the effectiveness of those interventions. Clearly, a consistent method to solve problems must be available to teachers and other staff to understand why some students are not responding to the academic and/or behavior instruction.

It is important to ensure all factors (curriculum, effective instruction, school and classroom environment) have been examined prior to assuming that student factors or disability are responsible for student performance. The

Guiding RTI System Implementation: The Oregon Experience

BY DAVID L. PUTNAM JR.

Three years of running a response to intervention project in Oregon has taught us much about what factors affect successes and disappointments.

From our work with some two dozen school districts in the Oregon Response to Intervention Project, we can see that implementation at the school level depends on several system factors. Primarily, these include school-based factors such as the initial collective skill and knowledge in a district, the degree to which the foundations of a multitiered instructional model and data-based decision making are in place and the educational belief system of the stakeholders. In addition, context factors such as district size and setting make a difference.

The variable with the single greatest impact, however, and one that can override everything else is focused and sustained leadership from building- and district-level administrators.

Lending Credibility

Some leadership tasks cut across roles. Administrators at all levels must clearly articulate a vision of what the change process will involve. Because RTI implementation often requires significant changes for staff, administrators should clarify the



David Putnam

expectations with well-defined *non-negotiables* as well as areas of flexibility.

For example, implementing a research-based core curriculum is a critical feature and administrators must hold fast to the expectation this will be

carried out consistently by teachers and with fidelity. Administrators can be flexible about how this is accomplished and teachers can help determine the process.

Articulating a clear vision and plan for implementation is an important first step that must be followed by sustained focus on student outcomes and support for RTI. A school or district easily can become fragmented with multiple initiatives and teachers may feel the current initiative is just one more in a series of passing fads.

In our own district in a suburb of Portland, Ore., the superintendent's involvement has had a significant impact. He communicates the importance of placing student achievement at the top of the district's priorities when he meets with teachers, parents and leadership groups. He has

taken the time to develop a deep understanding of response to intervention and can meaningfully describe what it takes to implement a multitiered system of instructional delivery. This lends credibility to his message and amplifies its impact.

The superintendent's deep involvement is equally apparent when he speaks to school districts that we support as part of the statewide response to intervention project. Often educators are stunned to find a superintendent meeting with them to address the importance of RTI, and they are inspired by this involvement. The importance of a consistent message across levels of district leadership cannot be overstated.

Make or Break

Without question, the leadership provided — or not provided — by building administrators can make or break an RTI initiative. Principals are at the pivotal point of contact between a great idea and the functional changes in how business is done in a school. For RTI to be successful, principals must operate as real-time, contributing members of the RTI team. They need to be directly involved with orchestrating assessment efforts, supervising the fidelity of instructional practices and coordinating group and individual interven-

problem-solving process occurs within each tier of the pyramid.

The third essential component of RTI is the use of an integrated data-collection/assessment system to inform decisions at each tier of the pyramid. This component helps determine a student's response to instruction and intervention. The overarching format for these assessments is curriculum-based assessment. These procedures have a 30-year history and have been used across curriculum areas and grade levels.

These assessments share several characteristics:

- ▶ directly assess the specific skills embodied in state and local academic standards;
- ▶ are sensitive to small increments of growth over time;
- ▶ can be administered efficiently over short periods;
- ▶ may be repeatedly administered using multiple forms;
- ▶ are readily summarized in teacher-friendly ways;
- ▶ can be used to make comparisons across students;

▶ can be used to monitor an individual student's progress over time; and

▶ have direct relevance to the development of instructional strategies that address the student's area of need.

Curriculum-based measurements or formative assessments are administered frequently and are more closely aligned to day-to-day instruction. They help teachers answer two key questions: What to teach and how to teach. State assessments that students take regularly are not sensitive to daily instruction and serve an entirely different purpose. That is, they set out to determine, for example, how all 4th graders or 10th graders are performing on a large scale across a state.

