DBI Implementation Rubric

This DBI Implementation Rubric is intended to support monitoring of school-level implementation of data-based individualization (DBI) for students who need intensive intervention. The rubric follows the structure of the Center on Response to Intervention's Integrity Rubric (see www.rti4success.org) and is aligned with the essential components of DBI and the infrastructure that is necessary for successful implementation in Grades K–6. It describes levels of implementation on a 1–5 scale across DBI components. The rubric is accompanied by guiding questions that may be used for a self-assessment or structured interview of a school's DBI leadership team (see the DBI Implementation Interview).

DBI implementation requires the following components:

1. System Features

2. Data and Decision Making

3. Intervention

4. DBI Process

5. DBI Evaluation

1. **System Features to Support DBI Readiness and Implementation**—Resources and organizational structures necessary to support implementation of the components of DBI in a unified system

Description of Measures for Components and Subcomponents	1 (Little or No Implementation)	3 (Partial or Inconsistent Implementation)	5 (Complete and Consistent Implementation)
(a) District Leadership	Decisions and actions by district leaders limit the feasibility or effectiveness of the essential components of the DBI framework at the school; there is lack of leadership support for DBI.	Decisions and actions by district leaders are partially or inconsistently supportive of the essential components of the DBI framework at the school; support for DBI implementation is not very evident.	Decisions and actions by district leaders proactively support the essential components of the DBI framework at the school and help make the DBI framework more effective; support for DBI implementation is a high priority.
(b) School Leadership	Decisions and actions by school leaders limit the feasibility or effectiveness of the essential components of the DBI framework at the school; there is lack of leadership support for DBI.	Decisions and actions by school leaders are partially or inconsistently supportive of the essential components of the DBI framework at the school; support for DBI implementation is not very evident.	Decisions and actions by school leaders proactively support the essential components of the DBI framework at the school and help make the DBI framework more effective; support for DBI implementation is a high priority.
(c) School Schedules	School schedules are not aligned to support multiple levels of intervention and high-quality instruction based on student need; inadequate time is available for interventions; schedules are inflexible and cannot support changes to student groupings.	School schedules are partially or inconsistently aligned to support multiple levels of intervention and high-quality instruction based on student need; some additional time is built in for interventions; schedules are somewhat flexible and can support some changes to student groupings.	School schedules are aligned to support multiple levels of intervention and high-quality instruction based on student need; adequate additional time is built in for interventions; schedules are flexible and can support changes to student groupings as needed.
(d) Resources	Resources (e.g., funds, programs, time available) are not allocated to support DBI implementation.	Resources (e.g., funds, programs, time available) are partially or inconsistently allocated to support DBI implementation.	Resources (e.g., funds, programs, time available) are adequately allocated to support DBI implementation.

Description of Measures for Components and Subcomponents	1 (Little or No Implementation)	3 (Partial or Inconsistent Implementation)	5 (Complete and Consistent Implementation)
(e) Cultural and Linguistic Responsiveness	Little or no evidence that staff can articulate information and factors that they consider when adopting culturally and linguistically appropriate: 1. Assessments 2. Intervention programs	Partial or inconsistent evidence that staff can articulate information and factors that they consider when adopting culturally and linguistically appropriate: 1. Assessments 2. Intervention programs	Strong and consistent evidence that staff can articulate information and factors that they consider when adopting culturally and linguistically appropriate: 1. Assessments 2. Intervention programs
(f) Communications With and Involvement of Parents	No conditions are met: 1. A description of the DBI process is shared with parents of students who need it. 2. A coherent process is used to update parents on the progress of their child. 3. Parents are involved during decision making regarding participation of their child in intensive intervention.	At least one condition is met: 1. A description of the DBI process is shared with parents of students who need it. 2. A coherent process is used to update parents on the progress of their child. 3. Parents are involved during decision making regarding participation of their child in intensive intervention.	All conditions are met: 1. A description of the DBI process is shared with parents of students who need it. 2. A coherent process is used to update parents on the progress of their child. 3. Parents are involved during decision making regarding participation of their child in intensive intervention.
(g) Communication With and Involvement of All Staff	No conditions are met: 1. A description of the school's DBI process is shared with staff that works with students with intensive needs. 2. A system is in place to keep staff informed about student progress. 3. Teacher teams collaborate frequently.	At least one condition is met: 1. A description of the school's DBI process is shared with staff that works with students with intensive needs. 2. A system is in place to keep staff informed about student progress. 3. Teacher teams collaborate frequently.	All conditions are met: 1. A description of the school's DBI process is shared with staff that works with students with intensive needs. 2. A system is in place to keep staff informed about student progress. 3. Teacher teams collaborate frequently.

