School Readiness for Response to Intervention (RTI) Implementation

Instructions: This document is designed to assist school-based educational staff in the self-evaluation of their current level of RTI implementation, to identify features already in place, and to identify areas in need of improvement. These features are viewed as essential for RtI implementation. The following interpretive scale is used to indicating ratings in each area.

Current Status Scale:
1 = not in place
2 = partially in place
3 = fully in place

STRAND A: RTI Logistics and Philosophies	Current Status	Improvement Priority High Medium Low
1. Is there coordination between all local service provides for children in early childhood programs (e.g. Head Start, ECFE, ECSE, School Readiness etc.)	1 2 3	2 1 0
2. Are all teachers and supporting staff committed to make educational decisions by examining data-based outcomes?	1 2 3	2 1 0
3. Are the data collection procedures robust (i.e. are reliable administrators collecting the data?)	1 2 3	2 1 0
4. Are the supporting staff familiar with the tenants of an RTI model?	1 2 3	2 1 0
5. Does the educational setting have access to typically developing students?	1 2 3	2 1 0
6. Are transportation efforts maintained to bring students to the educational site?	1 2 3	2 1 0

STRAND B: Measurement System	Current Status	Improvement Priority High Medium Low		
7. Is there a universal screening system for making *general education* decisions about the growth and development of ALL students' literacy skills?	1 2 3	2	1	0
8. Are these data collected 3 or more times a year in order to show growth and development?	1 2 3	2	1	0
9. Is the *measurement system reliable, valid and predictive of later performance?*	1 2 3	2	1	0
10. Is the data collection process *efficient* and *inexpensive* relative to materials?	1 2 3	2	1	0
11. Are the data from the measurement system *provided to teachers* in an easy-to-read format?	1 2 3	2	1	0
12. Are the screening data used to *identify at-risk students* at the beginning of the year?	1 2 3	2	1	0
13. Is there a *standard graph* that can be used to show the risk status of individual students (e.g., a box plot)?	1 2 3	2	1	0
14. Are the data used to help in *instructional planning*?	1 2 3	2	1	0
15. Is there a standard graph that can be used to *show the growth and rate of progress* of students?	1 2 3	2	1	0
16. Is there a data warehouse that allows school staff to easily review multiple types of student data that may be relevant to reading concerns?	1 2 3	2	1	0
17. Does your *school administrator use these data* to help teachers meet the needs of students (e.g., staff development, change curriculum)?	1 2 3	2	1	0
18. Are collected data (screening data and progress monitoring data) reported to parents?	1 2 3	2	1	0
19. Is the measurement system being used bi-weekly to monitor progress for students receiving targeted instruction (Tier 2)?	1 2 3	2	1	0
14. Is the measurement system being used weekly to monitor progress for students receiving intensive instruction (Tier 3)?	1 2 3	2	1	0
15. Is there a designated person who maintains the database for the measurement system and ensures the data are collected and entered properly?	1 2 3	2	1	0

STRAND C: Curriculum & Instruction *AREA 1: Curriculum*	Current Status	Improvement Priority High Medium Low		
1) Is the core early literacy curriculum evidenced based and address 5 necessary components: phonemic awareness, alphabet knowledge, fluency, vocabulary, & comprehension?	1 2 3	2	1	0
2) Is writing instruction integrated with early-literacy instruction?	1 2 3	2	1	0
3) Does the district have a plan for evaluating the fidelity of core curriculum implementation?	1 2 3	2	1	0
4) Does the district have a 3 tiered model of instructional support (e.g., core, supplemental, and intensive)?	1 2 3	2	1	0
5) Does the district have a system to evaluate effectiveness of core, supplemental, and intensive intervention programs?	1 2 3	2	1	0
6) Is the curriculum aligned with MN Standards?	1 2 3	2	1	0
7) Do teachers use flexible grouping during core instruction to maximize student performance?	1 2 3	2	1	0

STRAND C: Curriculum & Instruction *AREA 2: Instruction*	Current Status	Improvement Priority High Medium Low		
1. Are teachers knowledgeable of the five components of early literacy and how they interrelate?	1 2 3	2	1	0
2. Are teachers knowledgeable of research-based principles for effective instruction in the area of comprehension?	1 2 3	2	1	0
3. Are teachers knowledgeable of research-based principles for effective instruction in the area of vocabulary development?	1 2 3	2	1	0
4. Are teachers knowledgeable of research-based principles for effective instruction in the area of alphabet knowledge?	1 2 3	2	1	0
5. Are teachers knowledgeable of research-based principles for effective instruction in the area of fluency?	1 2 3	2	1	0
6. Are teachers knowledgeable of research-based principles for effective instruction in the area of phonemic awareness?	1 2 3	2	1	0
8. Does the district have a coaching process in place to determine the extent to which teachers <u>demonstrate</u> effective instructional practices in the five dimensions of early literacy?	1 2 3	2	1	0