Secondary Levels

Some think that because there is little research at the middle or high school levels that RTI is not valid in the secondary level. This is not so. The principles and components of RTI are the same at all grade levels.

The challenge in secondary schools involves identify-

tions. They must be integral members of the school RTI team, providing guidance and allocating resources as needed. The impact of principal involvement can be contrasted in two schools that we work with.

At the elementary school in one rural school district, the principal leads the developing RTI process. There is a strong commitment to the concept that academic failure is not an option. Professional development regarding the core reading curriculum has been strong and ongoing and there is a clear expectation that the curriculum will be implemented with fidelity. The principal monitors instruction. Community funds support a reading coach and other resources.

The effects on student achievement have been significant. The percentage of students meeting DIBELS benchmark scores has increased dramatically in the three years since implementation, especially in the primary grades.

The principal in a second district supports the RTI initiative at a broad level, but is not nearly as involved operationally. As one might expect, implementation is struggling to gain traction.

The difference in the two districts largely relates to the degree of oversight and instructional guidance provided to all staff, from general to special education. RTI is often mistakenly viewed as a special education initiative, when really it is an "every ed" effort with the core infrastructure components residing in general education. As such, principals must truly function as instructional leaders to coordinate all aspects of teaching and learning.

Size Impacts

District size is a dimension that can present challenges at either end of the continuum. At one extreme, tiny school districts often are limited in resources. Their small size results in failing to meet thresholds that would make them eligible for certain supports or resources, or give efficiencies of shared expertise or hard resources across the district. However, in the words of one successful school leader who serves as principal of three schools and director of curriculum, assessment and Title I in a 325-student district in the heart of the Willamette Valley: "It doesn't take a lot of money or resources. You just have to take a step back and look at the way you do things and be willing to do things differently."

This school leader has infused this attitude into her small staff, who are excited by their accomplishments. The district has implemented a new reading core curriculum, systematized universal screening and progress monitoring and organized reading intervention groups in the two short years it has participated in the state-wide project. The district has established a well-organized RTI team that works collaboratively to review student performance data regularly and make instructional decisions. A clear sense of collective ownership of all students prevails.

At the other end of the continuum, large districts benefit from shared resources but face the challenge and complexity of coordinating procedures, training and programs across many schools. Here, too, we have been impressed

with how far administrative will, collaboration and creative problem solving can go. We have witnessed significant and rapid system development in a large urban/suburban district that's confronted with all the challenges that large districts typically face.

The key to the success in this case is a well-organized and highly skilled central-office leadership team that has worked closely with building principals to maintain a consistent and concerted focus. The district RTI leadership team meets regularly to review procedures and coordinate implementation. Professional development has been consistent and sustained. Principals serve as team leaders within most elementary schools, and teachers report feeling informed and supported.

In reflecting upon her district's journey at a conference last year, the director of student services recalled a discussion she had with a parent regarding the newly minted RTI system and the emphasis on identifying struggling learners and providing interventions as early as possible.

"That sounds great," the parent responded. "But what did you do before RTI? Don't tell me you just waited until they failed before they got services."

What could she say?

David Putnam is co-project manager of response to intervention in the Tigard-Tualatin School District in Tigard, Oregon. E-mail: dputnam@ttsd.k12.or.us

ing the multiple measures or universal screens you will use to decide which students need more intensive instruction or intervention.

Typically, students at the secondary level are deficient in basic skills that get in the way of learning higher-level skills. In Long Beach, multiple measures include scores on state assessments, grades (although subjective), literacy screens and pre-assessments in core curriculum materials being used in English language arts, district-developed quarterly and end-of-course exams in algebra, grade 8 math or English language development. The use of multiple measures depend on what your target is (e.g., literacy, mathematics, English learners).

