

Results Driven Accountability and Intensive Intervention: Using MTSS to Improve Outcomes for Students with Disabilities

Webinar Transcript

Moderator: Thank you all so much for joining us today at our Webinar on Results Driven Accountability and Intensive Intervention; Using MTSS to Improve Outcomes for Students with Disabilities.

[Slide 2 – A Note about Questions]: A note about some questions before we get started today. If you have technical questions if you wouldn't mind inserting them into the "Chat Box?" That will help our host address your technical questions if you can't hear the audio or if you're having difficulty signing on. If you have questions related to the webinar content if you will go ahead and put those in the "Q and A Box" which is below the "Chat Box." That will help our panelists that are on to answer your questions related to the webinar content. Please note that there are a lot of you logged in so, we will do our best to address the webinar content questions that you have. But, we may not be able to get to all of them. We will be answering those questions after the webinar is over and answers to your questions will be posted with the webinar.

[Slide 3 – Panelists]: So, before we get started today, I want to introduce the panelists that will be going through this. And we're really lucky to have some great panelists today. I am Doctor Sarah Arden and I'm just going to be doing the introductions to this webinar. I am a Researcher at The American Institutes for Research. I actually do technical assistance for them primarily in the state of Missouri. We also have Doctor Laura Berry Kuchle with us who is a Researcher as well at The American Institutes for Research. And she does technical assistance in the state of Missouri as well but also all over. In addition to her, we really lucky to have Doctor Chris Lemons with us. He is one of our Senior Advisors at The National Center on Intensive Interventions and he is an Assistant Director in the Department of Special ED at Peabody College of Vanderbilt University. We also have Doctor Chris Riley-Tillman on with us. He is a Trainer and has helped us do come of the conceptualization work for the National Center on Intensive Interventions. He is also a Professor at the University of Missouri College of Education.

[Slide 4 – Session Overview]: So, an overview of what we're going to do today. The first about ten slides are what I'm going to be reviewing with you. And that's talking about the division of results drive accountability and how intensive intervention is part of results driven accountability. And then I will also be giving you an overview of The National Center on Systemic Improvement.

And then we're going to move on to do an introduction to data-based individualization. And talk about why do we need to assess DBI? Then talk through the implementation rubric with some lessons that we have learned at The National Center on Intensive Interventions. We will talk about strategies for improving technical assistance and some resources around supporting implementation for MTSS and data-based individualization.

[Slide 5 – Results-Driven Accountability: Vision] So, recently there's been a shift. This is a shift from OSEP to measuring outcomes for students with disabilities. Measuring their outcome based on compliance to measuring their outcomes with results plus compliance. And this comes because, what we know is that, even if we just measure compliance for students with disabilities, that doesn't always equal results. Our students with disabilities aren't making a lot of growth academically.

The recent NAEP Scores show that our students with disabilities aren't growing. They're not very proficient academically. So, there's a push OSEP and the push is called Results Driven Accountability. The vision is that all components of accountability be aligned in a manner that supports states in improving results. For instance, toddlers, children and youth with disabilities and in addition, also supporting their families.

[Slide 6: SSIP] So, part of this results driven accountability push is that states will work on these plans called SSIP Plans. Or, State Systemic Improvement Plans. And these SSIP Plans happen in phases. And the first part of these phases can be seen in the top right hand corner or the sort of red side of this page. And that, states identifying what the problem is? And their problem typically is that they're students with disabilities aren't making much growth.

And so, they identify an area or a problem area. Particularly reading or mathematics or some sort of social emotional area or graduation rates or what have you. But, there's a problem where their students aren't making much growth. And then, states move on to this next sort of phase and do what's called a roots cause analysis. They identify why this is happening?

What is causing our students with disabilities to not make growth? Do we have infrastructure issues? Do we not have enough teachers? Do we not have enough training? Are we not using the correct curriculum? Are we not measuring in the right way, etcetera, etcetera? And they identify both barriers and leverage points for improvement around these areas.

