

Appendix M

**Fall 2010
Site Visit
Follow-Up Reports**

East Valley

East Valley High School Follow Up – Fall 2010

| Consensus/Leadership Building |
|---|
| Moving Forward |
| The district negotiated two-hour late start professional development time on Mondays. There have been 22 late starts this year. This time is being used for PLCs and RTI. Teams have established norms for how to develop consensus. |
| Entire staff has received PBIS training. |
| Sixteen teachers receiving in-depth PBIS training (Flint Simonson) and are working on “getting it moving.” |
| Leadership believes that staff understands the RTI model because it is being mirrored with PBIS (the idea of tiers). |
| Lingering Issues |
| The school is moving towards implementing RTI in academics as opposed to just in behavior. |
| Questions to Consider |
| What mechanisms are in place to monitor staff knowledge of RTI? What is the plan to better emphasize academic RTI? |
| Data Collection/Management |
| Moving Forward |
| School has started developing common end of the unit assessments in Algebra and Geometry. |
| They use SRI Lexile scores to do screening/placement in Reading, state assessment and grades. |
| Lingering Issues |
| They do not have common assessments within content areas, but the topic is on the agenda for the near future. |
| They do not yet have common grading practices; they noted that grading is still very subjective, though teams are working on improving the reliability of classroom assessments. |
| Grading practices tend to be focused on activities, rather than objectives. |
| It was noted that grades from middle school do not seem to reflect student skills, thus cannot be used in making decisions for students transitioning to high school, especially in math. They are looking for ways to make better placement decisions in math. |
| Large percentage of SPED students receiving failing grades in social studies and science. |
| Questions to Consider |
| What is the process for planning important PDs; is there a calendar of upcoming opportunities, a timeline for addressing important topics? (e.g., common assessments, academic RTI, grading). |
| What strategies are being used to monitor teacher fidelity to RTI protocols or to instructional best practices? |
| What mechanisms are in place to facilitate communication between high school and the middle school related to using data to place students in intervention and plan for student needs overall? |
| Multi-tiered System of Instruction |
| Moving Forward |
| Teams have created “two pyramids and interventions” for behavior. |
| Teacher meetings with students about their need for a remedial class (e.g. Read 180) have improved students’ |

East Valley

East Valley High School Follow Up – Fall 2010

| |
|---|
| willingness to give up electives and instead receive “double dose” in a subject area. |
| Teachers are starting RTI efforts with an emphasis on CORE instruction. The development of PLCs is a first step in this respect. |
| Two classes of Read 180 are ongoing (41 students with room for 60). |
| For identified students, school has created a two year Algebra track (two classes). Two teachers are team teaching. One day the Title I teacher covers prerequisite skills (pre-teaches), the next day the Algebra teacher delivers the lesson. If students begin to fail, they are moved to a pre-Algebra section, preventing failing grades on transcripts. |
| Two major “learning support” team initiatives: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Counselors have targeted students who need help with organization-backpack/notebook checks. ▪ Paying AP students with ASB funds to “tutor” struggling students. Struggling students tell the counselor they need help and counselor connects them with an AP tutor. |
| Lingering Issues |
| A number of failing students are perceived as “lazy” by teachers. |
| Teachers are intensely focusing on implementing and improving Tier 1 and have not been able to spend time working on Tier 2. |
| A large number of students have been placed into Pre-AP courses, draining all sections of regular science. |
| Questions to Consider |
| What strategies can be implemented to improve student motivation? What PD can be provided to teachers’ to support student motivation? Can it be tied into PBIS training and implementation? |
| Special Education |
| Moving Forward |
| School psychologist has developed a one page checklist so that teachers can know what kind of accommodations can be provided for students. |
| Remedial courses (Read 180, 2-Year Algebra) are open to all kids with and without IEPs. |
| Lingering Issues |
| Case managers frustrated with lack of differentiation in core classes. |
| Questions to Consider |
| How can SPED staff expertise be utilized to support RTI efforts? |

East Valley Mountain View Middle School Follow Up – Fall 2010

| Consensus/Leadership Building |
|--|
| Moving Forward |
| The district negotiated two-hour late start professional development time on Mondays. There have been 22 late starts this year. This time is being used for PLCs and RTI. Teams have established norms for how to develop consensus. |
| District “Revisioning” process has been occurring. |
| The RTI Leadership team attended RTI Summit in Pasco in September and visited White River in Puyallup. |
| The percentage of students receiving D’s and F’s was shared with the staff, which dramatically increased the willingness of the teachers to provide extra instructional support. Many teachers are volunteering time after school and during their lunch periods to run interventions. |
| RTI representatives from the building attend regular trainings offered by the district. |
| PD from the district is open to all teachers. |
| Teachers have invited the principal in during math testing- he is visible in the classrooms. |
| Lingering Issues |
| Not all teachers take advantage of the RTI PD opportunities. |
| The leadership team feels that the cost of PD is too high - think that it may be helpful for the state to offer more Webinars. |
| Questions to Consider |
| What strategies or policies might increase staff participation in RTI PD? |
| Data Collection/Management |
| Moving Forward |
| The principal shared the number of school-wide failing grades with staff. |
| Using ORF, Math Alert and MSP scores for screening. School Psychologist (Steve Hirsch) has helped create an excel spreadsheet to make MSP predictions/screening decisions. |
| The school is collecting Explore data three times a year (ACT test for 8 th grade). Requiring parent signatures that they have reviewed final test scores. |
| The school collects ORF for all students, SRI Lexile scores, and BRI informal reading inventory for those that are below standards (usually SPED students). |
| Will be using part of late start Mondays to review student data. |
| Principal is working with teachers on strategies for basing grades on classroom learning/performance instead of on behavior. |
| They have implemented a color-coded system to facilitate review of grades. |
| They are using EXPLORE test as potential screener for 8 th grade students. |
| Students are graphing weekly math scores (based on class assignments) and teachers are asking students to talk about their “progress monitoring” graphs. A friendly between-class competition is developing. |
| Teachers are allowing alternative forms of assessment (e.g. verbal response in lieu of paper pencil) for students who are not necessarily at standard. |

East Valley Mountain View Middle School Follow Up – Fall 2010

| |
|---|
| Lingering Issues |
| “Five Clicks” data warehouse is ineffective. School has since developed their own system. |
| Data is used primarily for screening and placement decisions. |
| School is looking for a computer-based way to organize student assignment data to help track which students are falling behind in work completion. This will be used during the intervention period. |
| Questions to Consider |
| What other options are there beyond Five Clicks for data management? Can EXCEL be used? |
| What kind of data is needed for diagnostic and intervention planning decisions? How can this aspect of the intervention time be strengthened? |
| Multi-tiered System of Instruction |
| Moving Forward |
| Established a new “during the day intervention”- students who are failing/behind are provided support during their lunch period for any subject areas. Support is provided by teachers who are choosing to take lunch with the students. |
| Students are buying into the lunch intervention time; they are asking teachers for help. They are starting to believe that the teachers are there to help them. |
| School is allowing kids in detention to participate in intervention time. |
| They have implemented a “flex” period. |
| Two hour study support time (2:30-4:30) is available for students. |
| Teachers are volunteering time to do this and students are volunteering to get support during both intervention periods. |
| Principal will be proposing a thirty-minute intervention time during the school day to the staff. This will be accommodated by taking off 3 minutes of the existing 48 minute periods. |
| School has been working on behavior through the counselor; she is forming school success groups. |
| Teachers changed late work policy, allowing for some credit for late assignments (as opposed to no credit). This has helped decrease the failure rate. It has also sent the message to kids that learning material related the assignment is important. |
| Several teachers are trying to intentionally connect with parents to “celebrate” student success. (e.g. calling the parents of five students each Friday). |
| School is doing more work on core instruction (using whiteboards, pre-testing). |
| They have completely reorganized how math instruction is delivered. Students are placed in math classes according to skills, not by grade level (Math 100, 200, 300 and 400). Lower level math classes have two teachers with 28 kids. |
| They have 30 Read 180 licenses for the 8 th grade. Next year the teacher will start “looping” and Read 180 will be offered for 7 th graders. |
| One “low” group for language arts. |
| Lingering Issues |
| Teachers have not been trained in PBIS but have a committee looking into possibilities. |
| During lunch, the focus of the intervention is “hit and miss” and is primarily focused on help with homework. |

**East Valley
Mountain View Middle School Follow Up – Fall 2010**

| |
|---|
| Teachers would like to see this time be more targeted. |
| Questions to Consider |
| A lot of intervention opportunities have been created - can systems/processes be developed to streamline these? What resources are needed? |
| How is data being used to track intervention success? |
| What plans are being made to reduce the amount of volunteering that teachers are doing to run interventions? Is this sustainable? |
| Special Education |
| Moving Forward |
| SST team meets 2-4 times per week. |
| Teacher support from SST was noted as positive. |
| Have new special education teacher and new school psychologist (both seen as positive assets). School psych. is an RTI expert (Steve Hirsch). |
| Lingering Issues |
| None reported. |
| Questions to Consider |
| How can SPED staff support intervention times? |

East Valley

Skyview/Continuous Curriculum Elementary Follow Up – Fall 2010

| Consensus/Leadership Building |
|--|
| Moving Forward |
| Teaming and collaborations have <i>increased</i> despite the decrease in intervention teaching staff. |
| The district negotiated two-hour late start professional development time on Mondays. There have been 22 late starts this year. This time is being used for PLCs and RTI. Teams have established norms for how to develop consensus. |
| Twice monthly collaboration time has been set aside. |
| Groundwork has been established for implementing PLCs |
| Formalized collaboration groups have been assembled (but have not started). |
| PD was provided for several general education teachers in Visualizing and Verbalizing. This PD will eventually be offered for all teachers. |
| Lingering Issues |
| Principal is working on strategies to provide PD and support on collaborative group work. |
| District “re-visionsing” is problematic for teachers; there is a reluctance to work in PLCs because of the uncertain future and the possible reconfiguration of schools. |
| Leadership has dedicated two staff meetings a month to collaboration time. |
| Questions to Consider |
| How can staff be encouraged to recognize the connection between collaboration, instruction and outcomes for students? |
| How can PLC work be structured this year so that teachers see their efforts as valuable? |
| What other resources can the principal access to provide PD support around collaboration? |
| Data Collection/Management |
| Moving Forward |
| Administer ORF 3x a year. Just received DAYS from DIBELS. Use reading inventory (BRI) for students who are at risk. Math Alert is used for mathematics. |
| In grade levels that are teaming, core curriculum assessments are used to make decisions about transitioning among tiers in reading. |
| LEP students and SPED students are progress monitored. |
| Data profile meetings were conducted at the beginning of the year. Teachers used data to discuss students with specialists. Teachers found these very beneficial. |
| Teachers felt that conversations about data have increased since the implementation of RTI. |
| Lingering Issues |
| MSP data show issues in reading comprehension. |
| Teachers reported that 5 Clicks data warehouse is not working. |
| Teachers are feeling that organizing and tracking data is too much work (with EXCEL). |
| Progress monitoring has been haphazard in the past because not all students were monitored regularly. Teachers are doing it in their classrooms. |

East Valley

Skyview/Continuous Curriculum Elementary Follow Up – Fall 2010

| |
|---|
| Mixed results for the profile meetings- teachers are still struggling to allocate time and resources. |
| Teachers stated that there is not a consistent way to track progress in classroom or across grade levels. |
| Questions to Consider |
| What strategies/mechanisms can streamline data collection and tracking? |
| How can the connections between the collection of data, participation in PLCs, and student learning be highlighted for teachers so that work in these areas is perceived as valuable? |
| Multi-tiered System of Instruction |
| Moving Forward |
| Pathways for reading and math developed for all grades (except 3 rd and 4 th). |
| Twice weekly math interventions are being developed in math. |
| Two teachers are volunteering their after-school time to the after-school intervention program. |
| Strategies are being developed to include interventions during the school day. |
| Speech language pathologist is providing whole-class language instruction in K-1 classrooms and teachers are implementing follow-up support during the week. |
| Teachers found that offering an intervention for a few days or a few weeks is insufficiently intense. They are making plans to provide more intense interventions. |
| Behavior plans are becoming more universal. |
| Work study student from Eastern is providing interventions. This is perceived as beneficial. |
| Lingering Issues |
| The 3 rd and 4 th grade teachers have not been able to agree on pathways, so they have not been completed. |
| Funding for the extended school day was discontinued, which was where most interventions were occurring. |
| School is struggling to find resources and time to offer interventions during the school day. |
| Lap Program teacher position reduced by half in Spring. This teacher had been a leader in the school's RTI initiatives (including the data warehouse). A substitute has been hired for the .5 position. |
| Two 1 st -grade teachers and 2 2 nd grade teachers are using "walk-to-read" and ReadWell assessments every six weeks to identify instructional groups. |
| The 3 rd and 4 th grade teachers are not interested to modifying schedules. |
| In the spring, school conducted an inventory of resources available for interventions. At the time of the site visit, teachers felt a need to review the inventory results. |
| Questions to Consider |
| Would a calendar of goals and timelines for key initiatives be helpful to teachers and school leaders? |
| What PD or support might support 3 rd and 4 th grade teachers as they move forward? What are the roadblocks to moving forward? |
| Special Education |
| Moving Forward |
| Speech language pathologist has volunteered time to organize SST schedules and to manage meetings. |

East Valley
Skyview/Continuous Curriculum Elementary Follow Up – Fall 2010

| |
|--|
| SPED doing Tier 3 interventions. Sometimes include students without an IEP. |
| Using RTI data as part of the eligibility process. |
| Lingering Issues |
| SPED is not part of the RTI leadership. |
| Questions to Consider |
| How can SPED staff be better utilized in the building RTI model? What needs to change to support the development of RTI? |

Hoquiam

Hoquiam High School Follow Up – Fall 2010

| Consensus/Leadership Building |
|---|
| Moving Forward |
| PD was provided for the whole school (an RTI overview) at the beginning of the year – clarified the misunderstanding that there are “RTI kids.” |
| PD provided for the school on Safe and Civil schools and Assessment. |
| Principal and vice principal spending the majority of time focusing on developing Math RTI with emphasis on setting up the structural pieces. |
| Visited the elementary school “walk to math” model to see how they differentiated math groups. |
| Vice principal has been in the math classrooms 38/40 school days. |
| Whole staff participated in the scheduling of a blocked math time. |
| Math teachers have bi-weekly sessions with the math coach. |
| Have developed common planning time for the algebra and algebra support teachers. |
| Lingering Issues |
| No common prep time for intervention teachers. |
| No CAST (RTI) team meetings. |
| Questions to Consider |
| What are the goals and how will you know you have reached them? |
| What resources will it take to reorganize schedules in order to allow for common planning time? Or for common intervention time? |
| Would a structure for CAST team meetings help staff to participate? |
| Data Collection/Management |
| Moving Forward |
| Intervention teachers progress monitor with ORF fluency and with MAZE in reading intervention classes. |
| Have developed tracking sheets for data and have data on all students. |
| Collecting MAPS data and using this in Math decision making. |
| Beginning to use the MAPS as a reading screener and follow this with ORF for 8 th graders and freshmen. |
| Have been collecting data on behavior. |
| Lingering Issues |
| Working on how to provide all students interventions. |
| Collecting MAZE data every two weeks and placing it on a spreadsheet but most of the time it “ends up in a folder.” |
| A lack of time was cited as a reason for not using the data to inform instruction. |
| No common prep time between intervention teachers. |

Hoquiam

Hoquiam High School Follow Up – Fall 2010

| |
|--|
| Questions to Consider |
| What strategies might highlight for teachers the connection between data on student progress and instructional decision making? Would connection data and the goal-setting process be of benefit? (As opposed to using HSPE as the indicator?) |
| Multi-tiered System of Instruction |
| Moving Forward |
| Forty 9 th grade students were below standards on MAPS assessment- created two classes of Algebra support where kids are pre-taught. (Students then have two periods of Algebra.) |
| Qualification for Algebra support was not based on IEP status, but on test scores. All students were considered for the Algebra support class. |
| Coordinating Algebra and Algebra Support teachers so that they know what each one is doing- have created a lesson plan template. |
| Teachers are beginning to talk about geometry and how to provide intervention support. |
| Have three groups of reading intervention (1 fluency and 2 comprehension). 10 students per group. |
| Have a School Improvement Planning (SIP) team that is beginning to look at behavior data and possible interventions for behavior and changing school climate. |
| Lingering Issues |
| Have plans to check for fidelity of implementation on the implementation of intervention programs. Coaches have had training on this and are just beginning the conversations with teachers. |
| Have been using REWARDS Plus Science, but are looking at switching to LANGUAGE! Planning on visiting Vancouver to see their language support system. Simply trying to find a better intervention for content area reading. They are currently pre-teaching vocabulary and reading text, but direct instruction was cited as a “deal breaker” for high school students. |
| RTI coach lost her extra prep. period this year and it is harder to take care of/manage the data. |
| Questions to Consider |
| Would there be value in linking the REWARDS classes with the language arts intervention classes, similar to what is being tried with math? |
| Can support teachers and related resources (e.g. special education) assist with designing/planning/implementing intervention classes? |
| Special Education |
| Moving Forward |
| Counselors and the guidance team are starting to use the data. |
| Lingering Issues |
| Special Education is still not involved in RTI issues. |
| RTI team would like to set up an RTI Team that included SPED staff. |

Hoquiam
Hoquiam High School Follow Up – Fall 2010

| Questions to Consider |
|--|
| What are the barriers to involving special education staff in the process? What are the benefits, if any, of adding a special education representative to a leadership team? |
| Is professional development needed for special education staff? |