Description of Measures for Components and Subcomponents	1 (Little or No Implementation)	3 (Partial or Inconsistent Implementation)	5 (Complete and Consistent Implementation)
(h) Participation of Students With Disabilities	DBI strategies are never infused in special education planning for students with disabilities who need more intensive supports as part of their individualized education programs (IEPs).	DBI strategies are partially or inconsistently infused in special education planning for students with disabilities who need more intensive supports as part of their IEPs.	Intensive intervention is part of a continuum of services considered for all students with disabilities in the school. When students with disabilities need more intensive supports, DBI strategies are consistently infused into their special education planning as part of their IEPs.

2. Data and Decision Making—Data for the purpose of making decisions within a DBI framework

Description of Measures for Components and Subcomponents	1 (Little or No Implementation)	3 (Partial or Inconsistent Implementation)	5 (Complete and Consistent Implementation)
(a) Process to Identify Students in Need of Intensive Intervention	There is no evidence of a process whereby students in need of intensive intervention are identified based on one or more of the following criteria: 1. Data support that student has persistent nonresponse to Tier 2/evidence-based intervention. 2. Data support that student has persistent and intensive need in academics and/or behavior. 3. Student has a relevant diagnosis or disability that warrants intensive intervention.	There is some evidence of a process whereby students in need of intensive intervention are identified based on one or more of the following criteria; however, the process may be applied partially or inconsistently: 1. Data support that student has persistent nonresponse to Tier 2/evidence-based intervention. 2. Data support that student has persistent and intensive need in academics and/or behavior. 3. Student has a relevant diagnosis or disability that warrants intensive intervention.	There is evidence of an articulated process whereby students in need of intensive intervention are consistently identified based on one or more of the following criteria: 1. Data support that student has persistent nonresponse to Tier 2/evidence-based intervention. 2. Data support that student has persistent and intensive need in academics and/or behavior. 3. Student has a relevant diagnosis or disability that warrants intensive intervention.

Description of Measures for Components and Subcomponents	1 (Little or No Implementation)	3 (Partial or Inconsistent Implementation)	5 (Complete and Consistent Implementation)
(b) Academic Progress-Monitoring Tools	No evidence that progress-monitoring tools meet the following criteria (when available): 1. A sufficient number of alternate forms of equal and controlled difficulty allows for progress monitoring at recommended intervals based on tier. 2. The tool is sensitive to student improvement. 3. The tool identifies acceptable or expected levels of performance. 4. Reliability and validity information for the performance-level score are available, and staff is able to articulate the supporting evidence.	Partial or inconsistent evidence that progress-monitoring tools meet the following criteria (when available): 1. A sufficient number of alternate forms of equal and controlled difficulty allows for progress monitoring at recommended intervals based on tier. 2. The tool is sensitive to student improvement. 3. The tool identifies acceptable or expected levels of performance. 4. Reliability and validity information for the performance-level score are available, and staff is able to articulate the supporting evidence.	Strong and consistent evidence that progress-monitoring tools meet the following criteria (when available): 1. A sufficient number of alternate forms of equal and controlled difficulty allows for progress monitoring at recommended intervals based on tier. 2. The tool is sensitive to student improvement. 3. The tool identifies acceptable or expected levels of performance. 4. Reliability and validity information for the performance-level score are available, and staff is able to articulate the supporting evidence.

