National Center on
INTENSIVE INTERVENTION
at American Institutes for Research ■

AIR®
AMERICAN INSTITUTES FOR RESEARCH®

IDEAs that Work
U.S. Office of Special
Education Programs

Continuous Program Improvement: Faculty Professional Learning Series Webinar #4

[Slide 1 – Continuous Program Improvement: Faculty Professional Learning Series: Webinar #4]: Lindsey Hayes: Good afternoon everyone. I'd like to welcome you to the National Center on Intensive Intervention's webinar on Continuous Program Improvement. This webinar is the fourth installment in our Faculty Professional Learning Series, which we kicked off in June. Today we'll be wrapping up the series by talking about continuous improvement of teacher preparation programs.

But first, I'd like to introduce myself and then our guest presenters. My name is Lindsey Hayes and I work for the National Center on Intensive Intervention at the American Institutes for Research. I'm joined by my colleague Amy Colpo who also works at the National Center on Intensive Intervention. And today, I'm very pleased to announce that we have two guest presenters joining us for the series. The first is Lynn Holdheide who is the Co-Director of the CEEDAR Center and the other is Dr. Cara McDermott-Fasy who is an Associate Professor of Special Education at Rhode Island College. We're very excited to have them with us today.

[Slide 2 – Webinar Format & Questions]: Before we get started, I want to go over a few housekeeping items. Throughout the presentation we're going to be using the question and answer pod to moderate our questions and answers later on in the presentation. So, throughout the presentation today if you have a question please submit it via the chat pod. We have someone who will be compiling those questions and asking them of our presenters at periodic points when we'll pause throughout the presentation. If you have any technical issues or questions, please also put those in the chat pod and a webinar team member will try to assist you as soon as possible.

I know another very common question that we are asked is where can we find the slide deck from today's presentation. That is located in two different places today. If you look in your GoToWebinar panel, you should be able to find our complete slide deck under the handout section and you can download that there. But if you would prefer, we will also be posting the full slide deck along with the transcript a few days after this webinar, and you can find that on our National Center on Intensive Intervention website at intensiveintervention.org. You can also, at intensiveintervention.org, access the materials from our previous three webinars in the Professional Learning Series.

[Slide 3 – Faculty Professional Learning Series]: Before we begin, I'd like to talk a little bit about the purpose of this Faculty Professional Learning Series. So, the National Center on Intensive Intervention, or NCII as it's known for short, is funded through the U.S. Department of Education's Office of Special Education Programs. NCII's mission is to build district and school capacity to support the implementation of intensive intervention, which is specifically for students with severe and persistent learning and behavioral needs. As part of our charge, we're also charged to work with institutions of higher education to help faculty members integrate intensive intervention content into their coursework and field experiences. This also applies to professional development providers who are working to support in-service educators.

So, this Professional Learning Series is part of the support that we're providing to faculty and professional development providers. Since today is the last installment of the Professional Learning Series, I would like to encourage you all to reach out to us at the National Center on intensiveintervention.org if you are interested in personalized one-on-one supports. At the end of today's session, I will be speaking more about that and what that support that we are able to offer to faculty members and professional development providers might look like.

But if you have attended this webinar or any of the previous webinars in the series, we really encourage you to reach out to us at NCII to get that one-on-one support for you and your faculty. Throughout this webinar series we've really attempted to learn from colleagues and NCII experts about topics related to intensive intervention. And I think we've gone over a lot of really great resources that we can use to help strengthen professional development and professional learning experiences for our teachers, educators and in-service teachers.

[Slide 4 – Agenda]: Today our topic is going to be continuous program improvements. So first, I want to go over our agenda. I'll spend a few minutes setting the stage for continuous and program improvement, what it is and why it's important. Then we'll hear from Lynn Holdheide with an example of a great resource that NCII in collaboration with the CEEDAR Center is about to release. It's an Innovation Configuration on Assessment practices within Multi-Tiered Systems of Support. Then we will hear from Dr. McDermott-Fasy about a program example where continuous program improvement has been used to help strengthen preparation experiences for educators at Rhode Island College. After each of these sections, we'll take a moment for questions and answers. And then I will conclude today by talking about ways that if you're a faculty member professional development provider you can again get that customized one-on-one personalized support from NCII to help strengthen preparation experiences for your teacher candidates around intensive intervention.

[Slide 5 – Introduction: Continuous Program Improvement]: So, I'll set the stage a little bit for continuous program improvement.

[Slide 6 – What is Continuous Program Improvement?]: First, let's talk about what I mean by this term of continuous program improvement. Continuous program improvement is an ongoing collaborative process by which programs review, reflect, revise and refine their content to benefit teachers within the program. We wanted this to be the final topic in our Professional Learning Series because it brings together a lot of the strands that we have talked about previously. In June, we spent a lot of time talking about the transition that we have had this year to virtual learning experiences both for K-12 students and for our pre-service teacher candidates. In October, we talked about strengthening the practice-based learning opportunities for teacher candidates including high quality clinical and field experiences. And last, at a webinar in October, we talked about resources that can really help us enhance our course content and enhance our materials using high quality course content resources.

All of these pieces together suggest a program in which a teacher candidate is receiving a coherent aligned preparation experience that grows with them. Because we expect that coherent aligned preparation experience for a teacher candidate across their entire continuum of support within the program it's important that faculty members and professional development providers

are continuously reviewing program offerings for these teacher candidates. Reflecting on the extent to which they offer the best most high-quality learning experiences for these candidates, and then make revisions or refinements as appropriate.