Hoquiam Lincoln Elementary Follow Up – Fall 2010

| Consensus/Leadership Building |
|---|
| Moving Forward |
| Change in principal has been seen as a positive. (There were no problems with the previous principal-the change was an opportunity to change other systems). |
| Whole district had PD in assessment and RTI on the learning Improvement Day. This had been asked for by the teachers. |
| Now holding CAST meetings during the day- has eliminated the late people/people not paying attention. |
| PD was provided for the staff on how to differentiate instruction based on MAPS testing (Kathlene Dawson). |
| Teachers are meeting once a month to discuss data. |
| Lingering Issues |
| Principal would like teachers to meet twice a month to discuss student progress. |
| Still working on buy in from groups of teachers, particularly 3 rd grade. |
| Questions to Consider |
| Would professional development opportunities or other strategies help teachers with “buy in”? |
| Can student achievement (or lack thereof) be shared in a way that might support “buy in” for non-implementing teachers? |
| Data Collection/Management |
| Moving Forward |
| They have mapped math goals with GLEs and have a system to track student progress toward math goals (in 2 nd grade). |
| Developing common assessments in math. |
| CAST team has sophisticated data interpretation skills; for example, they look at the number of data points (3) that are below the aimline and make adjustments to the intervention. Title Teacher is looking at the number of words per week. They are helping teachers do this as well. |
| Lingering Issues |
| The 3 rd grade teachers are reluctant to use student data for planning instruction. |
| DIBELS Next does not currently print the reports like DIBELS. |
| PD is needed (for teachers) on how to use data. |
| The 3 rd grade teachers are not on board with mapping of math goals. |
| Scores in several areas are low. Teachers do not necessarily agree that the data reliably reflect student ability or achievement. |
| Questions to Consider |
| Are there alternative strategies for presenting data and the benefits of data use to 3 rd grade teachers? |
| Can data use be tied into the monthly grade level discussion meetings? For example, can there be a structure provided for these meetings that includes reviewing and reporting out progress? |

Hoquiam Lincoln Elementary Follow Up – Fall 2010

| Multi-tiered System of Instruction |
|---|
| Moving Forward |
| Teachers are becoming comfortable with math and reading core curriculum. |
| Differentiation has helped teachers become aware of student needs. |
| The SPED director has offered to help find time for teachers to review data before conferences (so that they are comfortable talking to parents about a students' progress in interventions that are occurring in another classroom- see "Lingering Issues"). |
| District math coach is meeting with each grade level monthly to help with curriculum issues. |
| Have added time to the day for reading instruction. Spend 90 minutes in walk to read. Kids with challenges (strategic and intensive) have 30 additional minutes. |
| Students in interventions are receiving more instruction from certificated teachers and less from paraprofessionals. |
| Reading coaches have designed fidelity forms (with support from SRA conference) and are going to start fidelity checks of interventions. |
| Lingering Issues |
| Teachers are feeling "a loss of control" during walk to intervention time because they don't have their own kids. |
| Not all teachers are happy with the walk to read or walk to intervention because they don't have their own students for the entire time now. |
| A lot of teachers do not like direct instruction (philosophically). |
| Questions to Consider |
| How can teachers connect with students and data so that they feel ownership of their students and their learning? |
| Is there an opportunity to create planning time for teachers who are doing walk to intervention to discuss planning and groupings? Would this help create ownership? |
| What PD can be offered to support teachers' understanding of the role of direct instruction? |
| Special Education |
| Moving Forward |
| Using data for SPED/504 eligibility decisions. |
| Using MAP data as well as rate and accuracy checks in the Reading Mastery program (in addition to progress monitoring data) to determine which interventions are working for individual kids. Using all of this information during the referral process. |
| Lingering Issues |
| Resources (staff and time) are always an issue. |
| Questions to Consider |
| How else can you use the Special Education staff to help support RTI implementation? |

Hoquiam

Hoquiam Middle School Follow Up – Fall 2010

| Consensus/Leadership Building |
|---|
| Moving Forward |
| New principal has brought new ideas and initiatives that are being embraced by staff. |
| Year long calendar has been developed for professional planning. |
| Two new math teachers were hired, as well as a district math coach. The math teachers have common planning time. |
| Time has been designated for grade levels to talk about Math. |
| School has developed “PLCs”- there are several groups formed: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Science PLC on planning ▪ Building leadership PLC ▪ Student recognition PLC ▪ English team looking at readers/writer’s workshop ▪ RTI PLC |
| A calendar exists for PLC meeting times. |
| Lingering Issues |
| There is no formalized framework for PLC. |
| Not really using data for the PLCs. |
| Questions to Consider |
| What is the working definition of PLCs? How are these different than work groups? Is there a way to integrate discussions of data into the PLC framework? |
| Is there a system in place to ensure new staff is provided training in regards to RTI implementation? |
| Data Collection/Management |
| Moving Forward |
| Initiated MAPS testing last spring. |
| Using MAPS data for diagnostics- teachers are trying to set goals with this. |
| Like the Math and Reading Easy CBM (not sure if they are using this data). |
| They are starting to share data with the kids. |
| Lingering Issues |
| Data shows that 80% of students can decode grade level text but only 56% are passing the state tests. |
| Won’t have any math data until the spring. |
| Questions to Consider |
| Is there a way to have more timely information on Math? Why not use Easy CBM for more frequent monitoring? |

Hoquiam

Hoquiam Middle School Follow Up – Fall 2010

| Multi-tiered System of Instruction |
|---|
| Moving Forward |
| Focusing on core instruction. Doing reader’s workshop for core instruction - have brought in a trainer for this. |
| Have a three-tiered model for reading, with kids spread out across three groups. |
| 7 th and 8 th grades now receive reading and intervention time. |
| Reading instruction is supplanted for “intensive readers.” |
| Remedial reading class spends two days on decoding and two days on comprehension. |
| Designated Nov. 12 th as “Math Day” and have scheduled math activities/centers throughout the day for the whole school. |
| 6 th grade has put into place a 30 minute math intervention time every other day. |
| 6 th grade trying to add a 20-minute time period at the end of the day for intervention and may focus on math (this plan is still in its infancy). |
| Reading coaches have started doing fidelity checks for interventions this year. |
| Administrators will be doing “evaluation” checks after staff training. |
| Lingering Issues |
| Building RTI team spends most of the time on Reading. |
| Using mostly game work for Math intervention time; don’t yet have a structure for this time. |
| 7 th and 8 th grade have LAP skills classes for Math, but are still trying to figure out how to use this time. |
| Trying to find a MS program for comprehension. |
| Concerns about the use of Corrective Reading were raised but there is no data available to confirm whether or not this working. |
| Questions to Consider |
| How fluid are the groupings in the “Tiers”? When are changes to class configurations discussed? |
| How can data be used to check the effectiveness of various interventions and activities? |
| What plans does the building RTI team have to focus on math interventions? |
| Special Education |
| Moving Forward |
| Teachers utilize ORF, MAP and MSP data. |
| Guidance Team (GT) is requiring teachers to provide data before GT Team meetings and are requiring teachers to implement interventions that are recommended by the GT team. |
| Lingering Issues |
| No discussion about the quality of intervention delivery in some instances. |
| Questions to Consider |
| What does the progress look like of all special education students? Have there been changes in the data? |

Kiona-Benton

Kiona-Benton Elementary Follow Up – Fall 2010

| Consensus/Leadership Building |
|---|
| Moving Forward |
| A new principal was hired this fall. This is the fourth principal in four years for this building. |
| Principal conducted first data meetings in October. She met with pairs of grade level teachers. |
| Teachers are receiving coaching on how to access data, use the NWEA website, DIBELs and AIMSweb sites and core phonics information. |
| Teachers are being asked to enter Progress Monitoring data into the related sites as well as into the district data bank. They are beginning, therefore, to conduct their own progress monitoring at the request of the new principal who then meets with them monthly to discuss their data. |
| PLC time is being used to identify power standards, evaluate and match curricula. |
| The data meetings begun by the principal are imbedded professional development for all staff. |
| Principal identifies further work needed to make connections between the work being done and the philosophical understanding of RTI as a system. |
| Because teachers are becoming more informed and comfortable with the data, they are better able to inform parents during conferences. Students are also more informed of their data and are beginning to chart progress. |
| Readiness survey given to staff helps to further identify needed professional development. |
| All curricular materials have been inventoried to identify what materials they have that are research based, to ensure that all materials associated with core curriculum are being utilized, so they can get rid of materials that are not appropriate. |
| Two staff members are receiving certification in GLAD training. |
| Lingering Issues |
| Frequent staff changes are challenging (and can be beneficial) to implement consistent progress. |
| Questions to Consider |
| Are teachers “open” to entering data? Do they find it to be valuable in terms of understanding their student needs better? |
| Are there plans for additional professional development? |
| Data Collection/Management |
| Moving Forward |
| There is stronger evidence of PM in place to drive instruction. |
| Grade level teams work with the four interventionists to split classes into appropriate skill-based groups using the benchmark and progress monitoring data. |
| Teams conducted the fall benchmarking and then pass the information to the classroom teachers. |
| Intervention systems for both math and reading have been designed this fall. Reading interventions have been in place for a while. Some grades have started math interventions, but three grade levels had yet to start math at the time of this visit. |
| RTI review form developed last year is being used to track student progress and interventions that are implemented. A recent system upgrade requires the program to be updated. The RTI building coordinator still |

Kiona-Benton

Kiona-Benton Elementary Follow Up – Fall 2010

| |
|--|
| oversees the data management and screens the information. |
| “Make Yer Day” continues to be used for explicit behavior instruction. Team reports that three years of office referral data suggests an impact for this intervention. |
| Lingering Issues |
| Team reports that the lower grades are using progress monitoring to a greater degree to drive instruction. Focus of progress monitoring has shifted from more intensive students to more strategic students. |
| Questions to Consider |
| What plan is in place to develop math interventions? Is more professional development needed? |
| What strategies can support the upper grade teachers in their use of progress monitoring data to drive instruction? |
| Multi-tiered System of Instruction |
| Moving Forward |
| Team reports more progress in Tier 2 support with the use of progress monitoring and teachers working with interventionists to identify instructional groups. |
| The school is still not actively working on Tier 3 interventions. |
| Team reports that they continue to work on the “system” for moving students as needed every 4-6 weeks. |
| Monthly grade level data team meetings with the principal are designed to promote Tier 1 interventions in core instruction. |
| Lingering Issues |
| Developing a system for moving students fluidly throughout the tiers. |
| Questions to Consider |
| What is the plan for addressing/developing/identifying Tier 3 interventions? |
| Special Education |
| Moving Forward |
| Implementation of RTI Review/Referral form continues to provide data and information on student progress electronically. |
| Two special education teachers pull students out for math and reading interventions during core time. |
| Principal reports that with greater staff understanding about the processes of RTI, there is less urgency on the part of general education staff to push for special education referrals. |
| Special education teachers are using Everyday Math for their curricular materials and are working to evaluate the curricula against the state standards. |
| Principal and school psychologist report that special education referrals overall at the elementary are down slightly. |
| RTI data is part of the eligibility conversation and considered in the referral process. |
| Lingering Issues |
| None reported. |

Kiona-Benton
Kiona-Benton Elementary Follow Up – Fall 2010

| Questions to Consider |
|--|
| Do special education referrals continue to decline? |
| Is there a system for including “RTI data” as a part of eligibility decisions? |

Kiona-Benton

Kiona-Benton HS Follow Up – Fall 2010

| Consensus/Leadership Building |
|--|
| Moving Forward |
| The RTI coach who had been the main link between students and support staff shifted positions within the district and has moved to the elementary school. A new coach was hired just before this visit. This coach is new to the district and new to the position and was to begin work within the week of this visit. |
| Weekly district collaboration time (when the departments meet) continues. |
| The principal reports that the school is experiencing difficulties in developing collaboration teams. |
| Monthly data meetings have been implemented, but the math department is “pushing back” regarding the value of this work. |
| The principal hopes that moving toward discussions between the middle school and the high school over time will build greater capacity and urgency for using the RTI approach. |
| The principal reports that the general staff is beginning to move toward more reflective teaching based on the fact that the staff is examining MAP data this past fall. The goal is for staff will examine all scores of students who took the PSAT. |
| The entire district staff was to attend a RTI overview training by Rebecca Zumeta the day following this visit. |
| AVID is in place for all Freshmen and Sophomores. Core teachers attended AVID training this past summer. |
| A Science teacher (who has emerged as a respected staff member and mediator between the staff and administration) is taking a leadership role and meets collaboratively with teams and the principal to put some AVID strategies in place. |
| The leadership team intends to research and visit other districts in the state who have implemented intervention periods into the master schedule. |
| Lingering Issues |
| The high school program was highly reliant upon the former RTI coach. It is unclear how the initiative will move forward with the new coach. |
| GEAR Up parent group does not have a staff liaison this year. |
| Questions to Consider |
| Considering that there is a fair amount of pushback from certain staff members, have you considered first clarifying if teachers share a common vision? This may be a starting point worth exploring. |
| What plans are there for continuing implementation of RTI with the loss of the RTI coach? Was a transition plan implemented? |
| Where can you get a staff liaison for the GEAR Up parent group? |
| Who is guiding the collaboration process? Is there a structure in place for each meeting? |
| Do you have a need for more professional development for certain departments? In what areas? What plan do you have to implement this professional development? |
| Data Collection/Management |
| Moving Forward |
| HSPE and MAP data are still used to determine who need interventions. |
| Read 180 data was shared before conferences but is not used consistently for planning or making instructional decisions. |

Kiona-Benton

Kiona-Benton HS Follow Up – Fall 2010

| |
|--|
| All 9 th and 10 th grade students were MAP tested this fall. |
| GEAR Up funded PSAT testing taken by Freshmen, Sophomore and Junior students and they will be looking at that data as an additional piece of information about the students. |
| The principal continues to gather graduation and retention data, class failure rates, and discipline data which the staff reviews. He reports that there is no formal discipline program in place (such as PBIS). |
| There is a push to intervene positively with absences and develop a pro-active approach toward prevention of absenteeism. It is expected that the new RTI coach will take responsibility for that work. The principal reports that students reaching the Age of Majority pose a problem they are trying to address for retaining students in school and reaching graduation. |
| The principal reports that several students who received the READ 180 intervention last year passed the HSPE. |
| The principal reports working with the math department to build self-assessments within the math classes. |
| Lingering Issues |
| There is no evidence of progress monitoring being used outside of READ 180 classes and special education. |
| Questions to Consider |
| What other data can you use to make placement and instructional decisions? |
| What system has been set in place to track absenteeism? |
| Can you use progress monitoring data outside of the READ 180 classes and special education class? How? What data? |
| Multi-tiered System of Instruction |
| Moving Forward |
| Tier 1 targets all students, Tier 2 targets at-risk students. Tier 3 targets primarily special education students but the principal and Special Education teacher report that some at-risk students (non-SPED) are receiving Tier 3 interventions. |
| GEAR Up tutors continue to work in math classes, as well as before school, lunchtime, and after school. The principal reports that more students are opting “in” to use these supports and get the help they need to be successful. |
| The addition of AVID strategies in their Tier 1 classes is considered an improvement over last year. |
| There are two bi-lingual tutors in math this year which also considered a plus. |
| Lingering Issues |
| There continues to be limited structures in place for systematic interventions and fluid movement between tiers. |
| There is continued concern about providing interventions for accelerated students. |
| Questions to Consider |
| What resources can you tap into to get guidance on which interventions should be put in place and what the scheduling can look like? |
| Special Education |
| Moving Forward |
| The blended (at-risk and SPED students), co-taught classes using READ 180 paired with English and Science continue. This course is taught at a slower pace and utilizes READ 180 materials for content paired with adapted |

Kiona-Benton Kiona-Benton HS Follow Up – Fall 2010

| |
|---|
| <p>content. Last year students already at the high school were put into these classes. This year, incoming students were also considered.</p> |
| <p>This year, students identified for special education services were separated into an English group and a math group.</p> |
| <p>Two teachers have built a Transitions class for students to access post-secondary opportunities and to develop transition plans.</p> |
| <p>Modifications (primarily extended time and tutoring) to the Algebra class have allowed students to complete the course over two years. The slower pacing and modifications allow students with LD to complete the work and attempt the end of course test.</p> |
| Lingering Issues |
| <p>None reported.</p> |
| Questions to Consider |
| <p>What data can you use from the RTI process to help with instructional decisions?</p> |

Kiona-Benton

Kiona-Benton Middle School Follow Up – Fall 2010

| Consensus/Leadership Building |
|---|
| Moving Forward |
| This is the third year for collaborative time in the district. Weekly meetings began last year and the goal for these meetings at this school this fall is working on goal setting. |
| The principal is engaging in walk-throughs and training the staff to identify and display the learning objectives. |
| The principal is beginning data meetings this fall to engage staff in intentional discussions about differentiation in the core classes. He has identified a target of 80% of students being successful in the core instruction. He also engages staff in conversations about how they know where students are on concepts being taught in the classroom. |
| Pacing charts and power standards have been identified for math. |
| There is an effort to shift the culture from teaching the subject to teaching the students. |
| Two-thirds of the staff who teach READ 180 is new to the building so there has been training for them. |
| Rebecca Zumeta from OSPI was doing district-level staff development training on RTI practices the day after this visit. |
| Lingering Issues |
| None reported. |
| Questions to Consider |
| What other professional development opportunities are planned to get all staff “on board”? |
| Data Collection/Management |
| Moving Forward |
| MSP data is evaluated and is given to parents at conferences. |
| MAP data is collected twice a year and may be done mid-year for targeted students. |
| The team hopes to begin displaying data in hallways and have students more engaged in taking ownership for their goal setting. |
| The district is delivering training for using data to make instructional decisions. They discovered that information and reports that they collected from Pearson was not being used for classroom decisions. This year they are accessing NWEA website to generate students’ reports. |
| Staff is beginning to use the weekly team meetings to explore data. Training is being provided to assist staff in being more consistent in its use. |
| Easy CBM is being used for data collection and progress monitoring for Tier 3. |
| Social responsibility training using Navigation 101 and “Make Yer Day” is in its second full year. Students are assigned to “caves” of multi-aged students to receive this training. Cave teachers serve as advisors to the students in their caves. |
| Lingering Issues |
| The staff continues to work on using data effectively to make instructional decisions. |
| Questions to Consider |
| Who is administering the assessments and does this help teachers learn how to use data? |