Description of Measures for Components and Subcomponents	1 (Little or No Implementation)	3 (Partial or Inconsistent Implementation)	5 (Complete and Consistent Implementation)
(c) Behavior Progress-Monitoring Tools	No evidence that progress-monitoring tools meet the following criteria (when available): 1. Reliability and validity information for the progress-monitoring measure are available, and staff is able to articulate the supporting evidence. 2. The tool can be used repeatedly. 3. The tool is sensitive to behavioral change. 4. The tool can be used to establish benchmarks for acceptable behavior.	Partial or inconsistent evidence that progress-monitoring tools meet the following criteria (when available): 1. Reliability and validity information for the progress-monitoring measure are available and staff is able to articulate the supporting evidence. 2. The tool can be used repeatedly. 3. The tool is sensitive to behavioral change. 4. The tool can be used to establish benchmarks for acceptable behavior.	Strong and consistent evidence that progress-monitoring tools meet the following criteria (when available): 1. Reliability and validity information for the progress-monitoring measure are available and staff is able to articulate the supporting evidence. 2. The tool can be used repeatedly. 3. The tool is sensitive to behavioral change. 4. The tool can be used to establish benchmarks for acceptable behavior.

Description of Measures for Components and Subcomponents	1 (Little or No Implementation)	3 (Partial or Inconsistent Implementation)	5 (Complete and Consistent Implementation)
(d) Progress-Monitoring Procedures	There is no evidence that the following conditions are met for students requiring intensive intervention: 1. There is a progress-monitoring plan in place that includes a goal. 2. The plan is reasonable for the student (e.g., appropriate frequency, alignment with student skills). 3. Progress-monitoring data are graphed.	Partial or inconsistent evidence that the following conditions are met for students requiring intensive intervention: 1. There is a progress-monitoring plan in place that includes a goal. 2. The plan is reasonable for the student (e.g., appropriate frequency, alignment with student skills). 3. Progress-monitoring data are graphed.	There is evidence that the following conditions are met consistently for students who require intensive intervention: 1. There is a progress-monitoring plan in place that includes a goal. 2. The plan is reasonable for the student (e.g., appropriate frequency, alignment with student skills). 3. Progress-monitoring data are graphed.
(e) Diagnostic Assessment	There is no evidence that diagnostic assessment is used to identify specific skill deficits or function of behavior in order to guide adaptations to interventions when a student's progress is insufficient. (Examples include error analysis of progress monitoring (PM) data, work samples, functional behavior assessment (FBA), and standardized measures.)	There is some evidence that diagnostic assessment is used to identify specific skill deficits or function of behavior in order to guide adaptations to intervention when a student's progress is insufficient; however, use of diagnostic assessment is inconsistent. (Examples include error analysis of PM data, work samples, FBA, and standardized measures.)	There is evidence that diagnostic assessment is consistently used to identify specific skill deficits or function of behavior in order to guide adaptations to intervention when a student's progress is insufficient. (Examples include error analysis of PM data, work samples, FBA, and standardized measures.)

Description of Measures for Components and Subcomponents	1 (Little or No Implementation)	3 (Partial or Inconsistent Implementation)	5 (Complete and Consistent Implementation)
(f) Fidelity of Assessment Implementation	There is no evidence of the following: 1. Correct administration and scoring procedures are used. 2. A plan is in place to monitor the fidelity of assessment implementation.	There is some evidence of the following, but implementation may be inconsistent: 1. Correct administration and scoring procedures are used. 2. A plan is in place to monitor the fidelity of assessment implementation.	There is evidence of the following for all students receiving intensive intervention: 1. Correct administration and scoring procedures are used. 2. A plan is in place to monitor the fidelity of assessment implementation.