[Slide 7 – Why Does It Matter?]: And we know that this really matters because, again, complex skills such as designing and delivering intensive intervention, they're not taught in one class session; they're not taught even in one course. They are taught throughout all stages of the preparation experience from the coursework, to the aligned field experiences and then to the summative clinical experiences as well. And we know that course content grounded in evidence-based practices has to be married with opportunities for teacher candidates to practice and receive high quality feedback in order to get the most effective preparation experience.

So, this idea of continuous program improvement or faculty members coming together to review on, reflect upon, revise and refine programs really speaks to this idea that we need to be providing a coherent aligned learning experience for our teacher candidates that marries evidence-based practices and high-quality content with opportunities to practice.

[Slide 8 – Strengthening Teacher Preparation]: This theme today of marrying content and process is something that you'll hear us talk about and you will hear both of our guest presenters illustrate. Because we are the National Center for Intense Intervention, obviously all of our content is related to intensive intervention and preparing those teachers who are going to be serving students with the most severe and persistent learning and behavioral difficulties. Our mission at NCII is very much grounded in that content around intensive intervention, including the evidence-based practices that we need teachers to know and be able to do once they reach the classroom, and making sure that we're reinforcing that through high quality course content.

However, that content aspect around intensive intervention also has to be married with a process aspect when we talk about strengthening teacher preparation. And the way we can conceptualize that process is continuous improvement cycles. Again, those continuous improvement cycles are those cycles by which faculty are coming together to collaborate around reviewing programs. They are looking at alignment across the programs making sure that teacher candidates have a continuous learning experience and they're engaging in some critical reflection about ways that they can then improve their programs.

A lot of the resources around this continuous improvement process and experience are coming from the CEEDAR Center, CEEDAR standing for the Collaboration for Effective Educator Development Accountability and Reform. CEEDAR is also another OSEP funded Center, as I mentioned is NCII. But CEEDAR works with teacher preparation, faculty and state education agencies to create networks around professional learning systems and really working to strengthen both teacher practice and policy. So, a lot of the resources that we mentioned today are coming out of the CEEDAR Center, and particularly their Innovation Configurations which you'll hear Lynn Holdheide speak more about in a moment. But I want to highlight again that once we marry this idea of intensive intervention content and a continuous improvement process, we can use resources both from NCII where you're getting really high-quality course content that's designed for faculty and professional development providers. And marrying that with the continuous improvement process that's promoted through tools like the Innovation

Configurations. And through these things together we can help faculty continuously improve and enhance their programs to the benefit of teacher candidates.

[Slide 9 – Assessment Practices Within a Multi-Tiered System of Supports Innovation Configuration: Lynn Holdheide, CEEDAR Center]: With that I'm going to introduce Lynn Holdheide who is the Co-Director of the CEEDAR Center and let her talk about a brand new Innovation Configuration that's a collaboration between NCII and CEEDAR.

Lynn Holdheide: Thank you Lindsey, and welcome everyone. Glad to join you this afternoon and really happy to be able to show you the Assessment IC that was most recently released, actually, just put up on the website today I believe. Amy is going to put a link to it in the chat. As many of you know, CEEDAR has developed a number of Innovation Configurations and this one is adding to that list. It can be located on the website. This IC I think is a very timely and important IC. As many of you know, studies continue to reveal that teacher candidates often exit their programs without the ability to analyze and interpret assessment data well. And at the same time, we know that reports continue to suggest that preparation programs generally do not include data literacy, knowledge and skills within their coursework and field experiences. So, this IC is, as I said, very timely and important and it takes it a bit further and situates assessment knowledge and skill within an MTSS framework, which I know we are all passionate about and is critically important. If before we—if you can go to the next slide.

[Slide 10 – Assessment Practices Within a Multi-Tiered System of Supports]: So, before we go into this IC, I wanted to just call your attention to where the ICs fit into the broader preparation policy and reform initiative and initiatives that CEEDARs charge to supporting. CEEDAR has designed a road map to educator preparation reform. As you can hopefully see here in a minute on the slide, that is a planning framework to support preparation programs as they work to integrate evidence-based and high leverage practices within their coursework and field experiences. It highlights the major guidelines that programs should consider throughout the reform process and provides supporting facilitation guidance, including examples and resources for EPPs that can have that have both engaged and benefited from the reform process.

[Slide 11 – Step 4: Review Programs]: Step four in this roadmap. Thank you, Lindsey. That you can now see in the roadmap is really where these ICs are situated and fit within the broader reform initiative. And as you can see, it says review programs. I've lost count; I think we have sixteen ICs in total. And these ICs can be used to really evaluate how well candidates are being taught to provide, to implement the evidence-based practice.

[Slide 12 – Innovation Configurations (IC) Purpose]: And the next slide, hopefully won't take us quite as long to get there. But I did want to just review a little bit about what the ICs are. I know Lindsey kind of set us up very well and talked a lot about how we use the ICs to really strengthen existing preparation programs. And they're really designed to help evaluate how well and to what extent candidates are offered experiences and opportunities to apply both evidence-based practices and high leverage practices within a program. They can also be used to evaluate professional learning activities. They're not designed to be a high-stakes assessment evaluation process; they're really a self-assessment process that we find to be very useful as a collaborative process with faculty among and within a program. And what they do is help you look at a

program holistically to identify the gaps and strengths and needs within a program. And as a result, use those to strengthen the program, similar to what Lindsey described earlier as a continuous improvement cycle.