And then we get out of phase one and two. And states are now talking about; now that we know the problem, what are we going to do about it? And they come up with a series of actions or a plan for improvement or an implementation framework. What are we going to do about our kids with disabilities that aren't moving? And this is what it's going to look like. Currently, we're sort of in Phase Two of the plan.

Phase One analysis was due for states in April. So we're going to start moving forward into Phase Two. Where we'll be looking at intervention and; intervention practices that can help address these sort of now, we've come up with the problem. And how do we address it.

[Slide 8 – State-Identified Measurable Results]: So, as part of this identified problem that the states have come up with. States have been asked to come up with this; what we've called State-Identified Measurable Results. And the acronym is SiMR, "S," "I," "M," "R." And these can sort of be thought of as goals. For areas in which states have said okay, our students aren't growing in reading. Or, our students aren't growing in mathematics or what have you.

So, now we're going to come up with a child level or a family level goal if you will. To figure out how we're going to address the areas where our students with disabilities are struggling. These SiMRs or state identified measurable results are identified based on an analysis of data.

[Slide 9 – On What Are States Focusing?]: So, this list shows exactly where states are focusing. This was recently released by folks that are working with particular states. So, you can see that reading and ELA [English Language Arts] is a big focus. These are just Part B SiMRs also. Also, there are some

states focusing on Part C. But, for the purpose of this presentation because we're talking about intensive interventions we are going to look particularly at Part B SiMRs.

So, you can see some of the Part B SiMRs. These are where the states are focusing.

[Slide 10 – Collaboration between Centers]: There are a lot of centers working on this particular work. And this work is being led by WestED and the overarching center that's working on this is called The National Center for Systemic Improvement. So, it's being led by WestED but, AIR is a partner. As well as NASDSE, SRI, CCSSO, The Parent Center Network and The Meadows Center for Preventing Educational Risk. They are the evaluation center.

To the right of this slide are some resources. Also, at the end of this presentation, Chris Riley-Tillman and myself will talk a little bit about some resources that are available at through NCSI but there are more resources available if you have more questions about this. So this is being; this work is being done to support states and the collaboration of Centers.

[Slide 11 – Target Outcomes of NCSI]: So, there are some targeted outcomes of this big center. When we're talking about states building these plans and what do we want the states to do around these plans? And really, these can be boiled down to a couple of things. But, primarily it is to increase the capacity of the State Education Agencies to develop, implement and evaluate these State Systemic Improvement Plans or the SSIPs. And then like I said previously, within those SSIPs, come the smaller goals; those SiMR goals.

It is to increase the State Education Agency's (SEAs) knowledge, selection and utilization of evidence-based practices. Those evidence-based practices are commonly part of the SiMRs or those smaller goals that are a part of the improvement plan. It is to improve the infrastructure and coordination for delivering effective Technical Assistance.

[Slide 12 – Targeted Outcomes for NCSI Cont.]: It's to increase the use of effective dissemination strategies. To ensure that the LEAs and Early Intervention Service programs have access to these evidence-based practices. And then that they can select and implement those in a sustainable way. So, we want them to be able to say okay, here's our improvement plan. Here are the goals that we set forth in our improvement plan.

And then also to increase the effectiveness of SEAs and LEAs to engage both state and local stakeholders in the development of this plan. So, we want sort of stakeholders to wrap around and be a part of this process.

[Slide 13 – NCSI Approach to TA]: This is the approach to how technical assistance will work. This is also on the NCSI website if you're curious. But it just talks about the workflow of how the technical assistance will happen. And if you look down in the bottom left hand side of this slide, the Knowledge Utilization Team, the Data Team, the Systems Change Team and the Collaboration and Communication Team. Those are four teams that are working together that are supporting states if you will. Or supporting each other in helping how we can analyze these SSIPs and make sure that states are building up these plans and reaching these SiMRs in the best way possible.