3. **Intervention**—Individualized intervention with a focus on addressing severe and persistent academic and/or behavioral needs of students

Description of Measures for Components and Subcomponents	1 (Little or No Implementation)	3 (Partial or Inconsistent Implementation)	5 (Complete and Consistent Implementation)
(a) Intensive Intervention	There is no evidence that intensive intervention consistently meets the following criteria for all students in need: 1. Designed from an evidence-based platform (when available). 2. Reasonably aligned to student needs. 3. Intensified appropriately (more intensive than Tier 2).	There is some evidence that intensive intervention meets the following criteria, but criteria are not met consistently for all students in need: 1. Designed from an evidence-based platform (when available). 2. Reasonably aligned to student needs. 3. Intensified appropriately (more intensive than Tier 2).	There is evidence that intensive intervention consistently meets the following criteria for all students in need: 1. Designed from an evidence-based platform (when available). 2. Reasonably aligned to student needs. 3. Intensified appropriately (more intensive than Tier 2).

Description of Measures for Components and Subcomponents	1 (Little or No Implementation)	3 (Partial or Inconsistent Implementation)	5 (Complete and Consistent Implementation)
(b) Adaptation of Intervention	No evidence that interventions are being adapted based on student need with both quantitative AND qualitative changes, as appropriate.	Partial or inconsistent evidence that interventions are being adapted based on student need with both quantitative AND qualitative changes, as appropriate.	Strong and consistent evidence that interventions are being adapted based on student need with both quantitative AND qualitative changes, as appropriate.
(c) Fidelity of Implementation of Intervention	No evidence that: 1. Interventions are being implemented as intended (e.g., group size, dosage, intervention components) AND 2. Fidelity of implementation of intensive intervention is being monitored adequately	Partial or inconsistent evidence that: 1. Interventions are being implemented as intended (e.g., group size, dosage, intervention components) AND 2. Fidelity of implementation of intensive intervention is being monitored adequately	Strong and consistent evidence that: 1. Interventions are being implemented as intended (e.g., group size, dosage, intervention components) AND 2. Fidelity of implementation of intensive intervention is being monitored adequately
(d) Interventionist Characteristics	No evidence that interventionists have adequate training and experience to implement intensive interventions.	Partial or inconsistent evidence that interventionists have adequate training and experience to implement intensive interventions.	Strong and consistent evidence that interventionists have adequate training and experience to implement intensive interventions.

Description of Measures for Components and Subcomponents	1 (Little or No Implementation)	3 (Partial or Inconsistent Implementation)	5 (Complete and Consistent Implementation)
(e) Relationship to Core Instruction	Intensive intervention meets neither condition: 1. Relevant to core standards or schoolwide behavior expectations 2. Appropriate for student need	Intensive intervention meets only one condition or meets both conditions, but only for some students: 1. Relevant to core standards or schoolwide behavior expectations 2. Appropriate for student need	Strong and consistent evidence that intensive intervention is appropriate for student need. Intensive intervention may be aligned with core standards/schoolwide behavior expectations, OR it may address primary deficits that serve as prerequisites to learning core standards or performing expected behaviors.

4. DBI Process—The process for designing and delivering intensive intervention in academics and/or behavior to students in need

Description of Measures for Components and Subcomponents	1 (Little or No Implementation)	3 (Partial or Inconsistent Implementation)	5 (Complete and Consistent Implementation)
(a) Team or Appropriate Support Mechanism	There is no evidence that: 1. A team has been formed to make data-based decisions as part of the DBI process OR 2. Interventionists have an appropriate system of supports available for problem solving around data-based decision making	There is partial or inconsistent evidence that: 1. A team has been formed to make data-based decisions as part of the DBI process OR 2. Interventionists have an appropriate support mechanism available for problem solving around data-based decision making	There is consistent evidence that: 1. A team has been formed to make data-based decisions as part of the DBI process; the team includes individuals with various areas of expertise pertaining to intensive intervention; additional staff participates on the team as relevant OR 2. Interventionists have an appropriate support mechanism available for problem solving around data-based decision making
(b) Regular Meetings	There is no evidence of a meeting schedule for the DBI team or appropriate support mechanism.	There is evidence of a meeting schedule for the DBI team or appropriate support mechanism, but meetings are inconsistent.	There is evidence of a regular meeting schedule for the DBI team or appropriate support mechanism.