Kiona-Benton

Kiona-Benton Middle School Follow Up – Fall 2010

| Multi-tiered System of Instruction |
|---|
| Moving Forward |
| Parents were informed about the intervention systems when the students got their fall schedule. |
| The schedule includes “exploratory” periods where students identified for interventions will receive additional instruction for math and/or reading. Sixth and seventh grades have two opportunities for interventions. Eighth grade has one opportunity in the current schedule. |
| Some teachers who are teaching core classes are also teaching intervention classes which provides more consistency in both data management and interpretation. |
| Teachers are beginning conversations about fluid movement between interventions and core instruction and considering ways to move students. |
| IXL Math computer program is tied with MAP data. |
| Lingering Issues |
| How to move students throughout the tiers in a fluid responsive manner. |
| Questions to Consider |
| Have you established Tier 3? If so, is it considered SPED? |
| Special Education |
| Moving Forward |
| It appears that Special Education is Tier 3. |
| The Special Education teacher is teaching a Tier 3 intervention in addition to the Special Education students she is serving. These interventions in writing and math occur during the advisory time. Increased intensity of Tier 3 instruction is having student access Homework Zone, funded by 21 st Century Grant, after school. There is no transportation provided for after school which does not allow all students who need the intervention access to the program. |
| The Special Education Teacher is gathering data from EASY CBM and beginning to share how she is using that data to drive intervention plans and instruction. |
| The team is considering having the Special Education teacher move to an “inclusion” model. |
| One special education referral was made at the Middle School this year. |
| The Discrepancy model is still used for qualifying students. RTI data is considered as part of the information during evaluation. |
| Lingering Issues |
| None reported. |
| Questions to Consider |
| How can you involve Special Education staff more to help support RTI implementation? Is there a special education representative on the leadership team? |

Longview

Mark Morris High School Follow Up – Fall 2010

| Consensus/Leadership Building |
|---|
| Moving Forward |
| The leadership team is dedicated to building a master schedule that differentiates instruction for all students in all content areas and guides monthly meetings reviewing instructional data. |
| Department Chairs are aware of areas of challenge and have goals and plans to increase course offerings whenever possible. |
| Data based decision making is becoming the “culture” of the school. Discussions regarding data are taking place across the building at all times of the school day. |
| The leadership team sees more common language related to RTI taking place in the Language Arts and Math Departments. |
| Lingering Issues |
| PLC training is still needed to assist teams in not only looking at instruction but also at individual student needs/progress. |
| Staff reductions continue to limit progress with site goals for RTI. |
| Questions to Consider |
| Have you considered having department heads from the two high schools discuss various strategies for differentiation and sharing resources (just as you have in elective course offerings)? |
| Data Collection/Management |
| Moving Forward |
| The school has a “massive” group share on the server guides instructional delivery. |
| Teachers can access much of the data, and scores from 6 th grade – 12 th may be accessed by anyone with administrative privileges. Counselors and team leaders make data available for teachers. |
| Teachers and staff consider the data to be “very personal,” meaning they are very invested in the monitoring and sharing of data. |
| A goal for the team is to rebuild common assessments. |
| Lingering Issues |
| The time/energy for rebuilding common assessments will be a challenge for some time. |
| Questions to Consider |
| How are data used to guide transition planning and career development? |
| Multi-tiered System of Instruction |
| Moving Forward |
| The Leadership Team reports that the school has increased flexibility in the strategic courses, particularly in math, with focus on students identified as “strategic” meeting core standards. |
| The School has adopted a philosophy very different from other high schools. Students do not “choose” their courses; they are encouraged to take the most rigorous level courses possible and monitored closely. Example: previously they have had little enrollment, if any for Chemistry Honors. This year they have two full classes with Chemistry Honors. |

Longview

Mark Morris High School Follow Up – Fall 2010

| |
|---|
| A shuttle goes between the two high schools in the district to expand opportunities for students. For instance, one school has CAD while another has drama. |
| The school tried a team teaching option for students identified as strategic/intensive, and both teachers report a benefit from this experience; this practice will likely be continued. |
| Decision making is logical based on student needs. For instance, students in strategic math courses take biology first in high school rather than physical science, thereby eliminating the influence of math on success in the science curriculum for ninth graders. |
| Lingering Issues |
| Social Studies is an area needing further differentiation. Currently, the school offers only core and strategic level services in this area. |
| The school has huge challenges providing staff for the various courses added. |
| Classroom management in some classrooms across campus is a concern for the leadership team. |
| Questions to Consider |
| Increased enrollment in higher level courses may be an excellent goal. What data show that increased enrollment in higher level courses is leading to increased outcomes? Have you considered examining both achievement data and collecting student/parent perception data in terms of how these changes meaningfully impact access to higher education, etc.? |
| Special Education |
| Moving Forward |
| The Special Education team previously participated in their own PLCS but now divides up to attend the other PLCs meeting in the building to cover intensive intervention issues across the content areas. |
| Strong accommodation practices allow students with IEPs to benefit from Civics and History courses. |
| Lingering Issues |
| The school psychologist is assigned to two high schools and cannot provide the level of support the team would like to receive. |
| The leadership team continues to see misunderstanding of the purpose of RTI related to special education decision making. The team wants to see that teachers are most concerned about student rate of progress, not if they have been “RTI’d.” |
| Questions to Consider |
| What data might the school utilize to consider the need for additional school psychologist time? |

Longview Mint Valley Elementary Follow Up – Fall 2010

| Consensus/Leadership Building |
|--|
| Moving Forward |
| Both leadership team members and teachers report Mint Valley to be a “very supportive place to work.” |
| The leadership team meets bimonthly. This fall the team has focused on governance and strategic planning, refocusing on bylaws, roles and responsibilities. |
| There is continued reflection regarding moving staff to different positions to facilitate buy-in and understanding of RTI. This has been a consistent practice for Mint Valley. This fall, Title 1 staff moved physically to be more supportive and have also started their own PLC. |
| PLCs continue to meet and examine data. Additionally, much of the informal discussions and supportive collaboration take place outside of these meetings. Data drive these discussions. |
| Lingering Issues |
| With district budget cuts, the school lost two learning improvement days this year, thus reducing the amount of time for shared professional development and collaboration. |
| Not reaching AYP has required certain shifts in priorities. Many staff members attended multiple workshops; however, the knowledge gained has not been disseminated to other staff members due to a reduction in meeting times. |
| The team reports continued transition with curriculum and instruction (i.e. defining objectives, purposes, assessments). Concerns were expressed about difficulties aligning the Common Core and Priority Standards. |
| Teachers report difficulty finding a common time to meet and report this to be “one of [their] barriers.” |
| Communication between the district office and school buildings does not seem bidirectional at the current time. A sense of many district priorities and need to consider building level input is apparent. |
| Questions to Consider |
| How can you find time for increased staff sharing and development of common knowledge? |
| How can you seek input from the district office and share impact on teachers and staff? |
| How will you document informal collaboration practices? |
| Data Collection/Management |
| Moving Forward |
| Teachers and leadership team report the building to be “data rich.” |
| The district is adding common assessments based on priority standards and new math benchmarks based on the Washington GLEs. |
| Success maker was piloted at Mint Valley, and then picked up at the district. The school takes pride in its contributions to district use of data. |
| The team reports seeing a shift this year in how teachers are learning to use the data and trusting the data to guide their decisions. |
| The team reports less disruption of instructional schedules due to creative planning and more open teacher attitude because of their interest in data. |
| Lingering Issues |
| Some gaps in communication regarding data in K-3 and 4 th /5 th are apparent. |
| Communication needs to take place between district and schools about benchmark assessment scheduling. |

Longview Mint Valley Elementary Follow Up – Fall 2010

| |
|--|
| Questions to Consider |
| Has the school considered listing all assessment practices and defining purposes, thereby understanding the role of each assessment practice and how it fits with the overall RTI implementation? |
| Do you have a system for tracking SPED referrals? |
| Multi-tiered System of Instruction |
| Moving Forward |
| First and second grade classrooms utilize a Walk to Reading model, Math instruction is differentiated within grade. |
| Day 3 of PBIS training will take place in November to facilitate implementation of RTI behavior. |
| They continue to look for volunteers to help with intervention delivery. |
| Teachers are feeling more responsibility for all students, especially with AYP focus for special education and low SES students). |
| Lingering Issues |
| The school continues to experience trouble with having enough staff to implement interventions. |
| The school conducts much “informal” on the job training for intervention implementation. Documentation of this training should be taking place to consider fidelity issues. |
| Continuity with using school-wide targeted interventions. |
| Questions to Consider |
| Are you tracking students into Tier 1, 2, 3? |
| Are you providing enough PD to ensure accurate implementation of the interventions? |
| Are you differentiating between tiers? |
| Is Tier 3 SPED or a replacement core? |
| What other resources (human or monetary) can you tap into to help with a lack of staff to deliver interventions? |
| Is anyone monitoring fidelity of implementation? |
| Special Education |
| Moving Forward |
| Participants continue to use data gathered from their RTI model when determining eligibility. |
| There is continued inclusion of SPED students even more in general education classes as much as possible. Further, there is a focus on where SPED students receive services based on data, not their SPED label. Teachers are more accepting of having SPED students included in GE. |
| Lingering Issues |
| The team reports wanting to understand “how RTI relates to special education” implementation of interventions. That is, how do schools utilize all resources in a building for both general and special education students? |
| Questions to Consider |
| Are you considering a co-teaching model for SPED students to increase access to LRE and GE curriculum? |

Longview

Mt. Solo Middle School Follow Up – Fall 2010

| Consensus/Leadership Building |
|---|
| Moving Forward |
| The team reports strong shared goals related to RTI implementation in the following areas: CASA, Priority Standards, and PLC work. |
| This is Year 3 for PLCs in the building, and data based decision making is regularly taking place. |
| The Reading and Writing PLCs have merged and divided into two language arts PLCs with goals to connect instructional and assessment practices in these areas. |
| Paraprofessionals are included in decision making and trainings to increase the effectiveness in their roles. |
| The team recognizes a need to support students beyond the middle school experience and collaborates with high schools to transition students, with particular emphasis on students who have been transitioned out of special education. |
| Lingering Issues |
| PLCs only have 30 minutes weekly to meet. The administration is trying to use the late arrival monthly so PLC groups can meet for 90 minutes monthly for more intense/comprehensive decision making meetings. Then they would use 30 min meetings for follow up sessions. |
| Questions to Consider |
| Have you talked with other middle schools to see how they successfully implement RTI and provide differentiated instruction? |
| Do you have a set “agenda/system” for making the PLC meetings the most efficient and effective? |
| Data Collection/Management |
| Moving Forward |
| Students in special education and/or receiving intensive services all have notebooks with data reflecting progress over time in areas identified as needing support, including behavior. |
| Leadership team took all the data and developed packages for each content group to use in PLCs. |
| Leadership team expects every PLC to address reading fluency as the team recognizes the impact of reading on student performance in all other content areas, including math. |
| In the fall, teams examine rosters from previous years with updated scores to have feedback on effectiveness of instruction in the following year (often an issue that in the spring, educators never end up seeing their student scores). |
| Lingering Issues |
| How to place students in the fall without new data remains a challenge. |
| The leadership team reports they still need to improve in use of diagnostic data. |
| Questions to Consider |
| Have you prioritized the sources of data to use for instructional decision making within classes? |
| Multi-tiered System of Instruction |
| Moving Forward |
| The leadership team is attending day 5 trainings for PBIS and they feel that they have solid foundational principles established across the building. |

Longview

Mt. Solo Middle School Follow Up – Fall 2010

| |
|---|
| While a number of students with severe behavior challenges enter their school, the leadership team feels that all staff fosters an atmosphere of support and positive expectations. |
| The team is considering adding Core Plus literacy. |
| Teachers are taking responsibility for monitoring progress of students in the 390-410 range on the MSP to be strategic/intentional with students near the pass/fail line. |
| All staff members are taking a role in working with strategic level students; even the school librarian is reading with students. |
| Lingering Issues |
| Remains a challenge to find ways of moving students across the tiers, as the building lacks intervention “groups” often seen in elementary. |
| Students identified as needing behavior support are pulled out regularly by an intervention/prevention specialist as dictated by the program; such practices detract from instructional time. |
| Questions to Consider |
| Have you looked at models of schedules that allow for differentiation of classes without taking an “instructional group” approach? |
| Special Education |
| Moving Forward |
| This month (October) the school exited three students out of special education. |
| The team reports continued low rates of special education referrals (2 were found eligible last year) and teachers are no longer saying “I want them tested.” |
| Progress of special education students is monitored frequently and available for all staff to review. |
| Lingering Issues |
| Many students transferring from other districts have expired IEPs or “wrong labels.” |
| Questions to Consider |
| Are rates of improvement the deciding factor for exiting from special education? |
| Do IEPs utilize goals based on progress monitoring tools? |

Odessa

Odessa Elementary Follow Up – Fall 2010

| Consensus/Leadership Building |
|--|
| Moving Forward |
| Superintendent Suellen White is recognized by the leadership team as responding to their concerns by providing increased time for PLCs. |
| Retired second grade teacher Bev Scherr has taken a part time job coordinating RTI efforts (and is recognized by the leadership team as putting many volunteer hours into data management). |
| Almost the entire staff attended the Richland RTI training and gained strong knowledge and perspective related to RTI. |
| Odessa was identified as a “School of Distinction” for high percentages of students passing the MSP/HSP. |
| Lingering Issues |
| The leadership team is interested in gaining more information regarding fidelity. |
| The site is still interested in PBIS and wants to find ways to begin training. |
| Reduced budgets for personnel continue to challenge implementation of Tier II interventions. |
| Questions to Consider |
| Are you sharing your successes with RTI and PLCs across elementary, middle, and high school? |
| Are you examining continued PD that may be gained through quality free modules (Vanderbilt, PBIS). |
| Data Collection/Management |
| Moving Forward |
| Training with Rebecca Zumeta helped the team identify assessments that might be utilized for benchmark and/or diagnostic assessment, including word recognition fluency and letter naming fluency. |
| The school has also added DIBELS math and is considering writing assessment over time. |
| Bev Scherr is now using the DIBELS data management system and is getting scores entered quickly for teachers to access. |
| The primary teachers (K-3) frequently review progress of students and work to monitor/adjust reading groups. Students are experiencing fluid movement between the Tiers. |
| Lingering Issues |
| Using data to guide instructional decisions in math is an area to prioritize for future PD. |
| Questions to Consider |
| With Bev utilizing many hours for data management/dissemination, is she documenting the time and job responsibilities to assure sustainability over time for this role? |
| Multi-tiered System of Instruction |
| Moving Forward |
| The district is focusing on full implementation of programs they currently own but had missing pieces. Many of their programs are identified as effective in research reviews, e.g., they are purchasing missing components of DISTAR to use as a Tier III intervention. |
| Leadership team/teachers report being pleased with how their instructional programs are working. |
| K-5 teachers attended a math workshop. |

Odessa

Odessa Elementary Follow Up – Fall 2010

| |
|---|
| 2 nd – 4 th continue to do Walk to Read; 1st grade continues to receive paraprofessional support for reading instruction, and groups are intact within the classroom. |
| Odessa has identified writing as an area of focus within the next few years. |
| New programs have been purchased for differentiation/supplemental instruction: Read Well II for 2 nd grade students exceeding progress and Fluency Foundations as remedial for 2nd grade. |
| The Special Education teacher has moved her classroom to the elementary building and thus is in closer proximity to provide support/consultation to regular education teachers. |
| Lingering Issues |
| Several grades continue to utilize double dose core instruction as standard protocol for supplemental instruction, might need diagnostic assessment to be linked to interventions. |
| Students in Tier III receive pull-out services that at times challenge scheduling. |
| Questions to Consider |
| How can you build sustainable supplemental programming with community resources/volunteers? |
| Special Education |
| Moving Forward |
| Regular education and special education teachers are working collaboratively to provide services to Tier III students; e.g., one student who is in special education is receiving exposure to non-disabled peers by participating in a lower grade general education classroom. |
| It's not clear how CBM data are used for special education eligibility decisions. |
| Lingering Issues |
| Special education is stretched to provide a continuum of services for students across PreK – high school classrooms. |
| Questions to Consider |
| Have you considered involving special education staff in rotating grade level PLCs? |

Odessa

Odessa Middle School Follow Up – Fall 2010

| Consensus/Leadership Building |
|--|
| Moving Forward |
| Superintendent Suellen White is recognized by the leadership team as responding to their concerns by providing increased time for PLCs. |
| Almost the entire staff attended the Richland RTI training and gained strong knowledge and perspective related to RTI. |
| Odessa was identified as a “School of Distinction” for high percentages of students passing the MSP/HSP. |
| Secondary staff developed common language and knowledge at the Richland training and is expressing interest in increased opportunities for training in RTI for Behavior (PBIS). |
| Lingering Issues |
| The site relies on direction from the RTI coordinator. |
| Questions to Consider |
| Have you considered having building level RTI leadership team meetings on a regular basis? |
| Data Collection/Management |
| Moving Forward |
| All students take the MAP and STAR testing three times/year. The IRI is administered via computer as well. |
| Bev Sherr’s role in data management/collection is a huge resource to all teachers. |
| With multiple assessments utilized at the middle school level, time efficiency is a factor considered as important in administration. |
| Report cards/progress reports are considered important sources of data; all students with Ds and Fs are monitored closely by departments. |
| Lingering Issues |
| The validity of some test scores is questioned due to poor motivation for success in benchmark assessment. |
| Questions to Consider |
| Have you considered involving students in data tracking? |
| Multi-tiered System of Instruction |
| Moving Forward |
| The English/Social Studies Middle School teacher and Spanish teacher/Remedial English teacher work collaboratively to provide creative instructional delivery based on data and provide flexible grouping for students. |
| Middle school is now responsible for instruction of 5 th graders, and 5 th /6 th grade students share a space in one building with strong access to the library from the English/Language Arts classroom. |
| Mental health counseling is provided one day/week. |
| Physical changes in the building have limited transition time and provide a buffer/division for 5 th /6 th graders from high school students. |
| Tier II interventions are described as “casual” in terms of delivery. |
| Goodness of fit in terms of student needs/behavior challenges are considered in classroom placement. |

Odessa

Odessa Middle School Follow Up – Fall 2010

| |
|---|
| Lingering Issues |
| Behavioral/motivation issues are perceived as preventing success with a few very visible students. |
| With the small staff numbers in the middle school, it is a challenge to provide targeted instruction. |
| Money is needed to building a reading library for 5 th graders (novels). |
| Questions to Consider |
| Do you have formalized PLCs working at the Middle School Level to guide instructional delivery of reading, math, and content areas? |
| How are you documenting instructional decision making and delivery of supplemental instruction at the middle school level? |
| Special Education |
| Moving Forward |
| The special education teacher continues to serve as a valuable resource/consultant to general education teachers. |
| Very few special education referrals have taken place. |
| Lingering Issues |
| Several students with more intense behavioral difficulties require intensive time from special education staff. |
| Questions to Consider |
| What training is provided to paraprofessionals in special education and how does the training align with building RTI goals? |