[Slide 13 – Innovation Configurations]: ICs answer the following questions and I've already alluded to that. But what type of instruction and experiences do teachers receive? With a particular focus on opportunities candidates have to apply what they have learned. And that opportunity of application is then applied or paired with coaching and feedback. We all know this: it is much harder to actually implement the practice than to learn about it. You can learn about a practice you can know the research behind it but actually being in a classroom and using it to a level of fidelity is so much harder. And so, what Innovation Configurations are designed to do is really look across the breadth of knowledge development to application, and ensuring that the opportunities for candidates to learn and practice are scaffolded over time and paired with coaching and support, which we all know is necessary in order to hit a level of expertise and fidelity of implementation.

[Slide 14 – Innovation Configuration Process]: The process to use the ICs is one that is self-driven and is designed really to look across the program and not at a particular course. Sometimes people will take a look at like Scientifically Based Reading instruction and think, well I'm just going to look at that particular course. And I think you all know that covering contents and evidence-based practices deeply cannot happen just one course alone. So, I just wanted to stress that. And I also wanted to stress that the ICs are really focused on the essential components of an evidence-based practice and it really is, as I mentioned before, targeting opportunities for candidates to deliberately apply these practices that they've learned in their coursework.

[Slide 15 – Innovation Configuration Dimensions]: You see the reiteration of the essential components; these are either descriptors or examples of that particular practice and provide a little bit more detail about that component or essential component of the evidence-based practice. And there's also the degree of implementation. Again, that's taking a look at the degree to which they have an opportunity to practice.

[Slide 16 – Innovation Configuration Format]: You see an example of a written form of an IC. You can see the essential features that run down the left column, I should say essential components that run down the left column. And then you look at the implementation levels that run across the top. This is a printed form which you can find on the website. We also, for CEEDAR states have an electronic IC platform where you can upload your coursework, assignments, etc. And it generates, once you enter the data, generates a matrix which really helps you assess the program holistically and look to see where strengths can be made.

[Slide 17 – Essential Components]: So, now I'll go deeply into the MTSS Assessment IC. As you see here there's five essential components. None of this I think is surprising and demonstrates what candidates should know and be able to do upon completion as it means to the use of assessment within an MTSS framework. These essential components can serve as a foundation for strengthening existing programs so that educators can exit with some level of capacity to use these various forms of assessments to make database educational instructional

decisions and services. And I want to emphasize within the MTSS framework we could have just done this assessment IC is just assessment in general. But we really wanted to make sure that we situated the use of data and the use of assessment within an MTSS framework so that teachers and candidates really have an understanding how it fits. So, once they get out into a school system, they have the skills to operate effectively in an MTSS system.

I also want to note that we're not naïve. We know that it takes a lot of time and practice to become an expert with assessment and the skills that are related to it. And we recognize and that it's really important that not only do teachers learn this in a pre-service context but that we carry it through it in service context so that we're constantly reinforcing the skills that teachers need and the knowledge that teachers need in their classrooms.

[Slide 18 – 1.0 – Foundation of MTSS Assessment]: So, I'm going to break down each of those essential components a little bit. I'm not going to go in big detail because we don't have time. And I think you probably already know a lot about a lot of these. But this is just a tool that really helps highlight those that are critically important. As you can see here, the first area addresses general knowledge of MTSS frameworks: what's their purpose and how can assessment data be used to make decisions. And it also makes a distinction between the three-tiered systems. So, basically what you see here is it really is setting the foundation to have an understanding of what MTSS is and how assessment is situated within the tiered system to help it be implemented well. And then it also describes the different types of assessments—formative, summative and diagnostic—and how they can be again utilized within each of the tiers of assessment and tiers of implementation.

[Slide 19 – 2.0 – Universal Screening]: The next one is universal screening. Under this component the critical features of a universal screening are described and how it is used to identify students who may be at risk of poor learning or social emotional outcomes and to identify students who need more support. And again, this is not something that's new. But what I do think this does is really break it down to what is it that educators need to know. They need to understand the tool selection process within a screening tool. They need to have the process and the knowledge to administer and score the screening tools because what we've seen is that this is often a struggle that we're not implementing the screening tools well. And therefore, the data doesn't have as much fidelity to it to make educational decisions. And they also need to use this to know how to use these data to report it and also to make some other educational decisions. So, universal screening is critically important. You see some links to some resources that are part of the NCII's website to help in making those decisions.

[Slide 20 – 3.0 - Progress Monitoring]: The next is Progress Monitoring. Many of you know that this is critically important and has a lot of evidence behind it. That it comprises of looking at data consistently and monitoring student's progress has a huge impact on student performance in academics and in behavior. And it really is a process to take a look at those students who are identified at risk and ensure that progress is being made or if instructional adaptations need to be made.

So, there's some skills that teachers need. They need to have the skills and knowledge to analyze the technical adequacy and usability of potential progress monitoring tools. Many of you have

National Center on
INTENSIVE INTERVENTION
at American Institutes for Research ■

AIR
AMERICAN INSTITUTES FOR RESEARCH®

IDEAs
that Work
U.S. Office of Special
Education Programs

seen the progress monitoring tools chart that NCII uses which is critically important. But they also need to understand how do you make decisions about which tools to select. They also need to understand how to create individual student academic and behavioral goals. What is it? What's a good goal? What is sufficient progress? And how do you set a goal that by meeting those benchmarks the student will be on target to learn the academic standards that were set forth? So, those two are really important for students to learn and that is, candidates to learn rather. And that is a critical part of what's in the progress monitoring section of the Assessment IC.