[Slide 14 – Why Is This Important?]: So, why is all of this important and what does it have to do with what we're talking about? Well, meeting these SiMR goals or these goals that are addressed directly to these SSIP Plans will really require a focus on improving instruction. And so, here's where we step into it with intensive intervention. So, when state say our students with disabilities aren't progressing and

here is the problem. Here is our infrastructure analysis and why. And here is our series of action. We say that this requires a focus on improving instruction.

And states will need to be in need of support on how to provide intensive interventions for these kids who need it most. So, these Students with Disabilities who aren't moving will need intensive interventions. And that intensive intervention often includes evidence-based intervention strategies, overcoming implementation barriers and then making connections with other state, district and school initiatives. So, we know that this work doesn't occur in isolation and that improving instruction often occurs when we know what other states and other districts are doing.

[Slide 15 – What Does This Mean for the Field?]: So, what does it mean for the field? It means understanding data use. Knowing what data do we look at? How to access that data? Understanding the root cause of why our data isn't moving or what data we have. And then how do we analyze that?

It means understanding the knowledge that we have? So, how do we select a coherent and evidence-based practice? How do we implement them with fidelity? And then how do we scale up and sustain these evidence-based practices to support this work that we're doing? It means that there are probably some systems changes.

Looking at our infrastructure and saying, our students with disabilities aren't moving and here's what we need to do about it. And here's the infrastructure we have in place and here's where the changes need to go. It means looking at resources, resource mapping and alignment and then looking at the policies that support our goals. And then it also really means looking at the communication and collaboration.

Like I said earlier, this work doesn't happen in isolation so, really problem solving and planning with diverse stakeholders. Also, understanding what different departments are doing. How they work together? What's happening in the different settings and different times? And then working all of these pieces together for implementation to achieve results for students with disabilities.

[Slide 16 – What is Intensive Intervention and Why Do We Need to Assess Fidelity of Implementation?]: So, that being said, I'm going to go ahead and hand it over to our next presenter. To talk about intensive intervention and why do we need to assess the fidelity of implementation.

Chris Lemons: So hello and welcome everybody. My name is Chris Lemons and I am Assistant Professor of Special Education at Peabody College of Vanderbilt University. I am also a Senior Advisor for The National Center on Intensive Intervention and today, I'm going to be talking about intensive intervention and the need to assess fidelity of intensive intervention when it's being implemented. And if you have any questions after you review this Webinar, you can e-mail me at Chris dot Lemons at Vanderbilt dot EDU with questions.

[Slide 17 – What is Intensive Intervention?]: So, the first thing that I am going to address is what is intensive intervention? So, intensive intervention addresses severe and persistent learning or behavioral difficulties. And intensive intervention should be driven by data. And it's also characterized by an increased intensity. For example; for example, delivering interventions in a smaller group size or with expanded times. And it also involves individualization of academic instruction and or behavioral supports.

[Slide 18 – What is Intensive Intervention...]: So, intensive intervention is individualized based on student needs. And these needs are supported by data. It's also more intense than instruction that was provided in previous Tiers so, for example, Tiers one and two. And it is often substantially different content and pedagogy. And it is comprised of more frequent and precise progress monitoring.

It's also not a single approach. It's not a manual or a program. And it's not more of the same instruction that was provided in Tiers one or Tiers two. A good way of thinking about intensive interventions is that it is a process. Sometimes people have called this process experimental or clinical teaching. And another way to think about it is that it is instruction that is beyond the box. So, it's outside of the published curriculum.

[Slide 19 – Why Do We Need Intensive Intervention?]: So, there are several reasons that we need intensive interventions and these are related to the low academic achievement of children with disabilities. The increased dropout rates of these students and the increased arrest rates. So, for example in twenty eleven; the twenty eleven NAEP demonstrated that two out of three students with disabilities performed below basic proficiency in reading and math in eighth grade. There's also evidence from The National Longitudinal Study that four out of five individuals with disabilities are either unemployed or under employed as adults.