Richland

Chief Joseph Middle School Follow Up – Fall 2010

| Consensus/Leadership Building |
|---|
| Moving Forward |
| The Intervention Study Team attended training this fall at White Bluffs Elementary to review how the school is using data, including MAP data, MSP and benchmarking tools. They hope to implement a system similar to White Bluff beginning second quarter. |
| Chief Joseph MS has borrowed the protocol used by White Bluff's team for problem solving and they intend to expand upon it. According to the protocol, the teacher presents concern to the team, the team responds in a problem solving framework. A similar protocol is used in White River where six teachers attended a training this fall. |
| The Intervention Study Team is identifying staff that have not previously had opportunities to see the "big picture". They will be asked to participate in training. Prior to now, participation in training has been voluntary. |
| Training within the district includes 1) aligning curriculum, 2) identifying power standards, smart board training, 3) intra-district PLC work that is using webcams at various sites for staff to meet and collaborate, 4) development of a research model across the district including scope and sequence at the secondary level for librarians. |
| Vertical conversations are happening across the district to align curriculum and pacing in math and language arts. |
| Staff reports a more positive school-wide atmosphere. They have increased collaborative time and they are more confident that training is having an impact on practice. Collaborative time was implemented this year and it has allowed staff to discuss and review training information and begin to implement what they are learning. |
| Lingering Issues |
| The team reports that they are working toward a teacher-driven decision making process for scheduling students. Language Arts staff will be meeting soon to discuss movement within classes for tiered instruction. |
| Questions to Consider |
| Have vertical lines of communication and/or support (with the elementary school) been formalized; will they continue through the school year? |
| What systems are in place to allow student movement throughout the tiers? |
| Data Collection/Management |
| Moving Forward |
| Students in Tier 3 READ 180 classes are monitored weekly, or bi-weekly. Students are being monitored in Math by one staff person weekly. A meeting was being held the week of this visit to begin discussion about how students can move more fluidly within intervention(s)/classes. |
| The staff is engaging in conversations about how to successfully move students forward from Tier 3 instruction, which is replacement curriculum, to Tiers 1 and 2. A transition class has been developed to support these students. |
| PBIS committee, counselors, and the personal social responsibility teachers continue evaluating Make Your Day. They are looking at revising some of the language of the program to reflect the language in the original PBIS training. Second Step classes are taught by one teacher for 7 th and 8 th grade students. A sixth grade teacher teaches a guided study class with 19 students. Personal social responsibility classes are being taught to 37 students. |
| Collaborative problem solving meetings include conversations about MSP score, MAP data, attendance, discipline and how to facilitate movement between interventions. |

Richland

Chief Joseph Middle School Follow Up – Fall 2010

| |
|---|
| Lingering Issues |
| Having adequate time to collaborate to analyze data and make instructional decisions continues to be a challenge, though district-wide improvements have been made via the weekly early release days, teachers continue to report needing more time. |
| Questions to Consider |
| How are students moved from Tier 3 to Tiers 1 and/or 2, and how will they be supported in these classes? What criteria are used to determine that they are ready to transition? |
| Multi-tiered System of Instruction |
| Moving Forward |
| Interventions continue to be taught by both general and special educators. Many are teaching intervention classes, general classes, and accelerated classes over the course of the day. |
| Two special educators are teaching Tier 3 classes with both general and special education students. Tier 3 is using replacement curricula in math and language arts. |
| The team reports that more formative assessment strategies are being employed. GLAD strategies are being incorporated in core instruction; white boards are being used; staff is engaged in sharing more strategies between each other. |
| An “opt-out” route in place for parents to refuse interventions last year has been removed at the district level. |
| Students are more informed about their choices in how they test and perform in support classes. Students are asking how to get out of intervention classes and are setting goals for success. If they have passed some of the formative assessments (MAP testing) but did not pass MSP, they engage in conversations with staff about the possible reasons. Students are being taught to access Power School in class for extra credit and get reports to send home to parents. (Power school is a student information system.) |
| Weekly early release time is dedicated to examining what they want students to know, aligning curriculum, identifying power standards, planning for the students who passed the MAP testing but did not pass the MSP. |
| Staff worked hard this fall to insure the initial intervention placements were appropriate to reduce the movement and frustration at the beginning of the year and to target interventions earlier in the year. |
| Lingering Issues |
| Keeping parents aware of the interventions available for their students and their role in improving student performance. The staff is discussing how to use technology to educate families. They are also looking at strategies for increasing parents’ comfort in coming to the school. A family science night is one possibility. The staff is working on giving parents access to school computers if they do not have home access. |
| Questions to Consider |
| How is professional development aligned with teachers’ needs related to implementation and knowledge of interventions? |
| What strategies are being used to monitor fidelity of implementation? |
| Special Education |
| Moving Forward |
| Special educators continue to report more meaningful conversations with general education staff. They are working to standardize instructional materials and expectations district wide for their most disabled students. |
| This staff is expecting to enter in to more longitudinal conversations based on the notion that students are not |

Richland
Chief Joseph Middle School Follow Up – Fall 2010

| |
|--|
| being referred to special education at the elementary level because of all of the interventions that are in place. This staff anticipates the possibility of increased referrals for students who were not previously referred in spite of multiple interventions at the elementary level. |
| Lingering Issues |
| None reported. |
| Questions to Consider |
| Why does the staff anticipate more referrals for students who were not previously referred in the elementary school? |
| What is the special educator's role on the school leadership team? |

Richland Hanford High School Follow Up – Fall 2010

| Consensus/Leadership Building |
|---|
| Moving Forward |
| Professional Learning community time has been established district wide for Wednesday mornings. |
| Scheduling is still done primarily by the counselor and administrators. Special education teachers and other support teachers provide input for scheduling. |
| Schedule constraints are being “fine-tuned” to allow students to be placed in intervention classes for Math and Language Arts. |
| Departments break out during PLC time. All data for students (MAP scores, HSPE, student grades) is shared with staff during that time. |
| Some content areas are beginning to look at common assessments created by grade level classes. |
| The team suggests that more professional development is needed for school counselors around RTI |
| Lingering Issues |
| Most scheduling (actual scheduling-not placement decisions) decisions are still made by the administrators/counselors at this point. |
| Questions to Consider |
| What professional development opportunities planned for the staff? |
| Master schedules tend to drive student scheduling; however, is there a mechanism, system, or plan that might facilitate students’ move into and out of interventions? |
| Data Collection/Management |
| Moving Forward |
| All students in 9 th grade are MAP tested this year in the fall and spring. |
| Progress Monitoring is occurring in support classes in Language Arts using correct word sequences. There is a plan to capture data from an honors class and a general education class for comparison. |
| Math support classes are progress monitoring using correct digits and some of the content materials. |
| Language Arts progress monitoring is done by an educational assistant and teachers are informed of the results. |
| For math one teacher is progress monitoring weekly. Most other progress monitoring is done bi-weekly and one teacher is doing monthly progress monitoring. |
| Read 180 provides lexile score. |
| Team reports that they are getting a clearer picture of what “Tier One” kids look like. |
| Lingering Issues |
| Time to collaborate is in place but it is unclear how much of that time is devoted to instructional decision making or to what extent data is driving instructional decisions. |
| Questions to Consider |
| Who is administering the assessments and does this help teachers learn how to use data? |
| Are there upcoming PD opportunities to increase teachers’ understanding of data and its use to drive instruction? |
| While time to collaborate is in place, what strategies can be implemented to better structure this time? |

Richland Hanford High School Follow Up – Fall 2010

| Multi-tiered System of Instruction |
|---|
| Moving Forward |
| Movement between interventions is still constrained by master scheduling and semester systems. |
| Tier 3 math is at the pre-Algebra level. |
| ALEKS math has been put in place this year. Other interventions include Fast Math and Do the Math. |
| Some students with IEP's participate in the Tier 2 support classes. Others are in Tier 3 Pre-Algebra. |
| System 44 and Read 180 are being used for some students' Language Arts interventions and Social Studies instruction. |
| Support classes are capped at 24 students. |
| Lingering Issues |
| Scheduling remains difficult because of the master schedule restrictions. |
| Questions to Consider |
| Has the initiation of new interventions led to improved student outcomes? |
| Having 24 students in a support class can be challenging to teachers. Are there plans and/or resources to lower class sizes or to provide support class teachers with additional support or training? Can intervention support be incorporated into Tier 1 so that fewer students require additional support? |
| Special Education |
| Moving Forward |
| Special education was represented during this meeting by the building psychologist. He has supported the Educational Assistant who does the progress monitoring. |
| MDT staffing is every Monday afternoon. The counselor sets up the team meeting and pulls together the necessary staff. |
| There have been five referrals for evaluation this year. The hypothesis is that through continuing support classes at lower levels, referrals will be reduced or eliminated. |
| Students can be exited from specific goal areas if they meet standard. |
| Lingering Issues |
| None reported. |
| Questions to Consider |
| Is special education staff represented on the leadership teams? |

Richland White Bluffs Elementary Follow Up – Fall 2010

| Consensus/Leadership Building |
|---|
| Moving Forward |
| The Learning Improvement Team is guiding the School Improvement Plan and meets once a month. |
| The Instructional Support Team meets Tuesdays, Thursdays, and a third day a week as needed. A formal protocol has been developed to manage both the time and content of the meetings and to help identify areas of strengths and concerns for student profiles being presented. |
| The RTI staff readiness survey conducted last spring will be repeated in Spring 2011 and will serve as a benchmark tool. |
| Common block time continues this year. PLC time is during early-release time on Fridays in addition to the common block planning. |
| Built-in PLC time, which has been in place for several years, now incorporates training (on a voluntary basis) for how to use the PLC time more effectively. |
| Para-professional training continues as needed. Up front review and training on three new programs occurred at the beginning of the year and is reviewed as needed. Teachers (trained last year on interventions) have not reviewed trainings this year. |
| Paras are assigned students by intervention and skill base. Paras are beginning to attend PLC meetings to deliver student information in a “speed dating” fashion as a means of improving communication. |
| Increased enrollment has stretched their interveners more thinly so that classroom teachers are taking more responsibility for interventions. |
| A new intervention specialist is in place this year who has taught in the building since the site was opened. A new principal is in place this year as well. It appears that momentum has continued in spite of personnel changes. |
| Parents continue to be informed about RTI efforts through newsletters and the website. Parents were informed of staff survey results. |
| Lingering Issues |
| School enrollment is up this year to nearly 800 students. The staff reports there are more students with more intensive needs enrolled that make providing appropriate interventions more challenging. |
| Questions to Consider |
| Do teachers need additional training in anything? How do you determine who needs training and which training is most needed? |
| How do you plan to meet the needs of more students who are requiring intensive interventions (besides strengthening Tier 1)? Do you anticipate access to more funding to acquire new personnel? Materials? |
| Data Collection/Management |
| Moving Forward |
| A comprehensive data collection system is in place. Students are assigned by a point system to indicate intensity of interventions required. |
| MAP scores are used to monitor student progress. |
| Staff is more “in-tune” with students who are “green or blue” but do not maintain trend lines over time. They report thinking more strategically over time to support students who are “riding the trend line.” |
| Staff reports much more use of longitudinal data in their decision making. They assert that all students must |

Richland

White Bluffs Elementary Follow Up – Fall 2010

| |
|--|
| grow at least a year's growth within a year. (Not just strategic and intensive students, but benchmark and advanced students as well.) |
| Teachers are scoring their own AIMSweb benchmarks this year for math. 4 th grade has developed some grade level pre-assessments for math. Math Benchmarks have been identified district-wide. |
| Data reporting sheets are prepared for parents at conference time and are used for parents to assist in planning interventions. |
| SWIS data continues to be collected. The school counselor and school psych are using this data to build skill streaming groups who receive discreet behavior instruction weekly. School wide behavior expectations are being pre-taught. "Specials teachers (Art, Music, PE)" are tracking behavior data during PLC time and using the PBIS data to design interventions for students. This makes for improved communication between these teachers and the regular staff. Students with these specific needs are getting staff "mentors." |
| Pre-school data is moving forward. P-3 planning is in place and pre-school teachers are included in professional training. |
| Lingering Issues |
| Changing enrollment boundaries and student populations continue to challenge the systems in place. |
| Questions to Consider |
| Is scoring their own benchmarks helping teachers understand students' needs better? |
| Since boundaries are changing, are you communicating with any new feeder schools on a regular basis? |
| Multi-tiered System of Instruction |
| Moving Forward |
| Intervention programs continue to expand based on identified student needs. Corrective Reading, Reading Mastery, Rewards, Read Well, Soar to Success, Earobics, quick reads, Phonics for Readers. New this year is Step up to Writing. Do the Math, Interventions that go with the Envisions Curriculum, Fast Math and Math Whiz are being used in math. |
| The school had a goal of starting interventions on the first day of school for this year. They report that they started their interventions on day nine. |
| Intervention group sizes remain 1-5 students for Tier 2 and 3. |
| Math interventions occur before school and at lunch. Parents continue supporting interventions at some grade levels and provide support through home access to math programs on the internet. |
| Teachers are much more thoughtful about all students (because they are looking at each child's data rather than trends of the group), including those students who are at Benchmark or above and plan for all students to grow over the course of the year. There is a sharper focus on those students who are considered "on the bubble." |
| Increased school population requires classroom teachers to assume more responsibility for planning and delivering interventions in the gen. ed. classroom (Tier 2). (Previously, they were able to rely on paraprofessionals to deliver interventions.) |
| Staff conversations focus on the "rate of increase" in performance for all students. Previously, they had not looked at rate of increase; they only looked at raw scores. They are now using trend lines and plotting their data accordingly. |
| Teachers score their own AIMSweb benchmarks. |
| Student data is shared with parents at conference time and parents are encouraged to assist in the support planning for their students. |

Richland White Bluffs Elementary Follow Up – Fall 2010

| |
|---|
| All staff has been trained in PBIS. Staff participates in pre-teaching school wide behavior. Data is managed through SWIS. |
| PLC time for specials staff (Art, Music, Health and Fitness) is devoted to looking at behavior data. This staff is monitoring students and building mentoring plans for these students. They make special interventions for students identified with behavior issues during their class time. |
| Lingering Issues |
| When asked if anyone is monitoring fidelity, the response was that the RTI Coach/Coordinator oversees that work. She has also created an intricate spread sheet to help determine the extent of intervention each student requires. |
| Questions to Consider |
| Is additional professional development being offered to teachers since they are having to assume more responsibility for planning and delivering interventions? Is this PD on specific intervention programs and/or how to differentiate within their classroom? |
| Is anyone monitoring fidelity of implementation of interventions? |
| Are teachers making better instructional decisions because they are scoring their own benchmarks? |
| Special Education |
| Moving Forward |
| Special education “delivery” is flexible and delivered through-out the tiers. (There is no resource room teacher or model within this school.) |
| They continue to use a discrepancy model, but they also incorporate data gathered from having an RTI approach in place. |
| There is no formal special education “program”. Students with IEP’s are monitored by staff. Specially designed instruction is fulfilled through interventions in various tiers. |
| The new Intervention Specialist manages the intervention plans for the 23 students who have IEPs. There are 20 students identified for ELL services also managed by the Intervention Specialist. |
| Lingering Issues |
| The staff continues to struggle with the question of “Why refer students for special education at all, since they get the accommodations and instruction they require?” |
| What are appropriate accommodations for students when taking MSP? Is this question really a 504 question? |
| Questions to Consider |
| If special education is being “delivered throughout the tiers”, are students really receiving the proper services? |
| Who can answer these questions that you listed in the section above? |

Shoreline Einstein Middle School Follow Up – Fall 2010

| Consensus/Leadership Building |
|--|
| Moving Forward |
| Building staff decided to use high impact monies to restructure their study skills period along more RTI-aligned principles. |
| Social Studies teachers receiving PD in how to develop valid and reliable assessments. This includes how to develop common assessments. |
| Counselors reported that initially (a year ago) they had done “most of the work” and, at the first meeting with the evaluator, were exhausted. They said much has changed and teachers were really “jumping on board.” |
| Lingering Issues |
| RTI leadership team is still primarily counselor driven. |
| Questions to Consider |
| Would involving more staff in RTI leadership increase RTI activity? |
| Data Collection/Management |
| Moving Forward |
| RTI Coach is working with PRIDE classes to set up progress monitoring during PRIDE. (PRIDE is the name used for intervention classes.) |
| All Math teachers are using Easy-CBM data. |
| Math Department has created a series of common assessments. |
| Reading teachers are required to collect data monthly on student’s reading (Lexile scores). This is used to track progress. |
| Teachers are starting to use 1-3 Writes for Written Expression Curriculum Based Measurement (WE-CBM) as screening tool. |
| Lingering Issues |
| None reported. |
| All departments are in a different place in terms of common assessment development. These are not in place in literacy. |
| Questions to Consider |
| What systems can be put in place to track the implementation of RTI? Changes in student outcomes? Would school calendars and timelines help? How and when is the data collected being used? |
| Multi-tiered System of Instruction |
| Moving Forward |
| School continued to refine/develop pathways for reading and math. |
| School is developing pathway for good standing and behavior. |
| Teachers asked to keep their own core students during PRIDE intervention. This has decreased the number of failing students. |
| Teachers have increased intervention options during the school day. |
| Teachers have decreased the emphasis on work completion during the PRIDE time and increased opportunities |