And then most importantly, they need to know how to monitor the data. How do they collect it? How do they graph it? And how do they make educational decisions accordingly? And I know this sounds, maybe sounds kind of trite, like these are things that we know all teachers need to know already. But I can tell you in my experience this is the hardest thing for teachers to do. Using assessment data, making sure that they understand how to use the skills, take the data, make educational decisions about the data and feel confident in the results.

[Slide 21 – 4.0 – Intensifying Instruction Using DBI]: The next is one that you know very well. It is how do you intensify instruction using DBI? I elected not to go very deeply here because I know this is something that you guys cover quite a bit under the National Center for Intensive Intervention. But it is important to really understand the process and that candidates understand the process of DBI. Again, how are you using this data to make decisions? How are you really looking at the data to in a calculated way to make some very systemic instructional decisions that can help a particular student?

And I think you're very familiar with these, but I do think that teachers, especially Special Education teachers really need to have a deep understanding of how to intensify instruction using DBI. And I think that's an important distinction too, that there are some assessment knowledge and components within this IC that all teachers need to know. And then there are others like component four that are most critical for teachers of students with disabilities to have a really deep knowledge of.

[Slide 22 – 5.0 – Using MTSS Data]: And lastly, is component five and how are we using MTSS data. I mentioned before how are we ensuring that teachers know how to use the data to make instructional decisions. Obviously, that's really important. But also, how are they sharing that data with other educators and using that data to make decisions? We've all talked about data, developing a data rich culture and I think that's critically important. Teachers need to feel comfortable with data and they need to know how that data is being used to make not only individual student decisions but also programmatic and school decisions and how they are setting up services. And so, it's really important that they understand how to communicate that data, that they're participating in a data-driven kind of culture where you're discussing the data on a regular basis. And how are you sharing the data with your colleagues about how well the students are performing. Again, you know we we've gotten into this mode of a lot of data collection and not enough data use. And this is really cornering in on let's collect the data; make sure it's valid and reliable. But most importantly, let's use that data then to make educational decisions both at the individual level and at the programmatic level.

[Slide 23 – Evaluating MTSS Implementation]: And then finally, how are you using that data to evaluate MTSS implementation. I think everybody on this phone call knows the study that was done years ago that said RTI didn't work. And almost everybody said well that's because of fidelity of implementation. And this comes back to the continuous improvement cycle that Lindsey mentioned earlier. If you're not evaluating your MTSS system, both at the student level at the tiered level and at the organ, the school-wide level you're missing the mark. You're not having an opportunity to really check on the fidelity of implementation. We know there is evidence behind each of these components. And we also know that implementing those components with fidelity has a huge impact on MTSS success.

[Slide 24 – Questions?]: So, there's a lot that I just shared there. And I know many of you are very familiar with MTSS and the assessments that you use within, but I wanted to kind of give you a general overview of what this IC looks like and the way you would use it is to take a look at your program, whether it be for a General Ed., Special Ed. or even leaders and take a look at about how well teachers or the candidates are taught to understand what this assessment data is. How again, it is situated within an MTSS system? And then most particularly how are they learning and using the skills that they've learned throughout their program?

Sometimes I've heard the ICs be equated with NCTQ and the evaluation of programs. That's not what these are designed to do. This is really designed to be a self-reflective process that faculty can use collaboratively to really take a look at their programs and strengthen them so that the candidates once they get out have the skills to reinforce MTSS implementation. And most importantly, to ensure that they have the skills to support all students learning, especially those students that are at most risk of learning or of not reaching the outcomes we'd like them to achieve. With that Lindsey, I'll just stop and see what kind of questions we have.

Lindsey Hayes: Okay well please feel free to enter your questions in the chat pod and we'll pull those out and ask Lynn. But I'll start with two questions for you Lynn. You had spoken previously about the dimensions of the Innovation Configuration being the essential components and then the implementation levels. Can you talk a little bit more about the implementation levels? What those are and what those mean?

Lynn Holdheide: I can. And I don't know if you want to drop back to that slide Lindsey and have them up. But it's basically taking a look from zero through; yeah, I'll wait to see that you get there. So, you got it up. A little bit more.

Lindsey Hayes: Apologies everybody. It's giving me a little trouble. There's a lag I'm sorry. There you go.

[Slide 16 – Innovation Configuration Format]: **Lynn Holdheide:** There you go. So, I mentioned the essential components are down the left-hand side. And I should note, and I know you're asking me about implementation levels, but I want to kind of start with these essential components really quickly. Those aren't just pulled out from the air. Those are taking the research using national experts to identify what are the essential components that have the absolute evidence-base behind them to ensure that we have those listed down there, the left side, those are critically important. But most important too is the levels of implementation. And this is

looking at zero. There's really no evidence that that particular component is being covered within the program all the way up to level three, which is that highest level where you know there's some level of application with coaching and feedback. Now I think this is important and this is why you need to take a look at a program and not just a course.

Because there have been many times when I've looked at a particular course and they might have done a fair amount of knowledge development, say in progress monitoring, but they, in terms of assessment, it's really talking about progress monitoring and assessment within a test or in some sort of an assessment. And it doesn't actually have the candidate practicing and using progress monitoring data in a real-life situation. So, that's why you look across the program. So, you can see you might have, I don't know, course 101 that really does get into progress monitoring and MTSS at a very knowledge development level. And then in course, I don't know, 201 you might get a little bit deeper and have these students conducting assessments with their peers or with students in a tutoring situation.

