



What is RtI?
A look at tiers 1 and 2

Six Components of RtI

(From CDE)

- o Leadership
 - o Schools must devote time to implementation and maintenance of the RtI Model: time for data dialogues, for problem-solving team meetings, and for development of action plans that identify continued training needs.
- o Curriculum and Instruction
 - o The RtI Model is a three-tiered system designed to meet the needs of ALL students. Curriculum based on the state standards and quality instruction are essential for student success.
- o School Climate and Culture
 - o The core principles of a multi-tiered RtI model support and embrace positive school climate within all school settings. Positive school climate depends on four essential elements:
 - o 1. creating a caring school community
 - o 2. teaching appropriate behavior and social problem-solving skills
 - o 3. implementing positive behavior support (PBS)
 - o 4. providing rigorous academic instruction

Six Components of RtI

o Problem-solving Process

- o The purpose of the problem-solving process is to assist the classroom teacher and parents in designing and selecting strategies for improving student academic and/or behavioral performance with interventions that have a high probability of success.

o Assessment/Progress Monitoring

- o A major feature of the RtI Model is its use of data to drive the decision-making process- at the individual student, classroom, and school levels. To support RtI's fluid approach, reliable and ongoing information must be available to:
 - o Identify academic and behavioral needs of individual students,
 - o Inform the problem-solving process,
 - o Design and modify instruction to meet student needs,
 - o Evaluate the effectiveness of instruction at different levels, of the system (e.g., classroom, school, district).

o Family and Community Involvement

- o When families, schools, and communities work together, children are more successful in school and schools improve. Central to effective partnership is the recognition of shared responsibility and shared ownership of student challenges and successes.

Goals of RtI

- o Prevention of academic/behavior problems
 - o Attend to skill gaps early
 - o Provide interventions/instruction early
 - o Close skill gaps to prevent failure
- o Determination of eligibility as a student with a specific learning disability
 - o Pattern of inadequate response to interventions may result in referral to special education
 - o Student intervention response data are considered for SLD eligibility

Rainbow Graph - Tier I Student



AIMSweb®

Weld County School District RE-4
Year: 2009-2010

FILTER:

Reporting Method: AIMSweb Defaults - Norm Referenced
MCAP - 10,25,75,90 percentile calculated at the school level

Class Distribution by Scores and Percentile
Weld RE-4 School District - Mountain View Elementary
Grade 4 - (Michael VanderVelde - Homeroom) Fall 2009-2010
Mathematics Concepts and Applications

ID	Name	Points	Performance Summary	Potential Instructional Action
62889	Hatch, Joshua	23.0	Well Above Average	Consider Need for Individualized Instruction
Well Above Average >= 21.0 (80th %ile)				
63225	Klemmer, Joel	20.0	Above Average	Consider Need for Individualized Instruction
63392	Luoma, Cooper	18.0	Above Average	Consider Need for Individualized Instruction
81267	St. Clair, Joseph	18.0	Above Average	Consider Need for Individualized Instruction
62850	Strauss, Landyn	18.0	Above Average	Consider Need for Individualized Instruction
81155	Gallatin, Cassidy	17.0	Above Average	Consider Need for Individualized Instruction
Above Average >= 17.0 (75th %ile)				
63228	Koza, Hanna	16.0	Average	Continue Current Program
63229	Kramer, Taylor	15.0	Average	Continue Current Program
63209	Freitag, Brett	15.0	Average	Continue Current Program
62885	Cardenas, Trey	14.0	Average	Continue Current Program
64527	Dumm, Seth	12.0	Average	Continue Current Program
63211	Geear, Shay	12.0	Average	Continue Current Program
63217	Cline, Sophia	11.0	Average	Continue Current Program
64300	Martinez, Ajaion	11.0	Average	Continue Current Program
64077	Teeter, Madison	11.0	Average	Continue Current Program
62250	Velez Nevarez, Geovany	10.0	Average	Continue Current Program
Average >= 10.0 (26th %ile)				
64224	Black, Nicholas	9.0	Below Average	Further Assess and Consider Individualizing Program
64135	Deason, Kade	9.0	Below Average	Further Assess and Consider Individualizing Program
82416	McCall, Ashley	9.0	Below Average	Further Assess and Consider Individualizing Program
81158	Adent, Sarah	7.0	Below Average	Further Assess and Consider Individualizing Program
63206	Del Bene, Lucas	7.0	Below Average	Further Assess and Consider Individualizing Program
Below Average >= 7.0 (10th %ile)				
81755	Alvarado, Rebecca	5.0	Well Below Average	Begin Immediate Problem Solving
61588	Sandoval, Andrea	4.0	Well Below Average	Begin Immediate Problem Solving