Shoreline

Einstein Middle School Follow Up – Fall 2010

| |
|---|
| for instruction - some students are placed 3 days a week in literacy interventions, for example. PRIDE time is provided 3 days a week. |
| SPED has been delivering interventions during PRIDE time. SPED teachers are teamed up with Gen. Ed. Teachers. (Building elected to use their “high impact” monies to support this). |
| Students in SPED receive core instruction and an additional period of support. |
| School has developed a system so that students can move between PRIDE classes and working lunch in a more seamless way, while providing the teacher with information on what the student needs support with. |
| School has implemented a behavioral intervention for 15 students who struggle with organization and need adult connection. There is a plan to re-evaluate this at the trimester. Students are identified by teacher referral. |
| There has been a decrease in the number of self-contained special education classes. |
| Lingering Issues |
| Assumptions were made that teachers were adjusting curriculum (in literacy) based on data, but no one was sure. No one checks to see if instruction is altered based on the data. |
| Questions to Consider |
| Will the high impact monies be available next year? Are there plans on what to do if this isn’t available? |
| What can be done to support development of core instruction? |
| Are any systems set up to conduct fidelity of implementation? |
| Special Education |
| Moving Forward |
| SPED playing a more active role in intervention delivery that is aligned with gen. ed. Initiatives (See Multi-Tier). |
| SPED Department has a representative on the District Leadership team. |
| SPED teachers are embedded within each Department to encourage collaboration. They are aligning curriculum and using common assessments. |
| Lingering Issues |
| No discussion of data teams beyond traditional IEP teams. |
| Questions to Consider |
| How can SPED staff expertise be more integrated into the building RTI model? Is the collaboration working? |

Shoreline Parkside Elementary Follow Up – Fall 2010

| Consensus/Leadership Building |
|--|
| Moving Forward |
| PD will be provided on how to apply RTI principles and processes in math. |
| Switch to school-wide Title 1 status has been seen as a positive because it will allow for greater focus of all students' instructional needs. |
| Extensive PD is being provided, by the district, for new Math and Writing curricula. |
| Teachers completed PD in Vocabulary (Word Wired). |
| PD in Reading Comprehension was provided for the staff before school (Marzano's Strategies that Work). |
| Reading coach is a huge asset. She helps with PD and the development of materials for interventions, which is greatly appreciated by the teachers. |
| Staff appears to have moved beyond the "Buy In" stage. They are working to solve problems with implementation. |
| Many departments are planning to attend an upcoming workshop on "differentiated instruction". |
| Teachers are being provided with clock hours for the PLC work. They find this motivating. |
| Leadership is establishing a partnership with the Center for Human Services to support struggling students. This is in the very beginning stages and details are not yet available. |
| Lingering Issues |
| Staff has concerns about the number of meetings. |
| Staff is concerned that specialists spend their time in meetings, rather than providing direct services to students. Principal does not see this as a problem, but does plan to address staff's concerns. |
| Teachers feel they have been pulled from the classroom a great deal this year for PD. |
| The principal is creative with funding and is banking money from this year to be used next year to continue the release time for data sharing and other RTI activities. Without this funding, they are not sure how they can continue with implementation. |
| Questions to Consider |
| How can you help staff make the connection between collaboration meetings, intervention planning and student learning? Would frameworks for collaboration time be helpful? |
| Data Collection/Management |
| Moving Forward |
| The school added a progress monitoring meeting that happens every six weeks and teams are given a full day to review data. This is in addition to the 3x a year benchmarking meetings that had been occurring. |
| Teachers have been taught how to use EXCEL to graph their progress monitoring data. They are graphing progress monitoring data and including "aim-lines" in their graphs. Some teachers are doing their own progress monitoring. |
| Teachers are using their PM data at meetings, and have been grouping based on PM results. |
| Data dashboard is seen as useful for the teachers. (Contains student assignments, lexile scores, MSP scores, and other "data"). |

Shoreline Parkside Elementary Follow Up – Fall 2010

| |
|---|
| Lingering Issues |
| Teachers feel that diagnostic assessments are still needed in both reading and math. |
| Teachers recognize a need for a vocabulary screener and progress monitoring of vocabulary. |
| Teachers are struggling to use the QRI as a tool for progress monitoring. |
| Easy CBM seems sensitive at 6 th grade for screening, but may not be helpful for progress monitoring. |
| Questions to Consider |
| What are the effects on validity and reliability of modifying the QRI? The QRI seems to have been modified for use as a comprehension tool. |
| Would MAZE CBMs for comprehension progress monitoring address this need? |
| Multi-tiered System of Instruction |
| Moving Forward |
| Shift to Title 1 School Wide model has provided flexibility in staffing and scheduling, as well as additional resources. |
| Students are being moved between classrooms and interventions more fluidly with the shift to school wide. They do this at the trimesters. |
| New curriculum in both Math and Writing that staff is hopeful will strengthen core instruction. |
| Principal is emphasizing fidelity of implementation of new curriculum. |
| Teachers have expanded/reorganized their blocking schedule (K-2 block, 3-4, and 5 th). |
| They are using heterogeneous grouping for math core instruction. |
| Many teachers had been employing Marzano's strategies for reading comprehension (based on recent PD). The building is focusing on a new strategy each week. |
| Lingering Issues |
| Students who are below benchmark do not necessarily get additional intervention time. |
| Teachers and Principal said they needed to increase their "treasure trove of interventions". |
| Questions to Consider |
| Is there a way to provide additional support or intervention time for students that continue to be below benchmark? |
| Is there a plan for implementation, including who and when interventions are conducted? |
| Special Education |
| Moving Forward |
| Schools has begun including SPED, Title I, and ELL teachers into the data team sharing meeting time. |
| Teachers are using their progress monitoring data during SST meetings. |
| Referrals to SPED have decreased (principal felt this) (See lingering issues). |

Shoreline
Parkside Elementary Follow Up – Fall 2010

| |
|--|
| Lingering Issues |
| SST referrals have risen drastically and interventions from the team have increased. |
| Special Education is considered Tier 3. Still is not clear how SPED resource room staff is used. |
| Questions to Consider |
| How can SPED involvement be more streamlined into building RTI initiatives? |

Shoreline

Shorecrest High School Follow Up – Fall 2010

| Consensus/Leadership Building |
|--|
| Moving Forward |
| All school staff participated in RTI training in the Spring (Steve Hirsch) and again before school started. |
| School continues to use goals established at last year's accreditation to guide RTI work (Goal 1 focused on curriculum and assessment and Goal 2 focused on decreasing failure and drop out rates). |
| RTI Leadership working on taking a leadership role at the building level. Leadership team includes counselor, Vice Principal, and several general education teachers. |
| Teachers elected to change their schedule to provide intervention time (See Multi-tiers). |
| Counselors from all of the district schools are working together to create common inservices. |
| PD for the staff was provided with Patt Quinn on behavior. |
| Lingering Issues |
| RTI is still in the beginning stages. |
| Questions to Consider |
| What are the plans for RTI next steps? How can you use district staff and resources to support building efforts? |
| Data Collection/Management |
| Moving Forward |
| School continues to work on common assessments across departments. |
| Teachers are using failing grades as an indicator. |
| PLCs are meeting 2-3x a month. RTI Leadership team will be supporting an emphasis on common assessment. |
| Lingering Issues |
| There is not much solid data. |
| There is a need to move forward on the development of power standards and common assessments. |
| There has been pushback from the staff in terms of creating common assessments because there is a plan to align assessments across the two high schools in the next several years and teachers are reluctant to invest time in something that may be obsolete in the very near future. |
| Questions to Consider |
| What kind of data do you need to show student learning? How can you collect this? |
| Is there a way to facilitate conversations between the two high schools now? |
| Multi-tiered System of Instruction |
| Moving Forward |
| Intervention initiatives such as a peer tutoring program are up and running and showing positive results. |
| Implemented hard copy planners and all teachers are using time at the end of each period to have students mark assignments. |

Shoreline

Shorecrest High School Follow Up – Fall 2010

| |
|---|
| <p>A big change is the use of the TAP period. Previously it had been a study hall and it was not mandatory. It has been restructured into a 30 minute intervention time. All teachers are involved (school wide) and students who are failing or need support are referred to the teacher assigned to provide additional instruction. Peers are serving as tutors during this time as well.</p> |
| <p>There is partnering with the National Honor Society to increase options for high performing students. For example, these students are now tutoring other students to meet NHS requirements. There are currently about 100 tutors.</p> |
| <p>School has added classes in Read 180, and extended it beyond 9th grade.</p> |
| <p>Students in SPED receive core and an additional SPED class. SPED is Tier 3.</p> |
| <p>Teachers have blocked the math class so that struggling students have two classes of Algebra 1.</p> |
| <p>They have expanded SIOP class to include World History and BIO.</p> |
| <p>Lingering Issues</p> |
| <p>School is beginning to look at the behavioral applications of RTI.</p> |
| <p>Questions to Consider</p> |
| <p>How can data be used to show the impact of these initiatives? What data can you use?</p> |
| <p style="text-align: center;">Special Education</p> |
| <p>Moving Forward</p> |
| <p>None reported.</p> |
| <p>Lingering Issues</p> |
| <p>Special Education is still operating with historic paradigm of SPED. They are not really involved in RTI initiatives.</p> |
| <p>Questions to Consider</p> |
| <p>What PD is needed for SPED staff so that they can also be part of the RTI initiatives? Is there a SPED representative on your leadership team?</p> |
| <p>Is any data used from interventions classes or CBMs to help determine SPED eligibility (although it is rare to have referrals at this level)?</p> |

Stevenson/Carson

Stevenson/Carson Elementary Follow Up – Fall 2010

| Consensus/Leadership Building |
|---|
| Moving Forward |
| The Reading Task Force developed a PowerPoint presentation to describe the RTI system in reading in grades K-6. The document explains the purpose, leadership structures, assessment, student grouping, and curriculum in the RTI system. It has been presented to the school board and the staff. |
| Reading Street was adopted as the new core reading curriculum. This is the first year of its implementation. Teachers have had two days of professional development on Reading Street. Paraprofessionals were not included, although they have received some training from teachers. |
| Special education staff received training on Reading Mastery. |
| This year students remain in the regular classroom for core, strategic, and some intensive reading instruction. Staff “push in” this year rather than serving students in “pull out”. |
| ENVoY training in classroom management was provided for all teachers this year. A coach comes monthly to each school to reinforce initial training. This effort is moving the positive behavior program that was begun last year into the classroom. Teachers report the training and coaching have made a huge difference. |
| The Reading Task Force plan says the district has set some parameters for the RTI system, but within it grade level teams will be given more autonomy after demonstrating three years of student growth, with specific criteria to be determined by the principal. |
| Collaboration between the classroom teacher and paraprofessionals has improved because of the change from a pull-out to an in-class service delivery model, which has increased communication. |
| Communication between teachers and paraprofessionals is scheduled weekly in Stevenson and worked out on an individual basis weekly at Carson. |
| Lingering Issues |
| Ensuring all staff (including paraprofessionals) get adequate training in interventions. |
| Questions to Consider |
| Are there plans to train paraprofessionals who deliver instruction using Reading Street on the new curriculum? |
| If grade levels are given more autonomy is there a danger that the system might be less consistent between grade levels for students? |
| Data Collection/Management |
| Moving Forward |
| Students continue to be screened three times a year using DIBELS K-3 and MAPS 4-6. |
| Teachers (designated case managers) progress monitor their own students, with the exception of those students receiving intensive interventions. Stevenson monitors all students once a month using DIBELS. Students who are progressing well and may need to be moved up may be monitored more often. |
| Carson progress monitors all 3 rd grade students monthly. Staff monitors intensive or strategic students in grades 4-6 once a month using DIBELS. |
| The RTI Reading Plan states that the classroom teacher as case manager will provide evidence of student progress to the principal monthly. This will be acceptable in any format which meets this goal. |
| The MDM (monthly data meeting) by grade level occurs every 6 weeks. |

Stevenson/Carson

Stevenson/Carson Elementary Follow Up – Fall 2010

| |
|---|
| Lingering Issues |
| Data teams for behavior at both schools have not yet met this year. |
| SWIS data is being entered but is not being examined systematically. |
| Questions to Consider |
| Does there need to be a fixed schedule for teams to consider data on behavior? |
| Is the data examined by teams to determine evidence of student movement between tiers? |
| Would it be effective to standardize the format for reporting student progress to the principal? |
| Are you providing PD to address teachers' understanding of using data to drive instruction? |
| Multi-tiered System of Instruction |
| Moving Forward |
| Several of the teachers stated that they are very satisfied with the introduction of Reading Street as the core curriculum. They are impressed with its emphasis on oral language skills and said that they now have a curriculum that addresses multiple levels of reading instruction. |
| The target of the reading program is 90 minutes of reading instruction for all students. Writing occurs in addition to the reading block. |
| The lowest 10% of students are being served in reading in a replacement core, Reading Mastery, for 120 minutes per day. Most, but not all, of this group are students who are on IEPs. |
| Core, strategic and some intensive students are served in the regular curriculum in the general education classroom with additional staff "pushed in". |
| Up to 15% of the students (with the exception of special education students) receive an additional, supplemental 30 minutes of instruction, targeted to specific need. A number of programs targeting specific skills are used for the supplemental reading period, according to individual student need. |
| Strategic or intensive students have the opportunity to receive an extra 40 minutes after school, if parents can arrange transportation. WA Reading Corps staff provides the instruction using LEXIA materials. It is up to grade level teams to determine whether they extend the opportunity to strategic or intensive students. |
| A Tier 1 behavior program was developed last year. Expectations for behavior in commons areas was defined and a positive behavior reward system was implemented with students, rewarding compliance to PAW LAWS with BARK cards. Student expectations are to be taught/reviewed three times this year at Carson. The principal at Stevenson works with each classroom several times a year to teach expectations. |
| Lingering Issues |
| Although the school has fidelity checklists for some of the programs, fidelity is not being monitored systematically. Teachers feel that it is too early in the adoption cycle to monitor fidelity. |
| An area the team intends to consider is using the core curriculum vs. specific intervention programs to teach students who receive the extra 30 minutes at the strategic level. They feel that the students have difficulty transitioning back into the core program when they are taught with different materials. They intend to wait until they have more experience with Reading Street before they make those decisions. |
| The positive behavior program is continuing at Tier 1 with expectations being taught to students, but has not progressed further. Data is being recorded but not examined systematically. |

Stevenson/Carson
Stevenson/Carson Elementary Follow Up – Fall 2010

| |
|---|
| Questions to Consider |
| Could fidelity monitoring with feedback increase staff knowledge and competence with both the new and old programs? |
| Is there evidence in the data of student movement between groups? |
| Progress on behavior may have been lost due to focus on adopting a new reading program. Do some routines need to be implemented to support the systematic evaluation of the positive behavior support program? |
| Special Education |
| Moving Forward |
| They are still primarily using IQ/discrepancy model to determine SPED eligibility; however, they are first examining documentation/data gathered from their RTI model before any IQ testing is critical to process. |
| Lingering Issues |
| Special education did not appear to be involved in the RTI leadership group. |
| The percentage of students receiving special education is above the state average. |
| Questions to Consider |
| Are your number of SPED referrals continuing to decline? |

Stevenson/Carson

Stevenson/Carson High School Follow Up – Fall 2010

| Consensus/Leadership Building |
|--|
| Moving Forward |
| <p>SCHS planned for implementation of a three-tiered behavior RTI system last year. This is the first year of implementation of a Tier 1 school-wide positive behavior system. Blue “Bulldog Pride” slips awarded to students for positive behavior rewards are evident in the hallway. The slips are used in drawings on Friday for prizes and for a student of the month who gets a prized parking place. Bulldog Pride slips also go into each student’s portfolio for senior year.</p> |
| <p>Last summer two days of training were conducted for all staff by the current Principal using the Randy Sprick Safe and Civil Schools training DVDs.</p> |
| <p>Last week the whole staff determined together what are acceptable behaviors for common areas, assemblies, hallways, cafeteria, bathrooms, etc. They plan to start discussing it with students.</p> |
| <p>Another professional development effort that relates to behavior in the classroom is ENVoY training. The focus of the training is on instructional and management strategies in the classroom. The whole district participated in the training. A coach comes to the HS once a month to observe and give feedback to the teachers. The coach has come to the school three times since the initial training in the summer.</p> |
| <p>This year the campus has been closed for the first time at lunch.</p> |
| <p>A student privileges committee has been formed, due to the students’ reaction to the closed campus. The group has met twice. It is composed of students, teachers, administration, parents and school board members. The purpose of the committee is how to reward students who make good choices around attendance, tardies, and academics. One outcome of the committee has been the district providing half of the funding to re-instate a “rooter bus” for off-campus events.</p> |
| Lingering Issues |
| <p>Three of the five members of last year’s RTI building leadership team are still at the school. This is the first time this team has met this year.</p> |
| Questions to Consider |
| <p>Have more staff members bought into the RTI effort as a result of the school-wide positive behavior reward system and increased professional development?</p> |
| <p>How often should the RTI leadership team meet, and what information should be considered?</p> |
| <p>Do additional staff members need to be added to the RTI leadership team?</p> |
| <p>When does information need to be shared with the whole staff vs. the leadership team?</p> |
| Data Collection/Management |
| Moving Forward |
| <p>The team meets at least once a month to talk about data on discipline. The data is collected on the SWIS system.</p> |
| <p>Referrals have gone up this year. The team feels that it is due to the more consistent school-wide targeting of some student behaviors by the staff.</p> |
| <p>Tardies are still a focus for the school, and they are now able to compare this year’s experience to the baseline last year.</p> |
| <p>Last year the staff was not consistent in documenting behavior referrals. This year, with the addition of a part-time assistant principal, referrals are more consistent and documented in a timely manner.</p> |