And we know that students with learning disabilities have higher dropout rates compared to their non-disabled peers. And, there is also evidence from research done by Doug and Lynn Fuchs, Jeanne Wanzek and Sharon Vaughn that demonstrates that three to five percent of students do not respond to standard evidence-based programs. So, in other words after going through a high quality multi-tiered system of support or an RTI Model; about three to five percent of students will remain insufficiently responsive to that instruction.

[Slide 20 – What is NCII's Approach to Intensive Intervention?]: So, the National Center for Intensive Interventions approach to intensive interventions is a process called data-based individualization or DBI. And this is a systematic method for using data to determine both when and how to provide more intensive interventions to these students. The origins of this work came out of the work of Stan Deno and his colleagues at the University of Minnesota in the late nineteen seventies.

Initially, this program was called Data-Based Program Modification but, it can also be known as experimental teaching. And as I mentioned before, it is a process that the teacher or the team uses data and consistent iterations of making adaptations to programs to improve instruction for students. And, it's also not a one-time fix; it's an ongoing process comprised of both intervention and assessment and that the assessment leads to adjustments of the intervention over time.

[Slide 21 – DBI: Integrating data-based decision-making across academics and social behavior]: So, here is a flow chart that demonstrates kind of the key components of DBI or data-based individualization; Data-based individualization as conceptualized by The National Center on Intensive Intervention. And I encourage you to go to Intensive Intervention dot org to learn more about this model if you're interested. So, in this approach to intensive intervention you can see starting at the top of the figure that a teacher would start with a validated intervention program. So for example, a Tier two standard protocol secondary intervention and initially the teacher would make some adaptations to the program to make it more intense than what was provided at Tier two.

A progress monitoring plan would be set in place with specific goals. And the child's response to that intervention would be monitored over time. If the child is responsive the instruction continues. However, if the student is non-responsive, additional diagnostic assessments is performed to get more information about why the student may not be responding and to give guidance on how to make further adaptations to that program. The adapted intervention is applied and again, progress is monitored.

And if the student is responsive, that program continues. In the case of non-response additional assessment may be considered and additional adaptations are made.

[Slide 22 – Is DBI the same as MTSS? Is DBI Special Education?]: So, one of the big questions that we constantly get around intensive interventions is whether DBI is the same as RTI, MTSS and how it relates to special education. So, many of the components of DBI are very consistent with elements of special education and tiered service systems. So, for example in RTI and MTSS and PBIS; we have universal, secondary and tertiary intervention programs. There's progress monitoring and there are some team based decisions that are guided by data.

Similar components in special education instruction is provided in an individualized program. There's progress monitoring and also teams are used to make decisions. I think personally, I think this process should be included in special education. I think it could also be integrated into the most intensive Tiers of RTI and MTSS systems.

I think likely it is too much to be included in Tier two. It requires a lot more data collection and expertise of interventionists. And in many schools, they can't handle that much work at the Tier two level. So, most likely this process of DBI would be included in a higher Tier than Tier two. I think it's useful for schools to consider the need to ensure that the intensity of intervention in Special Education should not be less than that of the highest Tier in RTI or MTSS.

It's also useful to think that this process; DBI or intensive intervention can be imported into extant models and used independently of RTI. So, if a school is already implementing an RTI system DBI could be integrated into their third Tier onto their Special ED programs. I think it's also useful to note that a special educator who is functioning outside of a RTI model could also use DBI to guide instruction for her or his class.

[Slide 23 – Who Needs DBI?]: So, the children that need DBI are students with disabilities that are not making adequate progress in their current instructional program. They are also students who present with very low academic achievement and or high intensity or high need behavior problems and these are typically students with disabilities. This process can also be used for students in tiered intervention systems who have not responded to secondary intervention programs. That were developed; or delivered with fidelity.

I think it is useful to note that this isn't only limited to students with learning disabilities or learning disorders. And it's also useful to think that many of the students who are going to; who will require intensive intervention have co-occurring behavioral and academic needs. Both will need to be addressed in the DBI process.