At the secondary level, the creation of the master schedule is key. The challenge is creating the schedule to provide Tier 2 and 3 interventions for students while still allowing students to earn credit toward graduation. It is doable when the priority is set on providing tiered intervention classes for students who, according to multiple measures, show the need for additional targeted instruction. You cannot do more or catch up students using the same time structures.

Typically, middle and high school master schedules

include double blocks of time to provide additional Tier 2 and 3 interventions for students. So, for instance, students may be enrolled in Algebra I and have a second dose or block of perhaps a developmental math program. Likewise, students will be enrolled in English language arts with a second block of a reading intervention, thus increasing the time and intensity of instruction.

Starting Point

Generally, schools do not have the resources to provide supplemental and intensive instruction to more than 20 percent of students. Therefore, core instruction must be effective for 75-85 percent of students and must be developed and implemented to achieve that goal. Core instruction must be responsive to the needs of all students.

So the first step in the implementation of RTI is to evaluate the effectiveness of core instruction and to problem solve how to improve it if it is less than effective. Districts and schools should evaluate existing practices and resources to determine the approach that will best help establish needed core, strategic and intensive interventions.

A key indicator of a school and a district implementing RTI is that they have an instruction/intervention resource map identifying all of the academic and behavior instruction/interventions available to students at the core, supplemental and intensive levels.

One key component of this resource map is the degree to which the interventions in Tiers 2 and 3 are integrated with core instruction in Tier 1. Receiving instruction in Tier 2 or Tier 3 is not a life sentence. Students must be able to fluidly move between tiers as the data show they are ready.

In a traditional system, remedial and special education services are less integrated with core instruction than in an RTI model. There is a qualitative difference between establishing interventions and ensuring that the interventions are linked.

A note of caution: Do not bite off more than you can chew. Implementing with integrity is most important. There is no "RTI in a Box." Districts and schools must move through three phases — development of a consensus of need, establishment of the infrastructure and implementation of practice.

Take the time to develop consensus of RTI as the framework and foundation that will enable the district and school to systematically meet the needs of all students. Giving staff the tools (professional development, intervention support and documentation, data, technology to display and interpret the data) to successfully implement RTI is necessary before you attempt to implement RTI systemically. (See related story, page 14.)

Field Lessons

As school district leaders, we must identify, consolidate, supplement and integrate resources from diverse funding sources to produce the infrastructure necessary to support the implementation of RTI. This includes ongoing and sustained capacity building, both skill and knowl-

continues on page 18

Long Beach's Pivotal Turn Around RTI

In the Long Beach, Calif., Unified School District, this tiered approach to intervention was pivotal to transforming student achievement across the district.

Long Beach Unified School District is the state's third largest urban school district with more than 90,000 students, 84 percent of whom are minority and 68 percent of whom qualify for free and reduced price lunch, and where over 46 languages are spoken. RTI has proven a successful model to increase the achievement of all students.

In 2003, the Long Beach Unified School District won the highly prestigious Broad Prize for Urban Education and was a finalist again in 2007.

The use of the tiered approach to intervention was intentionally started with high school students whose outcome data showed to be failing at a high rate. Some lacked basic skills needed for higher-level learning.

Starting with a universal screen through which all 8th graders are assessed for skills on various measures, the district tiers students into the appropriate levels of instruction they need. The movement among all three tiers is fluid. Students are assessed and their progress monitored, allowing them to move among tiers where their instructional and behavioral needs are best met.

This approach was so successful in the high schools that it soon was implemented with all 5th graders moving into middle school. For students in grades other than 5th and 8th, each grade level uses a tiered approach to intervention in helping teachers make data-based decisions to drive instruction. As a result, Long Beach has been able to maintain high levels of student achievement for all learners, including special education students. And the school system has moved closer to erasing the achievement gap that exists among groups of students where this gap traditionally exists.

—Judy Elliott

continued from page 16

edge, from the board room to the classroom. This is not about adding another initiative. It is about keeping what works and replacing what doesn't with effective data-based instructional practices.