And then you can go all the way to level three where you're actually in classrooms and you're using that data. You're using those skills with some level of supervision either from the co-operating teacher or the supervisor at the university. So, that's what those levels of implementation are meant to do. I can tell you that when I did these reviews for a lot of syllabi over five hundred of them. What I noticed a lot was that the skill sets were listed in the standards on the syllabi. But rarely did it get to that level three where there was some clear indication that there was some expectation of application with feedback. Does that answer your question Lindsey?

Lindsey Hayes: I think it did. And some of what you said is actually a nice lead into the next question, which is someone who mentioned; and I think this is probably a pretty common scenario across teacher prep programs. What happens when within the sequence of the teacher prep program there is one course that is devoted to assessment? How would you use this Innovation Configuration in a program scenario like that, where there is a devoted course for assessment?

Lynn Holdheide: That's a very good question and one that comes up a lot. And that's why I think it needs to be a program-wide review and a collaborative process. Because what we have found; you know adding another course is usually not an option right. Because we're already covered with enough courses and credit requirements already. So, how do you keep adding courses on? And what often happens is you sit down, and you review what are the skills that are needed and what is covered in that particular course. And you're going to start to identify gaps, because you can only do so much in one course. And what you can then do is start to take a look at other courses within the program and see where can we embed some of this assessment work? Can it be in a pedagogy course? Can it be within a rating course? And the answer would be yes to all of those. But really what this allows you to do most particularly when you look at the matrix, which is when I say matrix is the entire program for a candidate and start to take a look at all the field experiences and the coursework. You can start to see where there's some opportunity to embed assessment within existing courses. That's not to say you can't have a standalone

assessment course still. But what it does show is how are you going to integrate those skills within content? So, the skills are really cemented for teachers. Does that make sense Lindsey?

Lindsey Hayes: Yes, it does. Thank you, Lynn. Amy are there any other questions that have come through the chat pod?

Amy Colpo: There's no more at this time. But feel free as we move on. If you have any regarding Lynn's presentation to drop them in there and we'll be sure to get them answered.

Lindsey Hayes: Alright. Thank you, Amy. And thank you so much Lynn for the overview of the Assessment for MTSS Innovation Configuration.

[Slide 25 – Interpreting Results from Universal Screeners]: So, in keeping with our theme about the marriage of content and process today, Lynn has just given an excellent example of an Innovation Configuration grounded in content that is very applicable to intensive intervention. And now we're going to hear from Dr. Cara McDermott-Fasy of Rhode Island College about how she has actually used continuous improvement cycles within her program. So, welcome Dr. McDermott-Fasy.

Dr. Cara McDermott-Fasy: Thank you for the opportunity to share a little bit about our continuous improvement efforts related to literacy and some of the resources that helped us improve course content along the way. This has really been a collaborative effort for us at Rhode Island College. And so, I really want to emphasize the "we" pronoun as I talk about the journey that we've been on. I'm just going to give you a little; can you go to the next slide Lindsey?

[Slide 26 – Context]: Thank you. Before I begin, I just wanted to provide a little context. Our state has been fortunate in that we have worked with NCII for many years through State Personal Development Grants, etc. As such, we have a lot of folks with expertise related to Multi-Tiered Systems of Support in our State Department of Education, institutions of higher ed. and local districts who have partnered extensively with NCII and other stakeholders like our Parent Information Network. Collectively, we have been working to build and refine Multi-Tiered Systems of Support to maximize student achievement and support students social emotional and behavioral needs for many years.

During the 2016–2017 academic year, institutions of higher ed. in our state were invited to learn more about the CEEDAR Center. As you may know, CEEDAR stands for Collaboration for Effective Educator Development Accountability and Reform. Their mission in part focuses on helping teacher and leader preparation programs reflect on and enhance course content related to core and specialized instruction to support students with disability in achieving college and career ready standards. We had just completed an accreditation process for our State Department of Education and we were embarking on a redesign. So, the timing of this introduction to CEEDAR was excellent for us. Our CEEDAR work began in the winter of 2017 with a series of modules on intensive intervention. This series of modules really brought together our state's past work with NCII and our future work with CEEDAR. At that time, we started to prioritize the courses in which intensive intervention content needed to be embedded and we worked to put a theater team together.

National Center on
INTENSIVE INTERVENTION
at American Institutes for Research ■

AIR
AMERICAN INSTITUTES FOR RESEARCH®

IDEAs
that Work
U.S. Office of Special
Education Programs

[Slide 27 – Continuous Improvement Related to Literacy]: In the fall of 2017, we began our next phase which focused on conducting a syllabi review using one or more of the CEEDAR Innovation Configurations and their Network Improvement Community or NIC platform. One of the ICs we chose was Evidence-Based Reading Instruction K-5, based on our conversations related to intensive interventions that spring and reading proficiency data that we were increasingly concerned about. To do this work, we assembled a subcommittee of faculty from the Elementary Education and Special Education Departments.