	Current Status	Improvement Priority High Medium Low		
9. Do teachers receive feedback on general principles of effective instruction such as high rates of engagement, frequent positive feedback, immediate error correction, opportunities for students to make active responses, etc?	1 2 3	2	1	0

STRAND D: Problem Solving & System Supports *Area 1. School wide Organization*	Current Status	Improvement Priority		
		High	Medium	Low
1. Is there strong instructional leadership that guides the RtI process by using data for decision-making purposes and finds the resources necessary to meet student needs.	1 2 3	2	1	0
2. Does the district use a standardized, evidenced-based framework for evaluating curriculum?	1 2 3	2	1	0
3. Does the school have evidenced based curriculum, instruction and/or strategies identified for Tier 2 and 3 supports?	1 2 3	2	1	0
4. Is the school schedule arranged in such a way that teaching teams can meet to discuss student progress and instructional changes on a monthly basis?	1 2 3	2	1	0
5. Resources are allocated to teaching teams based on student needs documented by progress monitoring data (e.g. teams with more needs have more resources)	1 2 3	2	1	0
6. Is comprehensive and on-going professional development in curriculum, instruction, measurement, and problem solving offered to staff as part of a continuous improvement process?	1 2 3	2	1	0

STRAND D: Problem Solving & System Supports *Area 2. Team Support*				
1. Is there a building team designed to help *general education teachers and parents* solve student problems?	1 2 3	2	1	0
2. Is the Problem-Solving team seen as a *general education rather than a special education process*?	1 2 3	2	1	0
3. Does the team have *balanced representation* of general and special education staff?	1 2 3	2	1	0
4. Is an *administrator a team member*?	1 2 3	2	1	0
6. Is there a *regularly scheduled* meeting time and place?	1 2 3	2	1	0

	Current Status	Improvement Priority High Medium Low		
7. Does the team have an agreed upon *mission statement?*	1 2 3	2	1	0
8. Does the team have procedures, forms, and resources?	1 2 3	2	1	0
9. Does the team use *forms* at the meeting to lead the team through the Problem-Solving process?	1 2 3	2	1	0
10. Are there flexible *roles* assigned to team members (e.g., timekeeper, facilitator, recorder, case manager).	1 2 3	2	1	0
11. Does the team use *effective communication* (e.g., open ended questioning, reflective listening)?	1 2 3	2	1	0
12. Are there standard procedures (i.e., *RIOT* procedures) that are used to collect Problem-Solving data?	1 2 3	2	1	0
13. Is there a system for *accessing* the team?	1 2 3	2	1	0
14. Does the team *maintain records on students* served through the team?	1 2 3	2	1	0
15. Are data regularly collected *on team functioning* (e.g., students served)?	1 2 3	2	1	0
16. Has the school/team ensured parents are knowledgeable and as involved as they can be in their child's education plan?	1 2 3	2	1	0

STRAND D: Problem Solving & System Supports *AREA 3: Problem Identification*	Current Status	Improvement Priority High Medium Low		
1. Are problems defined *operationally (i.e., observable and measurable)*?	1 2 3	2	1	0
2. When multiple problems are identified, does the team *prioritize them*?	1 2 3	2	1	0
3. Does a *team member* review records, conduct an interview, conduct observations, and/or conduct testing to determine the presence of discrepancies between expectations and what is occurring?	1 2 3	2	1	0
4. Are the data collected during the Problem Identification stage *displayed in a graphic or summary format?*	1 2 3	2	1	0
5. When there is a discrepancy between a student and peers or benchmark, are students provided targeted supports?	1 2 3	2	1	0
6. Are parents provided a description of assurances of what general education Problem-Solving will provide (e.g., timeline, data to be collected, decision-making rules)?	1 2 3	2	1	0

Adapted from the MN Response to Intervention Center   www.scred.k12.mn.us/RTI/RTIcontact.htm
RtI Readiness Checklist