Stevenson/Carson

Stevenson/Carson High School Follow Up – Fall 2010

| |
|--|
| <p>Before winter break the team plans to administer the Benchmarks of Quality survey to the team and some of the staff to indicate progress made on implementing the positive behavior plan. Last year two staff members completed it.</p> |
| <p>Lingering Issues</p> |
| <p>The team feels they need to revisit what is a minor and major referral, and review what needs to be handled by a teacher or by an administrator. The administrator is currently handling both minor and major discipline referrals.</p> |
| <p>Questions to Consider</p> |
| <p>What conclusions can the team draw from behavior data collected this school year?</p> |
| <p>What does the Benchmarks of Quality indicate about which structures are established and which are not?</p> |
| <p>Is there some confusion about the purpose and composition of several leadership groups?</p> |
| <p style="text-align: center;">Multi-tiered System of Instruction</p> |
| <p>Moving Forward</p> |
| <p>The team is beginning to problem solve around the “frequent flier” students, and involving appropriate staff members. They feel that has been helpful.</p> |
| <p>The focus this year is on developing PBIS in Tier 1. The district is exploring options to develop Tier 2 and Tier 3.</p> |
| <p>The assistant principal and an interventionist have developed consistent responses to students who have numerous tardies.</p> |
| <p>A consultant from OSPI (Rebecca Zumeta) is coming to the district tomorrow to help develop some screening of students who have emotional problems (such as depression) but do not exhibit overt behaviors.</p> |
| <p>Lingering Issues</p> |
| <p>Currently, only one tier of positive behavior support is in place in SCHS.</p> |
| <p>Questions to Consider</p> |
| <p>Is there evidence that training and coaching in the ENVoY model are improving student engagement in class?</p> |
| <p>Should minor discipline infractions be handled by the classroom teacher?</p> |
| <p>How is the school involved in the district consideration of Tier 2 and Tier 3 interventions in behavior?</p> |
| <p style="text-align: center;">Special Education</p> |
| <p>Moving Forward</p> |
| <p>Enrollment in Special Education has declined, but it is hard to tell if it is significant, due to the low number of students involved.</p> |
| <p>Students who are referred for Special Education have more data available for the referral team to consider.</p> |
| <p>Lingering Issues</p> |
| <p>The HS does get referrals for special education. Most referrals have a behavioral component.</p> |
| <p>Questions to Consider</p> |
| <p>Should a Special Education representative be added to the RTI leadership team?</p> |

Stevenson/Carson

Wind River Middle School Follow Up – Fall 2010

| Consensus/Leadership Building |
|---|
| Moving Forward |
| The building has progressed from focusing on student behavior in common areas to focusing on teacher/student management in the classroom and bus driver/student behavior on the bus. |
| All teachers in the district participated in ENVoY training last summer. The focus of the training is instructional strategies and classroom management, emphasizing consistent nonverbal cues for management. A coach visits the building once a month to observe and provide feedback for the teachers. |
| Bus drivers have been trained on the transportation curriculum of Randy Sprick's Foundations. |
| ENVoY training has promoted common language and consistent management cues to students and teachers throughout the district. |
| The district has policies in place regarding Response to Intervention in academics in the district. |
| Lingering Issues |
| Tardies are the number one referral issue. |
| Questions to Consider |
| Does a special education representative need to be added to the leadership team? |
| How will you increase parent understanding and participation? |
| Data Collection/Management |
| Moving Forward |
| The discipline referral form has been modified to conform to the SWIS database requirements. The behavior reflection form has been dropped because it was redundant. |
| Normally major office discipline referrals generate parent contact, and minor referrals do not. However, the principal sometimes makes a judgment to contact parents when minors warrant it. |
| Discipline data is shared with the whole staff because the school is small (eleven teachers). |
| The principal and interventionist/advocate look at discipline data frequently. The principal keeps her own log of discipline data, in order to include more details than SWIS allows. |
| Discipline referrals from transportation are down this year. |
| The team feels that teachers have a good understanding of what constitutes majors and minors. |
| Lingering Issues |
| The staff needs to be consistent in filling out the referral form, so that information can be gathered on other behaviors. |
| Questions to Consider |
| What positive reinforcement do students receive? |
| Does the school or team need to look at additional behaviors? |
| Multi-tiered System of Instruction |
| Moving Forward |
| A Tier 1 system of RTI in behavior has been developed for common areas and classroom behavior. |

Stevenson/Carson Wind River Middle School Follow Up – Fall 2010

| |
|---|
| A Tier 2 system is operating, led by the student advocate, but it is informal at this time. |
| A Second Step curriculum is being implemented with students. |
| A student assistance problem-solving team meets bi-weekly to consider interventions for individual students. It is not restricted to students with IEPs. |
| Implementation of Tier 3 interventions will be up to the school; not district-mandated. |
| There are “Gateways” classes to focus on students who are behind in reading and math. The classes have existed for years. The screening is based on MAPS and MSP data. It is not considered part of the RTI system. The reading class has only seven students this year, fewer than previous years. |
| Lingering Issues |
| Wind River has only Tier 1 in behavior developed, so there has been no movement between tiers. |
| The staff may need more professional development about Tier 2 and Tier 3 interventions. |
| Questions to Consider |
| What does the data say that may indicate what Tier 2 and 3 interventions are necessary? |
| Would there be fewer students identified for Special Education if more academic interventions were available? |
| Should the Gateways classes become part of the RTI system in academics? |
| Special Education |
| Moving Forward |
| Initial referrals for Special Education are declining at the MS. |
| Lingering Issues |
| The team reported that the majority of referrals come from Special Education. |
| Fifteen per cent of the student population at the MS is in Special Education. Two years ago it was 9%. |
| Questions to Consider |
| What does the data indicate about these referrals? Does it indicate the need for some change in curriculum or management within the Special Education program? |

Vancouver

Gaiser Middle School Follow Up – Fall 2010

| Consensus/Leadership Building |
|--|
| Moving Forward |
| RTI specialist Mike Mattos is conducting RTI training for the district on Saturday Nov. 13 th and it is open to all staff. All staff is encouraged to go and the literacy specialist thinks the administrators are planning to attend. |
| The literacy specialist is participating in another RTI book study (Enhancing RTI) with fellow literacy specialists at all levels. She questions how they can talk about <i>enhancing</i> RTI when she doesn't feel they even have it in place yet. |
| Lingering Issues |
| Communication from the district continues to be minimal in regards to implementing RTI at the secondary level. The literacy specialist noted that the district is trying to make efforts with the literacy specialists but unfortunately, not the actual building administrators. She feels that she can "do RTI in her classroom" but information on RTI needs to be distributed to more staff and key people to make it work building wide. |
| Scheduling continues to be an issue although they have been able to be more flexible in some areas such as creating a 3 period core block in which those students receive reading, writing and social studies instruction using Avid strategies. They also were able to create an intensive social studies class which has a teacher as well as an instructional assistant. |
| Questions to Consider |
| Is PD offered regarding implementation of RTI at the secondary level, available interventions, and specific training for teachers to implement the intervention, and ways to make data based instructional decisions? Specifically, are building leaders participating in RTI book studies or professional development opportunities? |
| Would there be value in having teachers and administrators share acquired knowledge from trainings with staff during professional development meetings? |
| What strategies can be implemented to help standardize "RTI language" (e.g., Tier 1, progress monitoring) and to increase awareness of current interventions and assessments that are aligned with an RTI framework? |
| Data Collection/Management |
| Moving Forward |
| MAP testing data is still being used three times a year as well as MSP (formerly the WASL) data once a year. The fall MAP test is used for placement decisions, the winter MAP is used for forecasting for following school year and moving students in and out of interventions as needed and the spring MAP is used as a growth indicator. The MSP (given in May typically) is used for an AYP rating and used as the first data point in placing students. The literacy specialist noted that when new students come in they also use the STAR test to obtain a baseline. If a student is testing below the 4 th grade, additional measures are administered starting with a SRI test. |
| The literacy specialist notes that in the past she has used additional assessments such as the Qualitative Reading Inventory and the San Diego Quick, but she has not used them much this year. |
| The literacy specialist assumes a majority of the responsibility for placing students and analyzing data. Teachers are only involved if they make a special recommendation or request for a student to be assessed again. The teachers are in the very early stages of PLC development but they are beginning to talk about formative assessments. |
| Lingering Issues |
| MAP and WASL scores are the two main sources of screening data for determining interventions. This may lead to relatively static placement in the tiered interventions, which does not support their goal of facilitating movement through the tiers. |

Vancouver Gaiser Middle School Follow Up – Fall 2010

| |
|--|
| <p>There is inconsistency in teachers' use of data, due in part to their limited knowledge about data-based decision making. Teachers are minimally involved in using data to make placement or instructional decisions; however, teachers seem receptive to the process of using data to make decisions.</p> |
| <p>Questions to Consider</p> |
| <p>What PD opportunities might improve staff access to and effective use of the MAP data? What strategies might better involve them in placement decision making?</p> |
| <p>What alternative progress monitoring tools may be useful to assist with identification/placement and instructional decisions?</p> |
| <p>Multi-tiered System of Instruction</p> |
| <p>Moving Forward</p> |
| <p>There have been some changes made: Tier 2 math and reading has been eliminated for students in 6th grade and instead, they are receiving instruction in the core. Intensive level students are in an intensive level math class which is now 2 periods replacing the core, but using the grade level core curriculum in a "slowed down manner".</p> |
| <p>In 7th and 8th grade, a Tier 2 literary focus and math lab class are offered in addition to the core. The Trans math class has moved from two periods to one this year after it was determined that two periods in a row were ineffective.</p> |
| <p>The middle school did receive some additional staffing which has been positive. Specifically, they have added a separate ELL program now so the ELL students are now able to stay at their home school and receive instruction from the new ELL teacher which is in place of core instruction. They have also gotten some additional paraprofessional help including one Russian interpreter.</p> |
| <p>This is the first year that they have implemented PBIS and the literacy specialist noted that she has seen a decrease in behavioral issues. They are using the SWISS data system to track what time of day students are getting referrals and using data to meet the needs of students. The four core areas they follow include: respect, responsibility, attitude, and safety. They also added an ISS area for re-direction needs and Friday school for students in Tiers 2 and 3.</p> |
| <p>Lingering Issues</p> |
| <p>There is no instructional coach so this responsibility has fallen to the literacy specialist.</p> |
| <p>Scheduling challenges remain, but there has been increased flexibility this year.</p> |
| <p>Questions to Consider</p> |
| <p>How are you using data to inform instructional decisions?</p> |
| <p>What RTI or intervention specific training are you providing to your new staff?</p> |
| <p>How can you target instruction in the core for students who are falling behind and needing intervention support?</p> |
| <p>Special Education</p> |
| <p>Moving Forward</p> |
| <p>Special education classes are generally smaller and have different pacing. If students have a reading and writing IEP they are in Special Education intensive literacy blocks, although there is some flexibility due to student scheduling issues.</p> |
| <p>Lingering Issues</p> |
| <p>The school continues to use the IQ/achievement discrepancy model to determine special education eligibility.</p> |

Vancouver
Gaiser Middle School Follow Up – Fall 2010

| |
|--|
| The literacy specialist notes that the school continues to use the WJIII, the MAP, and the MSP/WASL as a stable part of data collection; no other data is used. |
| Questions to Consider |
| What additional interventions are being offered for students receiving Special Education services? |
| Is the number of referrals declining? |
| Have you considered using any additional data to determine Special Education eligibility such as data collected as a part of the intervention classes being offered? |

Vancouver Hudson Bay High School Follow Up – Fall 2010

| Consensus/Leadership Building |
|--|
| Moving Forward |
| The literacy specialist continues to participate in book study meetings, but there still has been no professional development offered to other teachers or administrators. She does note that the Principal reads her RTI book over the summer. |
| The literacy specialist reports that she is also starting to “do some things on her own” with other teachers, but nothing is being done in a formal way. For example, she is meeting occasionally with teachers to look at grade books and data trends to determine an instructional course of action. |
| Overall, staff is positive about RTI implementation but they really do not know what it is; as of now, it is primarily seen as a “buzz word”. They do not feel knowledgeable about RTI implementation. They note that it has not been talked about at the secondary level, and the math specialist notes that it has not been talked about at math cadre meetings. They feel that they may be implementing the strategies, but they have not been specifically trained on RTI. |
| Lingering Issues |
| One specific issue noted is that many teachers do not know what to do in their class for management and differentiation when they have students at various levels. |
| The Literacy Specialist feels that implementing RTI may be scary for staff as it requires them to look at how effective they have been and to “take responsibility”. |
| Questions to Consider |
| Is PD offered or planned on implementation of RTI at the secondary level, available interventions, and specific training for teachers to implement the intervention, and ways to make data based instructional decisions? Is PD available on how to differentiate in a class? |
| Are there plans to encourage building administrators to attend RTI trainings or book studies? |
| Are there other school administrators or district administrators who could support RTI implementation at the secondary level? |
| Data Collection/Management |
| Moving Forward |
| Data from state testing and the middle school is still being used for placement decisions. MAP testing, given twice, is still being used along with grades and teacher input for placement decisions. |
| The PLC meetings are now held only once a month for two hours (as opposed to bi-weekly), and is used to look at class trends vs. individual student issues. The literacy specialist notes that the next step is to talk about what strategies the teachers can use after determining the needs of their classes. |
| The AimsWeb Maze which was purchased last year is still not being used because no one knows how to properly use it interpret the data. |
| All high schools have a math coach who works with teachers and departments to create summative and formative assessments. This data informs the department to help develop lessons. |
| Lingering Issues |
| There is continuing frustration over the inability to move students across tiers because of scheduling difficulties. |
| Using data in a class where student ability levels vary continues to be a challenge. Teachers would benefit from support on differentiating instruction and using data effectively. |

Vancouver Hudson Bay High School Follow Up – Fall 2010

| |
|--|
| Questions to Consider |
| Have you explored using additional or alternative measures for progress monitoring and/or making placement decisions? |
| Are there plans to provide PD related to using data to make decisions? |
| Multi-tiered System of Instruction |
| Moving Forward |
| English has a four tiered program with the top tier being any AP or Honors level classes (Level 1); Level 2 is a strategic level which includes students who are slightly below level 1 students. Also, in the 9 th and 10 th grade, an academic literacy class is provided which is an extra period of support and takes the place of an elective (anywhere from 22-26 students); Level 3 are intensive level students (comprehensive literacy). A large proportion are Special Education students and typically, Read 180 is used; Level 4 is reserved for Special Education students, but there is some flexibility depending on students' IEP goals. |
| Hudson Bay provides a math lab for math 1 and Math 2. These students take two math classes to support their regular math classes. They also provide PAP and AP math classes for those students who are advanced in mathematics. For those struggling in mathematics, they provide a foundations class (pre-algebra) and IEP level math classes. |
| There are no specific RTI behavior interventions being implemented. There is only a room for Special Education students with behavior goals on their IEP. |
| Lingering Issues |
| Minimal professional development is provided in regards to implementing specific interventions. |
| Differentiating in large classes continues to be a challenge. |
| Questions to Consider |
| How are you using data to inform instructional decisions? |
| What RTI or intervention-specific training is provided to new staff? |
| Are you planning to implement a tiered intervention model for behavior? Is there a plan to coordinate with the middle school in this respect? |
| Special Education |
| Moving Forward |
| The school continues to use the IQ-discrepancy model to determine eligibility for Special Education. |
| Lingering Issues |
| No outside data (besides typical assessments given by the School Psychologist) are used to determine eligibility. |
| Questions to Consider |
| Are additional interventions being offered for students receiving Special Education services? |
| Have you considered using additional data to determine Special Education eligibility such as data collected as a part of the intervention classes being offered? |

Vancouver

Walnut Grove Elementary Follow Up – Fall 2010

| Consensus/Leadership Building |
|---|
| Moving Forward |
| <p>In the past, the principal has struggled with buy-in from the upper grades (specifically 4th and 5th grades). Currently, she has had some turnover in the 4th grade as two teachers left and 3 moved from the primary grades. She noted that 5th grade is still “an island” and she notes that they see their main goal as to prepare the students for middle school. She is continually frustrated with their lack of progress based on data. They do not see the point of RTI (using data to drive instruction, etc.).</p> |
| <p>The principal noted that she has lost several members of her core team this year including her literacy coach and psychologist who were both instrumental in implementation efforts in the past. She does note that she is pleased with the new literacy coach and did retain one of her veteran counselors who serve on the core team.</p> |
| <p>Although the principal intended to have an experienced lower grade teacher model how to use data to collaborate/mentor upper grade teachers to increase buy-in and understanding, this has not occurred as much as she had intended. She attributed this lack of mentoring to the loss of the literacy coach. The one exception has occurred with the intensive 3rd grade teacher and the 5th grade intensive teachers who have collaborated in regards to teaching intensive level students. She does note, however, that they continue to meet as instructional teams across grade levels (i.e. literacy teachers k-5) with the intention of reducing disconnect from one grade level to the next.</p> |
| <p>The principal said one goal this year has been to be even more accountable for the students in interventions (last year there were 48 total). Therefore, the interventions specialist, associate, counselor, literacy specialist, psychologist, and sometimes the math coach meet weekly to discuss progress of new students placed in interventions and to review progress of previous students chosen for intervention as needed. One of these core team members then creates an action team composed of teachers (and others who know the student well if needed) to follow up. She notes that they are also making an effort this year to use district paperwork to ensure consistency.</p> |
| Lingering Issues |
| <p>Buy in from 5th grade teachers.</p> |
| <p>The principal expressed frustration that the upper-grade teachers still do not attend PD sessions. Part of this is because the school cannot make them mandatory. She did note that the primary teachers and interestingly, paraprofessionals do attend the PD sessions. She believes that the paraprofessionals see the value in attending the trainings because they see the benefit of the PD knowledge when implemented with the primary grade students which motivates them to learn strategies to work with all students, despite their grade levels.</p> |
| <p>The principal is frustrated with the lack of communication and support from the district. Her main concern is that she wants to ensure that they are on the right track in terms of the “vision” for RTI implementation the district has. She also has more need for support with the loss of several of her core team members, despite the fact that she has been lucky with low overall turnover of teachers and paraprofessionals. This school was a Reading First school and they are pleased with this, but 3 of the other elementary schools are not RF schools and reportedly, are not even familiar with the 5 reading components. The RTI coach, present at the focus group meeting, indicated that she would like more guidance about how to make her role the most effective in terms of supporting these schools which have various levels of experience and need.</p> |
| Questions to Consider |
| <p>Is there a way that paraprofessionals can be strategically used to help create buy-in for the upper grade level teachers?</p> |
| <p>What plans are being put in place to create collaboration and communication with the district and other schools across the district in regards to implementing a shared vision of RTI implementation?</p> |