Tier I
Student
Range




Tier I – Primary Instruction

- o *Expectation* = 80% or more of students successful with general education curriculum and instruction
- o *Assessment* = Universal screenings for academics and social/emotional growth (behaviors)
- o *Intervention* = Through differentiated instructional practices
- o *Roles and responsibilities* = primarily the general education teacher

Please see “Classroom
Intervention Packet” for ideas
to use in your class.

Want to integrate something new? Ask our
Intervention Team what Tier 2 curriculums
can be adopted for use in the classroom!

Rainbow Graph - Tier 2 Student

 Weld County School District RE-4
Year: 2009-2010

FILTER:
Reporting Method: AIMSweb Defaults - Norm Referenced
MCAP - 10,25,75,90 percentile calculated at the school level

Class Distribution by Scores and Percentile
Weld RE-4 School District - Mountain View Elementary
Grade 4 - (Michael VanderVelde - Homeroom) Fall 2009-2010
Mathematics Concepts and Applications

ID	Name	Points	Performance Summary	Potential Instructional Action
62889	Hatch, Joshua	23.0	Well Above Average	Consider Need for Individualized Instruction
Well Above Average >= 21.0 (80th %ile)				
63225	Klemmer, Joel	20.0	Above Average	Consider Need for Individualized Instruction
63392	Luoma, Cooper	18.0	Above Average	Consider Need for Individualized Instruction
81267	St. Clair, Joseph	18.0	Above Average	Consider Need for Individualized Instruction
62950	Strauss, Landyn	18.0	Above Average	Consider Need for Individualized Instruction
81155	Gallatin, Cassidy	17.0	Above Average	Consider Need for Individualized Instruction
Above Average >= 17.0 (75th %ile)				
63228	Koza, Hanna	16.0	Average	Continue Current Program
63229	Kramer, Taylor	15.0	Average	Continue Current Program
63209	Freitag, Brett	15.0	Average	Continue Current Program
62885	Cardenas, Trey	14.0	Average	Continue Current Program
64527	Dumm, Seth	12.0	Average	Continue Current Program
63211	Geear, Shay	12.0	Average	Continue Current Program
63217	Cline, Sophia	11.0	Average	Continue Current Program
64300	Martinez, Ajaion	11.0	Average	Continue Current Program
64077	Teeter, Madison	11.0	Average	Continue Current Program
62250	Velez Nevarez, Geovany	10.0	Average	Continue Current Program
Average >= 10.0 (26th %ile)				
64224	Black, Nicholas	9.0	Below Average	Further Assess and Consider Individualizing Program
64135	Deason, Kade	9.0	Below Average	Further Assess and Consider Individualizing Program
82416	McCall, Ashley	9.0	Below Average	Further Assess and Consider Individualizing Program
81158	Adent, Sarah	7.0	Below Average	Further Assess and Consider Individualizing Program
63206	Del Bene, Lucas	7.0	Below Average	Further Assess and Consider Individualizing Program
Below Average >= 7.0 (10th %ile)				
81755	Alvarado, Rebecca	5.0	Well Below Average	Begin Immediate Problem Solving
61588	Sandoval, Andrea	4.0	Well Below Average	Begin Immediate Problem Solving

Tier 2
Student
Range

Tier 2 – Secondary Intervention

- o *Expectation* = 15% of students may be at risk and in need of targeted interventions
- o *Assessment* = progress monitoring of student response to specific intervention
- o *Intervention* = standard protocol treatment intervention as available from the research; evidence-based intervention as available in the literature
- o *Roles and responsibilities* = variety of personnel as determined at the local site

Data Utilized to Identify Tier 2

- AIMSWeb benchmark testing and progress monitoring
- DIBELS testing results
- Intermediate Grades: TCAP scores from previous years
- Classroom data gathered through standardized classroom assessments

Citations

- *AIMSWeb – Charting the path to literacy sites. Class Distribution by Score and Percentile (rainbow graphs), 2010. Web. 11 Jan. 2013.*
- *The Colorado Department of Education sites. Response to Intervention (RtI), 2012. Web. 8 Jan. 2013.*