7. Are there procedures for addressing the needs of *severe problems* in a timely manner?	1 2 3	2	1	0

STRAND D: Problem Solving & System Supports *AREA 4: Problem Analysis*	Current Status	Improvement Priority High Medium Low		
1. Does the team have a *systematic approach to analyzing problems*?	1 2 3	2	1	0
2. Does the team use *survey-level assessment* procedures to analyze academic problems?	1 2 3	2	1	0
3. Does the team use *functional behavioral assessment* techniques to analyze behavioral problems?	1 2 3	2	1	0
2. Does the team assess whether the identified problem is a *skill-based or a performance-based* problem?	1 2 3	2	1	0
5. Does the team *develop hypotheses* for why a problem may be occurring?	1 2 3	2	1	0
6. Are hypotheses focused on *'relevant' and 'alterable' variables*?	1 2 3	2	1	0
7. Are hypotheses *specific, observable, measurable, and testable*?	1 2 3	2	1	0
8. Do the hypotheses generated during Problem Analysis consider all *potential factors that influence behavior/academics* (e.g., child, curriculum/instructional, peer school/community factors)?	1 2 3	2	1	0
9. If there is not enough data to confirm a hypothesis, are additional data collected within 10 school days?	1 2 3	2	1	0
10. Are Problem Analysis data used in *designing and implementing interventions*?	1 2 3	2	1	0
11 .Does the team obtain *baseline data* before a plan is developed?	1 2 3	2	1	0
12. Is there a system for *communicating* Problem Analysis results *to parents and teachers?*	1 2 3	2	1	0

STRAND D: Problem Solving & System Supports *AREA 5: Plan Development*	Current Status	Improvement Priority		
		High	Medium	Low
1. Is the intervention plan *supported by research* and the most valid or alterable hypothesis*?*	1 2 3	2	1	0
2. Is the plan a result of the Problem Identification and Analysis processes (i.e., Is the *intervention linked to the assessment*)?	1 2 3	2	1	0
3. Is the intervention plan *realistic to implement*?	1 2 3	2	1	0
4. Is the plan focused on those *factors that are most alterable* (i.e., instruction, curriculum, environment)?	1 2 3	2	1	0
5. Is there *a written description* of the plan with the following components: • A description of the specific intervention • The length of time (such as the number of weeks) that will be allowed for the intervention to have a positive effect • The number of minutes per day the intervention will be implemented (such as 30 to 45 minutes) • The persons responsible for providing the intervention • The location where the intervention will be provided • The factors for judging whether the student is experiencing success • A description of the progress monitoring strategy or approach, such as CBM, that will be used • A progress monitoring schedule • Frequency with which teachers/parents will receive reports about their child's response to the intervention.	1 2 3	2	1	0
6. Is the written plan provided to the teacher and parent?	1 2 3	2	1	0
7. Can data collected to evaluate the plan be *displayed in a graphic format*?	1 2 3	2	1	0
8. Is there a *commitment to continue an intervention*, as prescribed in the plan, until a team decision is made to discontinue it?	1 2 3	2	1	0
9. Is the *student involved* in the development of an intervention plan, when applicable?	1 2 3	2	1	0
10. Is there a system in place to *communicate the on-going results* of the intervention plan with teachers and parents?	1 2 3	2	1	0

STRAND D: Problem Solving & System Supports *AREA 6: Plan Implementation*	Current Status	Improvement Priority		
		High	Medium	Low
1. Is there a method of determining intervention integrity?	1 2 3	2	1	0

	Current Status	Improvement Priority High Medium Low		
2. Does a member of the team commit to evaluating whether the intervention is being *implemented as planned*?	1 2 3	2	1	0
3. Is student progress towards the identified goal being evaluated on a *regular basis,* as described?	1 2 3	2	1	0
4. Are the data being *displayed in graph* for decision-making purposes?	1 2 3	2	1	0
5. Is plan *progress communicated* with teachers & parents?	1 2 3	2	1	0
6. Is there *sufficient support* provided to implement intervention plans?	1 2 3	2	1	0
7. Are *parents involved* in Plan Implementation as appropriate?	1 2 3	2	1	0

STRAND D: Problem Solving & System Supports AREA 6: *Plan Evaluation*	Current Status	Improvement Priority High Medium Low		
1. Does the team follow *decision-making rules* when evaluating plans?	1 2 3	2	1	0
2. Are the baseline and progress monitoring data *displayed in a graph* for the purpose of evaluating the plan effectiveness?	1 2 3	2	1	0
3. Is there an agreed upon *timeline* for plan evaluating?	1 2 3	2	1	0
4. When a plan has not been successful, does the team *recycle through* the Problem-Solving process?	1 2 3	2	1	0
5. When a plan is effective, are decisions made about *fading the intervention*?	1 2 3	2	1	0
6. Is the student's response to the intervention communicated to parents as indicated on the written plan?	1 2 3	2	1	0
7. Are there criteria for determining when a child's needs exceed the resources of the Problem-Solving team and special education *eligibility is considered*?	1 2 3	2	1	0