The IC still by review process allows teams to look for any gaps or redundancies across course content. Initially this opportunity allowed us to sit down together and talk about the current context related to literacy, our goals and the courses in our current literacy scope and sequence across departments. Our continuous improvement journey related to literacy was part of a wider continuous improvement journey being undertaken by our School of Education. Overarching themes for our subcommittee as we embarked on the syllabi review process included the belief that literacy is an equity issue, that we needed to embrace a de-siloed approach to reform, and that we wanted to produce a literacy scope and sequence that mapped onto the MTSS, RTI, DBI framework and later aligned to the state's 2019 Right to Read Act, which included the requirements that program completers demonstrate proficiency in the Science of Reading and Structure of Literacy.

[Slide 28 – Goal #1: Intensive Intervention]: One major goal for our program completers is to be ready to support students with severe and persistent learning needs in the area of literacy and their families from day one. We recognized the importance of mentoring and induction and we knew that there would always be some level of scale up needed. However, a goal as we embarked on this continuous improvement journey was for our program completers to be ready to implement intensive intervention on day one. From our work with families, we knew the all too common narrative of parents whose children were diagnosed with language-based learning differences such as Dyslexia. We knew every year was critical and every teacher needed to be knowledgeable and effective.

[Slide 29 – Goal #2: Map Courses to MTSS/RTI/DBI Framework]: Another major goal discussed was to map our current course scope and sequence onto the MTSS, RTI, DBI framework to ensure that we were providing our teacher candidates with the knowledge, skills and practice-based learning opportunities to build competencies related to intensive intervention over the course of our program. And I think this is what Lynn was talking about. This enabled us to realize that we were missing critical content related to Tier 2, the foundation for Data-Based Individualization. We had also heard LEA representatives attending the modules on intensive intervention provided by NCII that; sorry. Representatives attending the modules on intensive intervention expressed competencies related to Tier 2 were often the most need of enhancement. We did have a CBM project in our Special Education Assessment course. However, feedback received during the accreditation process suggested shifting some of the coursework on RTI content to Elementary Ed. coursework. And including additional opportunities for candidates to learn about formal educational testing relevant to Special Ed. in our Special Education Assessment course. In sum, we have some refinement to do in order to achieve these two goals.

National Center on
INTENSIVE INTERVENTION
at American Institutes for Research ■

AIR® American Institutes for Research®

IDEAs that Work
U.S. Office of Special Education Programs

[Slide 30 – Examples of Change]: So, here are some of the examples of changes that we made to our literacy scope and sequence. We added a Tier 2 Literacy course. This helped us get at some of the essential content that was missing as well as some of those application pieces. We better align course content to the Science of Reading and Structured Literacy. We reworked our practice-based learning opportunities and course artifacts. For example, we added a high-quality core curriculum analysis assignment into our; each of our foundational courses. And we shifted our CBM project from our Special Ed. Assessment course into our Tier 2 Literacy course. In addition, we added a Capstone course in which teacher candidates will explore the needs of students with language-based learning differences, reflecting upon how, where and to what extent they and their families are being served or could be served in schools. And the teacher candidates will complete a self-driven project of their choice in that class.

[Slide 31 – Literacy Scope and Sequence]: So, here is our new literacy scope and sequence. In addition to these courses our teacher candidates take a course entitled Supporting Student Social Emotional Behavioral Needs and a course entitled Assessment for Students with Special Needs. These courses help address additional content related to Multi-Tiered Systems of Support. The addition of the Tier 2 Literacy course will also provide us with opportunities to integrate course content on high leverage practices in Special Education related to collaboration in addition to assessment. These HLPs address competencies such as collaborating with professionals to increase student success and critically organizing and facilitating effective meetings with professionals and families, which were also areas of need of need of enhancement in our program.

[Slide 32 – Mapping Courses to MTSS/RTI/DBI Framework]: We feel our new scope and sequence better positions our program completers to be ready to provide intensive intervention upon hire. By backward mapping from that overarching goal across the MTSS, RTI, DBI framework, we were able to enhance course content to ensure that we were providing our teacher candidates with the knowledge, skills and practice based opportunities to build competencies related to intensive intervention over the course of the program.

[Slide 33 – What Informed Changes? CEEDAR Technical Assistance]: Now I just wanted to share a few of the resources that were useful to us in our continuous improvement journey and the first resource was CEEDAR Technical Assistance.

[Slide 34 – Continuous Refinement]: Over the years, CEEDAR has provided us with technical assistance and tools to utilize in our continuous refinement efforts. As mentioned, our work with CEEDAR consisted of a syllabi review utilizing the Evidence-Based Reading Instruction K5 Innovation Configuration on their NIC platform. We did that in the fall of 2017. One of the things that that really did for us was just create the space for faculty members from Elementary Ed. and Special Education Departments to sit around a table, spread out our syllabi on the table and think about our courses across departments in a form of the scope and sequence.

So, that work with CEEDAR, that initial work with CEEDAR really created that time and space to have those conversations. Really that de-siloed approach that was really critical. A few semesters later, we chose to conduct another syllabi review utilizing the Evidence-Based Practices for Writing Instruction Innovation Configuration. And I would just say that the IC

National Center on
INTENSIVE INTERVENTION
at American Institutes for Research ■

AIR® AMERICAN INSTITUTES FOR RESEARCH®

IDEAs that Work
U.S. Office of Special
Education Programs

syllabi review process really does allow teams to look for any gaps and redundancies across courses, and then you can refine and enhance courses as needed.