Description of Measures for Components and Subcomponents	1 (Little or No Implementation)	3 (Partial or Inconsistent Implementation)	5 (Complete and Consistent Implementation)
(c) Data Review	There is no evidence that: 1. Adaptations of interventions are driven by student data. 2. Explicit goals with clear rules for determining when adaptations will be made are delineated for each student.	There is partial or inconsistent evidence that: 1. Adaptations of interventions are driven by student data. 2. Explicit goals with clear rules for determining when adaptations will be made are delineated for each student.	There is strong and consistent evidence that: 1. Adaptations of interventions are driven by student data. 2. Explicit goals with clear rules for determining when adaptations will be made are delineated for each student.
(d) Documentation	There is no evidence, for students receiving DBI, that: 1. Student intervention plans describe intervention components/strategies and how the intervention will be implemented (e.g., frequency, duration, and by whom). 2. Student intervention plans include a goal and progress-monitoring procedures. 3. Teachers keep intervention logs.	There is partial or inconsistent evidence, for students receiving DBI, that: 1. Student intervention plans describe intervention components/strategies and how the intervention will be implemented (e.g., frequency, duration, and by whom). 2. Student intervention plans include a goal and progress-monitoring procedures. 3. Teachers keep intervention logs.	There is strong and consistent evidence, for students receiving DBI, that: 1. Student intervention plans describe intervention components/strategies and how the intervention will be implemented (e.g., frequency, duration, and by whom). 2. Student intervention plans include a goal and progress-monitoring procedures. 3. Teachers keep intervention logs.

Description of Measures for Components and Subcomponents	1 (Little or No Implementation)	3 (Partial or Inconsistent Implementation)	5 (Complete and Consistent Implementation)
(e) Decision Rules	There is no evidence that: 1. Decision rules for determining the need for additional adaptations are clearly articulated and based on reliable, valid progress-monitoring data. 2. Decision rules are being implemented accurately.	There is partial or inconsistent evidence that: 1. Decision rules for determining the need for additional adaptations are clearly articulated and based on reliable, valid progress-monitoring data. 2. Decision rules are being implemented accurately.	There is strong and consistent evidence that: 1. Decision rules for determining the need for additional adaptations are clearly articulated and based on reliable, valid progress-monitoring data. 2. Decision rules are being implemented accurately.
(f) Overall implementation of DBI Process	There is no evidence of consistent implementation of the DBI process for students who require it.	There is evidence of partial or inconsistent implementation of the DBI process, or evidence of consistent implementation for only some students who require it.	There is evidence of consistent implementation of the DBI process for all students who require it.

5. DBI Evaluation—System for collecting and analyzing data to measure fidelity and effectiveness of DBI

Description of Measures for Components and Subcomponents	1 (Little or No Implementation)	3 (Partial or Inconsistent Implementation)	5 (Complete and Consistent Implementation)
(a) Evaluation	None of the following criteria are met: 1. Specific goals are set for the school's DBI process. 2. There is a plan to review DBI implementation (including allotted time for relevant staff to review and discuss data). 3. Relevant staff reviews the school's DBI implementation and makes changes as needed.	At least one of the following criteria is met: 1. Specific goals are set for the school's DBI process. 2. There is a plan to review DBI implementation (including allotted time for relevant staff to review and discuss data). 3. Relevant staff reviews the school's DBI implementation and makes changes as needed.	All of the following criteria are met: 1. Specific goals are set for the school's DBI process. 2. There is a plan to review DBI implementation (including allotted time for relevant staff to review and discuss data). 3. Relevant staff reviews the school's DBI implementation and makes changes as needed.