We must work to develop a single integrated system to connect general, remedial and special education that results in a seamless system of instruction, intervention and data-based student outcomes.

This approach has allowed the Long Beach Unified School District to erase the achievement gap, while providing special education services to only about 7.5 percent of its students.

Additionally, as district leaders we must establish timelines and defined responsibilities at the district and school site levels, to ensure the successful implementation of RTI across the preK-12 system. This includes providing intentional time to collaborate. And, as with the implementation of any reform, we must build in regular fidelity checks for all components of the system, both at the district and school-site levels.

Professional development must be integrated across English language learners and compensatory, gifted, general and special education. As Portland Public Schools continues its journey on establishing RTI systemically, it has moved from separate professional development by categorical program to a totally integrated system of training.



Judy Elliott has managed special education programs in several school districts

Teachers from all programs learn about instruction together, providing the opportunity to create a common understanding and common language on which instructional reform can take place.

Finally, as a part of any change process, expect and pro-actively manage resistance. Resistance to change suggests a loss of some sort. Our work in building consensus for RTI needs to identify what that sense of loss is. Personnel have much at stake. The shift to a culture of ongoing use of data at the classroom and building levels, on top of state assessments, can be intimidating to faculty and principals. The use of data is not meant to be punitive but rather to allow for a laser-like focus on the use of

personnel, existing resources and delivery of professional development.

In all my years in education one thing I've learned is for certain: Administrators, teachers and parents share a common yearning — to help students who are struggling. Once people see that data are a tool to provide tailored interventions for students and support for classroom instruction, trust is built, collegial relationships are forged and the realization emerges that we are in this for the betterment of all students. ■

Judy Elliott is the chief academic officer in the Los Angeles Unified School District. E-mail: judy.elliott@lausd.net

Additional Resources

Judy Elliott, who has worked in special education and other central-office roles in Long Beach, Calif., and Portland, Ore., recommends these resources for school leaders interested in learning more about response to intervention:

Books/Reports

- ▶ *Response to Intervention: Policy Considerations and Implementation* by George Batsch et al., available from National Association of State Directors of Special Education, Alexandria, Va., www.nasdse.org or 703-519-3800
- ▶ *Response to Intervention Blueprints: District Level Edition* by Judy L. Elliott and Diane Morrison, available from National Association of State Directors of Special Education

- ▶ *Response to Intervention Blueprints: School Building Level Edition* by Sharon Kearns and David Tilly, available from the National Association of State Directors of Special Education, www.nasde.org.

Websites/Articles

- ▶ "Create Your Implementation Blueprint: Introduction" by Susan L. Hall, www.rtinetwork.org/GetStarted/Develop/ar/Create-Your-Implementation-Blueprint
- ▶ "Developing a Plan" by George Batsche, www.rtinetwork.org/GetStarted/Develop/ar/DevelopingPlan
- ▶ National Online RTI Forum 2008, www.connectlive.com/events/rtinetwork060908
- ▶ RTI Action Network, www.rtinetwork.org, particularly "What is RTI?"
- ▶ "RTI and Math Instruction" by Amanda VanDerHeyden, www.rtinetwork.org/Learn/Why/ar/RTIandMath/1
- ▶ "Response to Intervention in Secondary Schools: Is It on Your Radar Screen?" by Barbara J. Ehren, www.rtinetwork.org/Learn/Why/ar/RadarScreen
- ▶ "School-Wide Positive Behavior Support and Response to Intervention" by George Sugai, www.rtinetwork.org/Learn/Behavior/ar/SchoolwideBehavior
- ▶ "Tiered Instruction and Intervention in a Response-to-Intervention Model" by Edward S. Shapiro, www.rtinetwork.org/Essential/TieredInstruction/ar/ServiceDelivery/1
- ▶ "Why Adopt an RTI Model?" by David P. Prasse, www.rtinetwork.org/Learn/Why/ar/WhyRTI