[Slide 35 – Current Collaboration: Creating a Crosswalk]: And really our current work, which is really exciting, a subcommittee of our state CEEDAR Team is working on creating a crosswalk between these course content resources for supporting students with intensive needs in the area of literacy. Upon completion, we plan to conduct an additional syllabi review using this crosswalk to further refine our literacy scope and sequence. And I would just say that the technical assistance provided by CEEDAR over these years has been critical to our course refinement process and thinking about our scope and sequence across departments and helping us meet those two overarching goals that I talked about in the beginning.

[Slide 36 – What Informed Changes? Advisory Committees]: Another important; Advisory Committees were another important course content resource for us.

[Slide 37 – Continuous Feedback]: As part of our wider School of Education redesign we created Program Advisory Committees. Our Program Advisory Committee consisted of a variety of key stakeholders who were able to provide us with feedback about our current program and proposed revisions. This feedback enabled us to further refine our course content. And we were really lucky in this process to have LEA representatives that have worked with NCII for many years. We had Literacy Specialists on that Advisory Committee who were able to provide really targeted feedback related to our revised scope and sequence so that was really powerful. And the final resource on the next slide.

[Slide 38 – What Informed Changes? Participation in a Wider Community of Practice]: That has been helpful for us especially as of late, is participation in a wider Community of Practice.

[Slide 39 – Continuous Learning]: We are continuously learning. And as we know better, we try to do better. On this slide you just see examples of some of our activities that we've been involved in; things like the Letters Training Book Clubs that we've been doing with on people in the state. But also, now between departments we're doing book clubs, being part of Professional Learning Communities, etc. So, continuous learning has really been an important part of our continuous improvement process as well.

[Slide 40 – Timeline]: So, our first course in our redesign program will be starting this spring. Our first program completers will be entering the field in the spring of 2024. And really interestingly that will align with on the new proficiency requirements in our Right to Read Act. So, we're really looking forward to the program starting to roll out this spring and starting to continue to reflect and refine as we move forward.

[Slide 41 – How Are We Collecting Data On Our Continuous Improvement Efforts?]: We are going to be collecting data as our new program rolls out. We are fortunate that our School of Ed. has an excellent Assessment and Program Improvement Committee. They're sort of leading the way on the unit level data collection and the program level data collection. In terms of the literacy scope and sequence we're really interested in collecting data from our program

National Center on
INTENSIVE INTERVENTION
at American Institutes for Research ■

AIR® American Institutes for Research®

IDEAs that Work
U.S. Office of Special Education Programs

completers and their employers. Do the program completers and those that hire them feel they are prepared to implement intensive interventions upon hire? Are they ready to support students with language-based learning differences including Dyslexia? We're also really starting to; we're thinking, we're working with our colleagues in Early Childhood to think about how we can build stronger partnerships with districts and schools, and really think about student impact data as well. We anticipate that there'll be a proficiency requirement down the road. And so, that will provide us with additional data to analyze.

[Slide 42 – Resources for Continuous Improvement]: So, I just want to say thank you for the opportunity to share a little bit about our continuous improvement journey related to literacy. It's been really a collaborative effort and we look forward to seeing how the program rolls out over the next few semesters. In terms of course content resources, these are the examples that have been really critical to our work. And I really look forward to using on the new Innovation Configuration that Lynn spoke about today. I think that that will really help us on our journey as we move forward. So, thank you very much.

[Slide 43 – Questions]: **Lindsey Hayes:** Thank you so much Cara. I thought that you gave such great illustrative examples of exactly how you and your team of colleagues went through this process. I think it was really helpful to see. And I know we have some questions coming in the chat pod. So, I'll let Amy take it away.

Amy Colpo: So, the first question we have is someone wanting to know more about the book clubs you mentioned. Can you share more about how they're organized? The goal of the meetings? Who are the stakeholders? How often do you meet?

Dr. Cara McDermott-Fasy: Yeah, that sort of developed over time. I think we started in early summer and it was just, you know just somebody who was a Literacy Specialist in the state. Just a few of us talking and we're like you know what why if we had time, we do more reading right. And so, we just sort of thought that the book club would be a good way to marry our work and collaboration etc. So, it was really just an informal start. We meet monthly or bi-monthly. We meet via Zoom. We have some guiding questions. The current book club that I'm in is reading the Reading Comprehension Blueprint, that has people who are for example Orton-Gillingham. They're going through the Orton-Gillingham program. They're on the, there are teachers that are also a part of it. We have a State Department of Ed. Literacy Specialist involved, a couple of faculty from our School of Education and practitioners in the field. But we're reading in the EL Ed. and Special Ed. faculty just started a book club on the knowledge gap.

We really wanted to think about the simple view of reading and think about the language comprehension strand and really get the connection with our methods classes, like Social Studies Methods and Science Methods. So, when we started that book club with the Elementary and Special Education Department faculty we were trying to make the connection between the literacy work that we were doing and the methods courses in science and social studies and how we could bring those two pieces of the simple view of reading together to promote reading proficiency in our state. And so, just kind of get the conversation going. So, we meet monthly or bimonthly via Zoom for about an hour. And we have questions that we kind of start with and then we just go from there. It's been really wonderful.

National Center on
INTENSIVE INTERVENTION
at American Institutes for Research ■

AIR
AMERICAN INSTITUTES FOR RESEARCH®

IDEAs that Work
U.S. Office of Special Education Programs

Lindsey Hayes: Cara, I'll pose the next question for you. At multiple points, you mentioned this dovetailing with your accreditation process. Can you speak a little bit about how the Innovation Configurations and the continuous improvement processes you went through, how they fit in with accreditation?