Vancouver

Walnut Grove Elementary Follow Up – Fall 2010

| Data Collection/Management |
|---|
| Moving Forward |
| Most teachers are collecting and using data to inform instructional decisions, with the exception of some upper grade teachers. As part of nominating/requesting a student to be reviewed for interventions to the core team, teachers must present data. This, the principal notes, is another one of her efforts to hold teachers accountable for using data. |
| Last year, the team expressed interest in exploring and adopting the SWISS system. The principal enthusiastically noted that they have adopted this system and she has been able to dive right in with some support from Bill Link, RTI coordinator. She is very pleased with this system although she notes there are still a few kinks they are learning to perfect. |
| They are now using data form a new math benchmark assessment and they are beginning to look more at MAP data. The principal showed a “scavenger hunt” activity she had teachers use to analyze math benchmark data. |
| Progress monitoring is still being administered/collected weekly or bi-weekly depending on intervention levels. |
| Lingering Issues |
| The principal noted that the psychologist is still utilizing traditional testing methods to identify students with disabilities; however, data from RTI implementation is being used. Some questions were raised about confusion in regards to the best way to intervene with students who qualify for SPED based on behavior data only. She is concerned that once they are put in SPED there are actually less resources to help these students than when in tiered interventions, and the Special Education setting doesn’t reflect a “real life setting”. This, however, does not apply to many students. |
| Questions to Consider |
| Are you at the point where you might consider bringing in other personnel in the process of looking at SWISS data? Would this be beneficial in any way? |
| Multi-tiered System of Instruction |
| Moving Forward |
| The principal is happy to note that they now have math interventions this year which was a goal from last year. Students in grades 2-5 are served 3 days a week. They are pulled from social studies and science because they are not allowed to pull students from specials. She noted that they decided not to include 1 st grade because 63% were at benchmark whereas only 8% were benchmark in 4 th grade. |
| They are reportedly still trying to differentiate in the Core as taught by Reading First (which is possible due to the minimal turnover of teachers who were trained in Reading First). |
| The principal is very satisfied with the resources for intervention they have been provided and she says that when needed, staff participates in the PD or booster sessions needed to implement these interventions. They are now using Language for Learning, a new program, with all K students during the first semester. This is in response to having many ELL students needed an oral language intervention. They note that this extends their required 60 minute Literacy block in K to 90 minutes and they have been very pleased with this addition. |
| Lingering Issues |
| The principal is pleased with the new math interventions, but would serve more students if there were more resources and time. A major issue related to this is that the principal is very disappointed with the whole scheduling issue in the district. She is disappointed that her whole master schedule is dictated by when specials teachers are in the building. This makes it very difficult to plan and make time for interventions. |

Vancouver

Walnut Grove Elementary Follow Up – Fall 2010

| |
|---|
| <p>Because the math curriculum finally chosen by the district was not on the governor's endorsed list, they are back to square one in terms of picking a curriculum; there is now a math task force at the district level to follow up on this but it is only in the planning stages. They do, at least, have math standards now to use as guides.</p> |
| <p>Besides the principal, no one is tracking fidelity. The principal notes that because the district won't let her use the literacy specialist as anything but a specialist serving her own intervention groups, she can't use her to help with fidelity. (She would like to use her more as a coach and someone to help track fidelity). The RTI coordinator noted that the district is looking at fidelity templates, but this is at the very beginning stages.</p> |
| <p>Questions to Consider</p> |
| <p>Is there anyone else who can help track fidelity? Teachers? RTI Coach?</p> |
| <p>Is there a way to ensure sustainability of some of the strategies and procedures learned through Reading First moving forward (in case of future staff turnover)?</p> |
| <p style="text-align: center;">Special Education</p> |
| <p>Moving Forward</p> |
| <p>They continue to use a discrepancy model, but they also incorporate data gathered from having an RTI approach in place. The principal "counts" students as "qualifying" for SPED if they have exhausted all intervention attempts, but they are also still using traditional testing. She prefers this model to the traditional discrepancy approach.</p> |
| <p>Lingering Issues</p> |
| <p>How to provide a "real setting" for students referred to SPED for behavior so they don't suffer academically.</p> |
| <p>Questions to Consider</p> |
| <p>Have you considered more of an inclusion model for these students referred to Special Education for behavior?</p> |

Walla Walla Garrison Middle School Follow Up – Fall 2010

| Consensus/Leadership Building |
|--|
| Moving Forward |
| The leadership team reports an increase in collaboration over the past years. There are more content based meetings to discuss data. Whole staff meetings are used for information dissemination. |
| A focused staff meeting at the beginning of the year had all staff review processes and systems related to their RTI model. A theme was the need to recognize RTI as a noun rather than a verb (i.e., “RTI’d” students). |
| This year staff has developed a hierarchy matrix for behavior, assuming responsibility from the administration. This includes a step system. Behavior plans for classes are based on the behavior matrix. Staff is using consistent language (e.g., responsibility, respectful, doing the right thing.) They consider this a PBIS system, but do not use PBIS terminology. |
| Para-professional staff attend trainings voluntarily. |
| Every Wednesday is designated PLC time. |
| Lingering Issues |
| Leadership is continuing to develop staff capacity related to knowledge of RTI and ability to implement with fidelity. |
| Questions to Consider |
| What strategies are proving effective for increasing parent understanding and participation? |
| Does the collaboration team have a leader or is there a framework for structuring these meetings? |
| How will you ensure that paraprofessionals get adequate training? |
| Data Collection/Management |
| Moving Forward |
| Progress Monitoring in Math is done every Friday using AIMSweb. AIMSweb was also used as the initial screener/benchmark tool in the fall. |
| Students receiving interventions are given MAP tests on a quarterly basis to evaluate progress. |
| Reading MAZE test was delivered again this fall as the initial screener. Students identified at risk were given the Diagnostic Decoding Survey as a follow up. |
| The CAST team uses protocols developed at the elementary school level to maintain consistency from the elementary school to the middle school. |
| Math teachers met before school started to discuss MAP data, AIMSweb data, and MSP results, as well as ELL status of students. They looked at the longitudinal data in “OASIS,” the district’s data bank. The team reports that this has supported greater differentiation in core classes. |
| Math data is beginning to drive content area teachers’ planning and instruction-related discussion. |
| Winter round of CAST meetings will include a greater number of classroom teachers. |
| Lingering Issues |
| None reported. |
| Questions to Consider |
| Is there a system in place for mapping interventions to needs based on diagnostic information? |

Walla Walla Garrison Middle School Follow Up – Fall 2010

| Multi-tiered System of Instruction |
|--|
| Moving Forward |
| Staff uses the intervention systems in place but is beginning to differentiate within the core, and use interventions in Tier 1 to more directly meet students' needs. |
| Staff is working to develop a definition for "intervention." They report some disagreement among staff as to what constitutes intervention. The team reports that they are nearing a "tipping point" where teachers will "buy into" a differentiated model where intervention is part of core instruction. |
| Math interventions have been scheduled during exploratory classes for students requiring Tier 2 interventions. These classes focus primarily on Number Sense and Computation. Additional differentiation is done during these classes. |
| GLAD strategies provide strong ways to differentiate in core content. |
| There is a focus on vocabulary instruction and comprehension strategies in the core curriculum aligned with Robert Marzano's work in the region. Each content team developed 30 key vocabulary words for the course for the year and identified which words to teach during each quarter. Students have a learning template useful for identifying and defining words over the course of the year. |
| Reading interventions are focused differently than math. Staff is implementing a reading fluency component. Core teachers and intervention teachers plan instruction. Words Their Way, Six-Minute Solution, and Readers' Theatre are used. |
| A "summer running start reading program" was initiated this year on a very small scale. |
| Lingering Issues |
| Strategies for effectively differentiate instruction within the core and agreeing on what constitutes an intervention. |
| Questions to Consider |
| Is there a plan to extend the summer running start program? |
| Special Education |
| Moving Forward |
| Special education uses a pull-out model. |
| Replacement curricula are used for math (Triumphs), reading and writing. Progress of reading students is monitored using fluency measures. |
| There are district-level conversations about curriculum mapping and identifying essential standards for special educators. |
| Special educators report an interest in professional development around formative assessments and implementation of interventions. |
| Special educators have received Lindamood Bell training. |
| Special educators are beginning to teach intervention classes for general education students (identified as Tier 3). |
| The master schedule was revised based on the model used by Chief Joseph Middle School in Richland. |
| Lingering Issues |
| No feedback at this time. |

Walla Walla
Garrison Middle School Follow Up – Fall 2010

| |
|------------------------------|
| Questions to Consider |
| No feedback at this time. |

Walla Walla Walla Walla High School Follow Up – Fall 2010

| Consensus/Leadership Building |
|---|
| Moving Forward |
| The leadership team has thirteen members including the school psych, the teachers who teach Tier 2 math classes, the social studies teacher who is co-teaching with special education, ELL representation and a representative from the GEAR UP grant. |
| General Staff participated in a professional development ½ day at the beginning of this school year. The time was dedicated to presenting staff a review of the RTI framework. They identified all the systems currently in place. They were shown where to find student data and how to sort it to begin making instructional decisions based on the current data. |
| There is consistent use of several strategies across the school including the use of Cornell notes and several AVID strategies. |
| The RTI Leadership team engaged in a book study around “Teach Like a Champion.” That team took the book recommendation to the RTI teachers who also read it. The team reports that they could see immediate implementation of many strategies. The focus of the book was how important Tier 1 instruction is and suggested strategies to “beef up” Tier 1. |
| One of the main purposes of the fall professional development was for staff to receive flow charts and forms for the RTI system and to begin brainstorming tiered interventions within their classrooms, understanding the complete system, and the daily class piece of the system. A very small group organized themselves to begin creating a skill check and use that for identifying who and what interventions might be needed. |
| The continued movement and improvement perceived by the team is attributed to Leadership with a vision. |
| The team reports this to be the “learning year.” They want to continue their PD thoughtfully and slowly, instruct parents about the scores on the data, train students and staff to talk about college readiness. |
| They report that parents are more informed through the student report cards. They also state there are more reports to parents via email, (8 times a year,) and there are planned student conferences. |
| Lingering Issues |
| None reported. |
| Questions to Consider |
| Do you have a structure in place to ensure that strategies for enhancing Tier 1 are sustained and/or implemented? |
| What are the next steps in the area of professional development? |
| How is implementation fidelity monitored? |
| Data Collection/Management |
| Moving Forward |
| The OASIS system (their data warehouse) is being upgraded. |
| All 9 th grade students identified for Tier 2 are MAP tested. |
| This school year ACT data is being collected to assess for college readiness. Explore ACT is taken by all 9 th grade students. Plan ACT is taken by all 10 th and 11 th grade students. Once the data is returned the staff will engage in professional development around measuring college readiness. The goal is to then create school-wide ACT classes. |
| Progress monitoring is in place in Tier 2 classes. |

Walla Walla

Walla Walla High School Follow Up – Fall 2010

| |
|--|
| MAP data is being used, in addition to end unit formative assessments, and other formative assessments such as exit passes, entry tasks, Champion strategies to evaluate student progress. |
| Every standard English class is now using a MAZE comprehension probe, Vocabulary assessments, GLAD strategies and Literacy First strategies. |
| Vertical teams continue from last spring and horizontal teams are working together to evaluate the data. |
| Regular reminders are sent to staff every six weeks to remind them to access OASIS data bank. The High school staff does not currently enter their own data. |
| Lingering Issues |
| Entering of data. |
| Questions to Consider |
| Who is administering the assessments and does this help teachers learn how to use data? |
| How does formative data support instructional decisions? |
| Multi-tiered System of Instruction |
| Moving Forward |
| The co-teaching model with ELL and Social Studies continues. |
| Co-teachers have a common planning time daily and the team reports they meet regularly. |
| All teachers are receiving training in English Language Development Standards, and are aligning with the state GLE's. |
| A new intake process is in place for incoming students with no data. CBMs are used as the intake tools, AIMSweb, MAZE, reading fluency, Correct word sequences in writing CBMs, Concepts and applications probes for math. The flow chart developed by the school then assists in determining placement. |
| The district implemented common writing assessments five years ago. |
| Math interventions continue as last year, but this year the intervention teacher is the same teacher as the student has for core instruction. |
| Lingering Issues |
| None reported. |
| Questions to Consider |
| Is there a specific structure for collaboration time and who leads these efforts? |
| Special Education |
| Moving Forward |
| Tier three students are those identified for Special Education services, ELL, and at-risk for dropout. |
| Special education reading curriculum has been changed to "Journeys" which more closely aligns to core instruction. |
| The team reports that Special Educators are entering into more conversations around co-teaching math and social studies classes. |
| The Special Education staff is working to build core skills in their instruction so that students are working on comprehension strategies, vocabulary and building background knowledge. |

Walla Walla
Walla Walla High School Follow Up – Fall 2010

| |
|--|
| Most students are taking algebra and using calculators to access. |
| Special Education students take the ACT and those results are used to assist in developing transition plans. |
| Lingering Issues |
| None reported. |
| Questions to Consider |
| No feedback at this time. |

Walla Walla Prospect Point Elementary Follow Up – Fall 2010

| Consensus/Leadership Building |
|---|
| Moving Forward |
| Parent involvement continues to improve. Emails between parents and educators increased. The frequency of other communication between parents and staff also increased. |
| Curriculum was featured during Open House this year, with parents participating in goal setting goals for their students. Staff also used the fall report card conferences as an opportunity to educate parents about the standards. |
| Standards training from last year will be being enhanced this year. Math is a focus for the school. Staff developed “smart goals” at each grade level this summer. Teacher training has focused on goal setting. |
| District-level assessments have been created. This school is participating in their pilot testing. |
| Quarterly team leadership meetings focus on preparing for CAST meetings. |
| Collaboration time is used to identify “what” the school wants to measure and “how” they will measure it. AIMSweb and progress monitoring are analyzed, and the screening probes are realigned to maximize the available instructional information. |
| The district used year 1 of the initiative to clarify issues related to the use of data. Year 2 focused on the clarification of standards. This year, Year 3, they are focusing on student growth. |
| Monthly district level trainings are available for those providing Tier 2 interventions in both ORIGO Math and First steps in Math. |
| Lingering Issues |
| None reported. |
| Questions to Consider |
| No feedback at this time. |
| Data Collection/Management |
| Moving Forward |
| Data display boards have been created. Staff is working to create smart goals. |
| MAP data is being used to identify areas where improvement is most likely for students who are on the “bubble.” The cut score for passage on MSP is 400. This effort focuses on students scoring in 390-405 range. |
| The school focusing this year on tracking Tier 2 interventions. |
| Classroom teachers are beginning to assume responsibility for progress monitoring of strategic-level students who are not being served by LAP in reading. In math, teachers are doing their own benchmarking and progress monitoring. |
| Lingering Issues |
| There may continue to be a need for professional development on using data to make instructional decisions. |
| Questions to Consider |
| Is there a system in place for staff to create smart goals? |
| What data are being tracked for Tier 2 interventions? How will these data be used to improve overall practice? To adjust for individual students? |
| Are teachers able to effectively differentiate within the core areas? |

Walla Walla Prospect Point Elementary Follow Up – Fall 2010

| Multi-tiered System of Instruction |
|---|
| Moving Forward |
| Reading intervention/instruction is “seamless” according to teachers and others in the school. K, 1, and 2 classrooms use a “flood in” model. Upper grades (3, 4, and 5) do not. Nine individuals are responsible for providing interventions. Students “walk” to interventions. Students receiving support in all three areas at a given grade level go to a common pull-out intervention. |
| Professional development for instructional intervention is provided by the LAP coordinator. |
| Lingering Issues |
| The team reports that additional professional development is needed for certified staff to build capacity to provide interventions. |
| Questions to Consider |
| What are the plans for providing professional development related to instructional interventions? |
| What strategies are being used to monitor fidelity of implementation for the interventions and for the RTI model generally? |
| Special Education |
| Moving Forward |
| The principal reports declines in the number of SPED referrals and in the number of students who are served in SPED. Last year, LAP served 27 Kindergarten students. The same cohort (now first grade) has 22 students being served this year. |
| The team reports that interventions are more effectively used to gather information and to identify students who may be eligible for SPED services. |
| The majority of SPED referrals are for students who move into district or move into the school. |
| Lingering Issues |
| The principal is concerned that special education curriculum does not align with the core. |
| Questions to Consider |
| What are the plans for evaluating and/or improving the alignment of SPED and core curriculum? |

White River Foothills Elementary Follow Up – Fall 2010

| Consensus/Leadership Building |
|---|
| Moving Forward |
| General education teachers are implementing interventions within the classroom in 1 st -4 th grade, without prompting or prodding from the RTI coordinator or administration. |
| Parent notifications for Title 1 students have more complete information about the services provided. A parent meeting for information about Title 1 before the open house was attended by approximately 70 parents. |
| The district has developed and introduced “The Ten Commitments” for use in RTI and Data Team Meetings, a protocol for teams to follow in preparing for the meeting, conducting the meeting, and following up team meetings. |
| The school has had grade level meetings to discuss benchmarking data. |
| The first grade teachers asked to do the monthly progress monitoring, because they get more information out of it when they administer the assessments. Previously progress monitoring was done by Title 1 and special education teachers or paraprofessionals. All grade levels except K have joined in and are monitoring almost all students monthly (students not monitored are in intensive interventions and receive instructional level monitoring there). |
| Professional development this year has centered around the new reading adoption, Imagine It. |
| The district is planning to train certified and classified substitutes in Reading Mastery to improve instruction for students when teachers are not in class. |
| The assessment coordinator and RTI coordinator are doing fidelity checks. They hired a substitute to take over teaching duties for the RTI coordinator for a day and observed all para-educators, comparing their observations and building inter-rater reliability. |
| Foothills is the highest performing elementary in Pierce and King County in reading, writing, and math in grades 3-5, compared to others with the same F & R lunch rate. |
| Lingering Issues |
| The RTI leadership team has not met yet this year. A special education teacher is not part of the leadership team, although the school psychologist is an active member. |
| The school missed AYP for special education students last year. |
| Staffing will probably be reduced next year when the stimulus money ends. The district intends to re-apply for the RTI grant if it can be extended for two years; however, it would not provide much money. |
| The district started doing some alignment to power standards, but has tabled the effort due to adoption of a new core reading curriculum (Imagine It) as well as the coming common core standards. |
| Questions to Consider |
| How will the district sustain the RTI effort if funding for intervention is reduced? |
| Would including a special education teacher to the leadership team be of value? |
| Data Collection/Management |
| Moving Forward |
| Teachers are still entering benchmark and progress monitoring data. The district supports them with 7 ½ hours of compensated time for data entry. |