Dr. Cara McDermott-Fasy: I just think that; you know we're just accreditation sort of, that process is a process that promotes reflection. And I think the Innovation Configuration gave us a tool and that is all. I always think about the fact that what the most powerful part of that process initially was just that it got us all to sit down around the table together and created that space for conversations. I had been; I just felt that that was the most powerful thing. That we, like Lynn mentioned, sometimes we focus so much on our course and our course syllabi that we just don't have the time and space to kind of sit down with other people on the scope and sequence and really think about gaps and redundancies. So, I feel like both the accreditation process and the the Innovation Configurations allowed us to just kind of sit back and reflect and take the time to think about things.

I will say the Advisory Committees were developed as part of our accreditation process to kind of get some additional feedback. And they were very helpful. And that we were able to kind of bring our new program ideas to those Advisory Committees and they were able to give us feedback and it was really helpful.

Lindsey Hayes: Great. I think we have time for one more quick question. Can you speak a little bit about the Capstone project? What are the requirements of that? And what kinds of things have students chosen to do in the past?

Dr. Cara McDermott-Fasy: So, this new program is just rolling out. So, we haven't had the Capstone experience yet because they're just beginning the new course next semester. But what we decided to do when we redesigned our program was the semester before this, the teacher candidate student teach, we wanted to give them the option for a Capstone experience. So, they'll have the choice of either picking the capstone course related to project-based learning which will be more focused on math and science or they can pick the capstone related to specialized language instruction. So, before they go into their student teaching experience, they get to sort of have this choice of a Capstone experience.

In both Capstones, there'll be a self-driven project. So, it's the call in the literacy scope and sequence; it's the culmination of their coursework. And now they get to sort of reflect and think about what they might want to learn a little bit more about, you know, do they want to learn more about Orthographic Mapping? Or the Four-Part Processor Model? Or you know, different models for supporting students with language-based learning differences within the district? Maybe what is it like for a student who is going to one of the specialized language schools is attending. What is that experience like for the student and the family? Things like that. So, it's a real self-different product. Self-driven project that will be obviously meant to, you know, we'll be able to advise them on it. But those are some examples of some of the things I'm thinking they might be interested in pursuing. Also interviewing, you know going a little bit, maybe going a little bit more in depth with a teacher going through kind of Orton-Gillingham training or letters training. Kind of learning more about things like that.

[Slide 44 – Sample Innovation Configurations]: **Lindsey Hayes:** Okay, thank you for that. And I'd like to again thank both Lynn and Cara for really excellent examples that you gave to help illustrate continuous program improvement at various. So, I'm going to wrap this up for the day. At various points previously in the presentation, both Lynn and Cara mentioned other topics of the Innovation Configurations, and I said earlier I think they're about sixteen total now. So, we have just a sampling of some of the other topics on which Innovation Configurations are available. And it's things like Evidence-Based Reading Instruction that you heard Cara mentioned, Universal Design for Learning, Culturally Responsive Teaching. A number of topics related to behavior and there's one for Response to Intervention. And this is this is just a, again, a sampling of them. So, if you are interested in taking a look at that Innovation Configuration process for any other particular content area, please take a look at the CEEDAR website which is listed here on the slide.

[Slide 45 – Opportunity for Faculty]: And finally, as I mentioned at the beginning of the webinar, because our Faculty Learning Series is at an end, we want to talk about next steps for faculty support. And we have a really great opportunity that's available through NCII to offer personalized one-on-one supports to teacher prep program faculty around intensive intervention. So, all the things that we've talked about in this webinar series, for instance the faculty course content resources, the practice piece, learning opportunity resources and ways to strengthen virtual supports to teacher candidates. All of those things, NCII has technical assistance providers who are ready and available to provide that personalized one-on-one support to any faculty or teams of faculty that decide that they would like some support in taking a look at their courses and programs around intensive intervention. So, this support can take a number of different forms ad this list is certainly not exhaustive.

But things that NCII technical assistance providers might be able to do for you are training for faculty on NCII course content, resources and tools. And this can be personalized and customized to the needs of your particular faculty. We can provide assistance reviewing programs for intensive intervention course content. We can make sure that we are linking you to high quality resources to enhance your existing course activities or field experiences or pretty much anything else you need. So, if you are interested in what you've heard during this Faculty Learning Series and you would like again to situate that conversation now in the context of what's happening in your particular teacher prep program or your particular courses we would love to hear from you.

If you are interested in this type of support, I really encourage you to reach out to me. I can be reached at lhayes@air.org. I think this would be a great opportunity for faculty because, as we previously heard, and you heard Cara mention this, you know, the support from CEEDAR and I would extend that to say support from CEEDAR and other OSEP funded Centers like NCII could be really valuable to helping faculty integrate this really high-quality intensive intervention course content into their programs. So, I really encourage you to reach out. Again, you can reach out to me at lhayes@air.org and we look forward to hearing from you.

[Slide 46 – National Center on Intensive Intervention]:   With that, Amy, we'll do one last check. Any other questions coming through the chat pod?

Amy Colpo: No, there are no more questions.

Lindsey Hayes: Okay. Well with that I see that Eliza has put our link to our survey today into the chat pod. We very much appreciate your cooperation with filling that out. We'll give you a moment to do that. You can see our contact information for all the presenters listed here today. I want to thank you for yet another great webinar, thank our guest presenters Lynn and Cara. And thank you all for a really great Professional Learning Series. Goodbye.