White River Foothills Elementary Follow Up – Fall 2010

| |
|---|
| <p>Foothills teachers are administering AimsWeb M-CAP (concepts and application) for the math screener for the first time this year. The district screener has been dropped. M-COMP (computation) is being tested at first grade level. Currently they are just benchmarking M-CAP and M-COMP.</p> |
| <p>There are many built-in assessments in the math program, and the intermediate teachers have continued implementing a tiered intervention model within the core math curriculum.</p> |
| <p>AimsWeb produces the Tier Transition Report, which shows how many students perform in benchmark, strategic, and intensive levels. Last year at Foothills the intensive group shrank, the strategic shrank and the benchmark group increased by the end of the year.</p> |
| <p>The team also looks at the individual report during the year to see how students move during the year.</p> |
| <p>Lingering Issues</p> |
| <p>Some teachers are having difficulty scoring AimsWeb MCAP. They are questioning the need for math progress monitoring.</p> |
| <p>Teachers are still questioning the emphasis in instruction and assessment on reading fluency, when the goal of reading is comprehension. The team members stated that the teachers are becoming less combative about it in discussions. They are beginning to understand the relationship between reading fluently and being able to comprehend.</p> |
| <p>Questions to Consider</p> |
| <p>Do the teachers find the math AIMSWeb MCAP and MCOMP benchmark screening information from AimsWeb useful?</p> |
| <p>Is there need for additional progress monitoring in math using AimsWeb as another source of information to supplement in-program math assessments?</p> |
| <p>Would professional development on reading fluency benefit teachers? Would fluency PD be better received if paired with PD on comprehension strategy instruction?</p> |
| <p style="text-align: center;">Multi-tiered System of Instruction</p> |
| <p>Moving Forward</p> |
| <p>There are many built-in assessments in the math program, and the teachers have been implementing a tiered intervention model within the math curriculum. There is a 45 minute intervention period built into the schedule and the intermediate teachers choose to use it for math. There is grouping within the third grade and extra support from para-professionals to meet student needs.</p> |
| <p>The system is flexing according to student need, with general education and Tier 2 adjusting intervention instruction so that Tier 3 students can receive more instruction.</p> |
| <p>Professional development was provided for new teachers in Reading Mastery and Connecting Math Concepts in August and September. All reading teachers attended training in the new core curriculum, Imagine It.</p> |
| <p>Lingering Issues</p> |
| <p>None reported.</p> |
| <p>Questions to Consider</p> |
| <p>Are replacement math interventions efficient?</p> |
| <p>Are you monitoring data closely so that if it shows you need to use the intervention time for something other than math, you will be aware of that need and be able to make that change?</p> |

White River Foothills Elementary Follow Up – Fall 2010

| Special Education |
|---|
| Moving Forward |
| The school psychologist has no initial referrals at Foothills yet this year, vs. three at her other elementary school. She believes the intervention system is working well to keep students out of special education. Last year several students were identified using an RTI model of identification for students with learning disabilities. |
| The third grade teachers have a new strategy this year, with a target of getting special education students out of AYP. The third grade teachers are keeping more of the Tier 2 students so that the Tier 2 intervention teacher can give some special education students a double dose of reading. The new special education teacher is participating in giving students a double dose of intervention, using the same curriculum. The students who are targeted by this strategy are not the lowest. The lowest learning disabled students (10/12 in 3rd are on IEPs) still get most of their instruction from the special education teacher. |
| The curriculum in special education is being implemented with more fidelity this year. The RTI coordinator and assessment coordinator observe teachers and paraprofessionals who implement the intervention curricula. They discuss the results with those who were observed and the RTI coordinator provides demonstration and coaching in areas that need improvement. |
| The primary teachers and Title 1 teacher are very intentionally using interventions as long as possible before referring students for special education; their belief is that the students are getting very good instruction in reading from very well trained instructors. A referral to special education is made only for students who don't benefit from intensive intervention and are believed to need intervention for a long time. |
| Lingering Issues |
| A new development is that two school psychology positions were eliminated, so school psychologists are spread over more buildings. |
| Tier 3 is still primarily special education, but a few non-IEP students are being served in Tier 3. |
| Questions to Consider |
| Are students in special education moving to less intensive interventions? |

White River Glacier Middle School Follow Up – Fall 2010

| Consensus/Leadership Building |
|---|
| Moving Forward |
| GMS staff added a testing center to the PACE student support/enrichment period. Students who need to re-take tests can do so in the center. |
| Further work has been done this year with teams on how to support each other to meet students' needs. One method they are trying is to have a different teacher work with students in the support period, thinking that perhaps a different way of presenting the content will meet the student's need. |
| A special education teacher and the school psychologist were present at this RTI leadership team interview. Last year special education was not represented on the team. |
| A data system that will be a better tool to organize PACE has been obtained and is being piloted through Skyward. The school plans to launch it November 12 th . |
| A Math Placement Pathway to describe assessments, cut scores, and interventions has been developed. |
| A Request for a Student Support form has been developed. It is a request from a teacher that the team consider information about a student that might indicate the student has an unmet need. The school staff has been introduced to it. |
| New staff members who teach interventions had a day of training in the interventions before school started. |
| District RTI coordinators meet together monthly. |
| The district has developed and introduced "The Ten Commitments" for use in RTI and Data Team Meetings, a protocol for teams to follow in preparing for the meeting, conducting the meeting, and following up team meetings. |
| Lingering Issues |
| This interview was the first meeting of the RTI leadership team this year. |
| The leadership team is still working on setting the dates for progress monitoring and the dates for the team to consider the data collected; how the school psychologist will be involved; and when LAP and special education staff will meet within their own groups to consider data. |
| The schedule of progress monitoring of the special education math interventions has not yet been finalized. Some progress monitoring is being done, but it is not yet systematized. |
| Questions to Consider |
| Are a special education teacher and the school psychologist part of the RTI leadership team? |
| Can a regular meeting schedule for the RTI leadership team be determined that can be followed each year? |
| Has the reassignment of the RTI Coordinator to Dean of Students (although retaining RTI duties) affected the functioning of the RTI leadership team? |
| Data Collection/Management |
| Moving Forward |
| The district is replacing the use of KidGraph (a tool to evaluate effectiveness of intervention programs) with the development of spreadsheets with progress monitoring data that match the kind of information parents receive on report cards. The goal is to roll the data into the student information system so parents of students who receive interventions will get the same kind of information about interventions as they do from the core curriculum. |

White River Glacier Middle School Follow Up – Fall 2010

| |
|--|
| <p>This year the AimsWeb MAZE is being given at the beginning of the year. The AimsWeb oral reading fluency measure is given only in January because they felt they had enough info coming from the ES. To the surprise of the team, some teachers have told them they miss having the ORF information at the beginning of the year.</p> |
| <p>AimsWeb MCAP (Math Concepts and Applications) is being given for initial screening and progress monitoring. MCOMP has been dropped since the staff prefers the information given by MCAP.</p> |
| <p>If a new student enters the school, the counselor looks at the MSP score and lets the para-professional know if they need AimsWeb screening.</p> |
| <p>Some students have been moved out of the math interventions due to performance in the class and subsequent re-screenings. The team thinks they are students who “blew off” the test the first time (i.e. false positives).</p> |
| <p>They are considering how teachers will access the support of the RTI leadership group when kids are struggling. That led to the Request for Student Support form, integrating the role of the old Student Support Team for referrals and the RTI team.</p> |
| <p>The LA, Math and Science and Social Studies teams are sharing formative assessment data with the whole staff once a year.</p> |
| <p>The departments are looking at the screening data as teams.</p> |
| <p>The RTI team is looking at benchmark assessment data from the HS.</p> |
| <p>Students who scored low on the MAZE were administered the cloze part of the Language! placement test. It gave them a lexile score and they used that to group students in the LAP reading class for 7th and 8th.</p> |
| <p>Progress monitoring is to be monitored monthly in Tiers 2 and 3. However, it isn’t in place yet.</p> |
| <p>GMS is piloting an intervention scheduler for Skyward. It will be used to determine where students go in PACE. Implementation begins second quarter.</p> |
| <p>Lingering Issues</p> |
| <p>There are continuing conversations at the district level about how to make information available to teachers.</p> |
| <p>The system for determining what data is shared, when it is shared, and how it is shared is evolving with practice.</p> |
| <p>The general education teachers can all log into the data but the team members do not know how often they do it.</p> |
| <p>The amount of time it takes to score and enter the MCAP data is a problem, so they need to figure out how to make it more efficient. AimsWeb does not allow the user to filter information as much as they would like.</p> |
| <p>The team discussed strategies used at the HS to enter all the data when they get behind. The district assessment coordinator may use some of the RTI grant resources for some additional data entry time to help them catch up now.</p> |
| <p>Questions to Consider</p> |
| <p>Do you have a plan about who will administer progress monitoring measures and when you will do this in Tiers 2 and 3?</p> |
| <p>Have you thought about changing the administration of the AimsWeb ORF back to the beginning of the year? Would more timely data be helpful?</p> |
| <p style="text-align: center;">Multi-tiered System of Instruction</p> |
| <p>Moving Forward</p> |
| <p>The Read to Achieve teacher questions whether Read to Achieve as an intervention should be only a semester or</p> |

White River Glacier Middle School Follow Up – Fall 2010

| |
|--|
| <p>a year. Is there enough material there for a whole year? How will that affect the HS? They may consult someone from SRA or the author.</p> |
| <p>Last year they reduced the number of students who were failing. Although that number was reduced they still have some students who are failing a number of grades.</p> |
| <p>The administrative staff has shared some common fidelity protocols, modified them, and shared the protocols with the staff who teach intervention programs. The intent is to use the protocols to observe teachers for fidelity of implementation of the curriculum. Results of the observations will be shared with the teachers and discussed, with the goal of improving or maintaining fidelity of the intervention programs.</p> |
| <p>Tier 3 is primarily special education The principal stated that there are not enough students who need Tier 3 interventions to fund it from general education, so it is funded by special education and is restricted to students on IEPs.</p> |
| <p>Students in Corrective Math (Tier 3) are also taking a regular math class (the intervention version of Holt).</p> |
| <p>Lingering Issues</p> |
| <p>Fidelity of implementation in the interventions needs to move to the next level, with staff observations for fidelity and with feedback to the teachers for discussion.</p> |
| <p>The principal stated a need to determine a better ways to engage the students who have a number of failing grades.</p> |
| <p>Questions to Consider</p> |
| <p>Do new staff members need additional training support in teaching interventions?</p> |
| <p>Are the interventions effective? Are you using data to confirm this on an ongoing basis?</p> |
| <p>Do any students move out of interventions? Is there a system in place so that students can “exit” interventions when they have shown adequate progress or are they getting “stuck” in interventions that are no longer appropriate because of scheduling and other issues? Are the interventions tracking students?</p> |
| <p style="text-align: center;">Special Education</p> |
| <p>Moving Forward</p> |
| <p>A special education teacher and school psychologist have been added this year to the leadership team.</p> |
| <p>Lingering Issues</p> |
| <p>Tier 3 is considered special education. The team stated that there are probably some other students who need Tier 3 Language!, but funding is a barrier to providing it.</p> |
| <p>Administrative and teaching staff need to engage in observations and determination of fidelity of implementation in the interventions.</p> |
| <p>Questions to Consider</p> |
| <p>Some school districts have succeeded in blending special education and general funds in RTI. How do they do that? What barriers need to be removed in this district?</p> |
| <p>Are the interventions effective? Are you using data to confirm this on an ongoing basis?</p> |
| <p>Do any students move out of interventions? Are the students tracked in interventions? Tracking students?</p> |

White River

White River High School Follow Up – Fall 2010

| Consensus/Leadership Building |
|--|
| Moving Forward |
| WRHS continues to focus on using data to help improve classroom instruction and support students. |
| The Principal stated that they feel like they've done a "pretty good job setting up interventions in Tier 3". |
| Their effort now is on how to support students who struggle before they need Tier 2 or Tier 3. |
| The HS is expanding implementation of PBIS from a leadership group to the whole staff this year. Students are currently involved in developing expectations for behavior in the common areas. |
| Members of the HS staff have been involved in two RTI presentations to other schools this year. A staff member stated that when they are considered by educators in other districts to be the "RTI gurus" it pressures them to think more deeply about their practices. |
| Sharing the data with teachers makes the content area teachers more accepting of pulling students out of their subjects for intervention. |
| This year the school has implemented automated phone calls twice a month to parents of students making D's and F's to make sure that parents are aware that their students are at risk of failing. |
| The staff understands how RTI is part of the system and not a separate effort. |
| The HS Language! teacher has worked with the new teacher who is teaching Language! at the MS, and is going to provide more support to the MS teacher to ensure fidelity of implementation of the intervention. |
| A pathway document describing RTI assessment and progress monitoring has been developed. |
| The district has developed and introduced "The Ten Commitments" for use in RTI and Data Team Meetings, a protocol for teams to follow in preparing for the meeting, conducting the meeting, and following up team meetings. |
| Lingering Issues |
| The team stated that they are still working to improve Tier 1 instruction. |
| It is challenging at the HS level to find ways to get students the help they need due to scheduling and credit issues. |
| Despite the new automated calls to parents, there is no drop in the numbers of D's and F's yet. Students who are honors students or who are close to driving age are showing interest in reducing their D's and F's, but teachers of struggling students have not observed interest by those students yet. |
| Questions to Consider |
| What is the effect of using the new team meeting protocol? |
| How else will you support students with D's and F's besides notifying parents? |
| Data Collection/Management |
| Moving Forward |
| A huge amount of data is collected on students. The focus is on determining what's important, organizing that effectively, and communicating it effectively to teachers. |
| Staff members are building a spreadsheet for progress monitoring using in-program assessments for the interventions. The goal is to enter the scores on all questions, so the teacher can evaluate instruction for the group as a whole. The next step is to do it for Essentials to Algebra. They are working on entering the data that goes on the report card into the student information data system. |

White River

White River High School Follow Up – Fall 2010

| |
|--|
| There is a growing culture in the school around using data to drive instruction and communicate results. The data is now reaching the teacher level for decisions around instruction and students in terms of their performance in specific areas. |
| Students in interventions at the MS come in with the data on progress in their specific intervention so HS teachers know where to start them in the same program. |
| Teachers are keeping more information on their students and using that information to refer students to specific subjects during the STAT intervention/enrichment period. |
| Special education students met AYP (Adequate Yearly Progress) for the first time this year in reading. |
| The HS increased achievement of AYP from passing in 11/17 cells two years ago to 15/17 cells last year. The two remaining groups not achieving AYP are special education and ELL students in math. |
| HSPE (High School Proficiency Exam) showed gains in math and science from 2009 to 2010. |
| The graduation rate increased from 85% in 2009 to 93% in 2010. |
| Suspensions, harassment, and bullying incidents have dropped from this time last year. |
| Attendance has increased. |
| Failure rates decreased from the 12 week point in the semester compared to last year. |
| WRHS has dropped the universal screening of 9 th graders this year because they have so much information coming in on students from the 8 th grade. |
| Students receiving interventions are benchmarked three times a year using AimsWeb MCAP and MAZE, and using in-program assessments for progress monitoring monthly. |
| The administrative team and building coordinators district-wide meet monthly and bring data to share around specific subjects and data points. They are able to see district and level strengths and needs. |
| Data is shared in staff meetings, which one teacher described as resembling “mini-inservices”. |
| A schedule for sharing data about student needs has been established. Data was shared from the MS to the HS and also from the HS back to the MS. |
| Lingering Issues |
| Students who enter WRHS from other districts have only the existing information that comes from the previous school. |
| The leadership team is still working on tools and methods to use to evaluate the effectiveness of interventions. They are no longer using KidGraph because they are developing and using their own tools. |
| WRHS would like to increase enrichment opportunities for students. |
| Questions to Consider |
| Should there be a protocol established and procedures available to gain information needed on students entering from outside districts? |
| Is there an established system in which MS staff communicates with HS staff about students’ needs? |
| Multi-tiered System of Instruction |
| Moving Forward |
| There is a problem-solving team to consider interventions needed by students referred by teachers. |
| Curricular groups of teachers are working together two PD days to improve the curriculum in Tier 1. |
| They have added a Physical Science intervention class. |

White River

White River High School Follow Up – Fall 2010

| |
|---|
| <p>The Read to Achieve intervention has continued with most students who were targeted last fall. They have added incoming 9th graders who were in the intervention in 8th grade, and continued their instruction where it ended. No students have exited the program.</p> |
| <p>They are making an effort not to have any sophomores in Essentials to Algebra because it places them behind in terms of graduation. There are some older kids in E to A who are credit deficient.</p> |
| <p>General education teachers are teaching Tier 2 interventions of Read to Achieve and Essentials to Algebra.</p> |
| <p>One new effort led by a math teacher is an “Algebra boot camp” for students who are falling behind in Algebra. Students will be taken out of their classes for one full day to receive targeted instruction from math teachers. At this time the effort is planned for one day; the team will subsequently discuss the result of the intervention.</p> |
| <p>Lingering Issues</p> |
| <p>Fidelity protocols have been developed at other levels, but the HS has not yet focused on fidelity of implementation. That will begin this year.</p> |
| <p>The assessment coordinator is working on a system to evaluate the effectiveness of interventions in helping students achieve the standards. He states that preliminary data is promising.</p> |
| <p>Questions to Consider</p> |
| <p>Are the interventions becoming a system for tracking students?</p> |
| <p>Is the “Algebra boot camp” actually a targeted Tier 2 intervention?</p> |
| <p>Is the “Algebra boot camp” effective? If so, is there a need to repeat it periodically?</p> |
| <p>What is the plan to move beyond Tier 1 in PBIS?</p> |
| <p>Special Education</p> |
| <p>Moving Forward</p> |
| <p>Tier 3 classes of Language! and Corrective Math are taught by special education teachers, and students who are in the classes are on IEPs. There are some students who have IEPs who take Essentials to Algebra, which is considered Tier 2 for most students, but is effectively Tier 3 for some.</p> |
| <p>A special education teacher and a school psychologist are an active part of the RTI leadership team.</p> |
| <p>Lingering Issues</p> |
| <p>It appears that Tier 3 is considered special education.</p> |
| <p>Fidelity of implementation is not systematically examined, although they are planning to focus on that this year.</p> |
| <p>Questions to Consider</p> |
| <p>Are there students who need the intensiveness of Tier 3 interventions, but are not receiving them because they are not identified for special education? How are you supporting these students?</p> |
| <p>Is there any movement of students into less intense tiers of instruction?</p> |