[Slide 24 – What Is Fidelity?]: So, next I'm going to talk about fidelity and the importance of monitoring fidelity in the intensive intervention process. So, what is fidelity? So fidelity is the extent to which an intervention's components have been implemented as planned. So, the question that we're asking when we're monitoring fidelity is; the plan that we have developed is that what is occurring in the school?

So, for DBI this includes the instructional platform, the adaptive iterations of interventions. The ongoing progress monitoring of the child's response and then the decision making procedures related to how adaptations are made. And so, there's an IRIS module for additional information. If you would like to learn more about fidelity I would encourage you to go to this module. And I think it's also useful to think that in DBI, monitoring fidelity is also a part of the formative decision making process.

So, monitoring fidelity of each component of DBI can help the team or teacher guide those adaptations and determine what needs to happen next.

[Slide 25 – What is Fidelity?]: So, for DBI we can look at two different levels of fidelity. So we have the student level and so this is where we're looking at an individual student. Are the assessments and intervention components being carried out as we planned? And for student level fidelity this may be assessed through teacher logs, observations and record review. And sometimes just with interviews with the teacher to determine if that process is being followed.

At the systems level, so here is where we're looking at the school or team. We're kind of broadening out a little more and thinking are the essential components of DBI being implemented correctly. Are there systems level challenges that may make an individual teachers ability to implement DBI difficult? And for this process, we can either use a systems level rubric or interview. That might examine what's going on with the teams? And I'll cover some examples of these next.

[Slide 26 – Why Does Fidelity Matter?]: So, fidelity matters for several different reasons. So, fidelity assessment gives us evidence that the process is being implemented as intended. And again, we're focusing on is the assessment being collected, is the intervention being delivered and are decisions related to adapting that intervention; are they being delivered as we intended? And again, we can focus on the student and systems level when we're focusing on fidelity for DBI.

Does this information provide us with guidance on how to improve DBI implementation? So, it may provide us with information on whether the Interventionists needs some additional training or support. Maybe, the intervention needs to be changed in a specific way. Or, maybe at the systems level, there are challenges that really preclude the Interventionist from delivering DBI as intended.

So, there are possible scheduling challenges that maybe the student isn't available to come to the intervention group. Or, that staff do not have enough evidence-based platforms to really begin the DBI process.

[Slide 27 – Developing a Rubric to Measure Implementation Fidelity]: So, for NCII we developed a rubric as part of our efforts to guide technical assistance. And so, I'm going to review the tools that we used as a starting point. I'm going to give some information that we learned from our knowledge development sites. And I'm going to talk about the core features that we've included in the fidelity tool because, we view them as being really essential to implementing DBI with success.

I do want to note that this fidelity rubric and the accompanying interview can be used to evaluate other school level improvement approaches. So, although we developed this specifically for NCII's technical assistance around data-based individualization this rubric and interview maybe useful for schools to use for other efforts outside of DBI.

[Slide 28 – Developing a Systems-Level Rubric]: So, one of the first things that we did was to review some key systems level items that we found to be essential to implementing response to intervention. And so, there's a link on this slide to a resource that was developed under the Center on Response to Intervention. And this rubric identified structures, resources and practices that really needed to be in place at the earlier tiers. To make sure that data-based individualization would be possible at the upper Tiers.

[Slide 29 – Measuring School-Level Implementation]: So, we also adapted the materials to make them more specific to data-based individualization. So, here we're focusing more on the school level of implementation. Again on this link; you can get the rubric and the accompanying interview. And we describe that in a little bit more detail. These features in the rubric are aligned with the essential components of DBI and the infrastructure that's really necessary for successful implementation of this process.

So, for us we focused in on the school level for the purposes of our technical assistance. And again, the tool on the site has a rubric and set of interview questions.

[Slide 30 – Key Findings from Knowledge Implementation]: We also used some information gain from some knowledge development sites to help kind of fine tune our rubric and interview process. So, in this project we focused on some schools that had really demonstrated very positive outcomes for students with disabilities. And we conducted some focus groups, observations and interviews to try to get a better understanding of the key features that needed to be in place is intensive interventions for these students was going to be effective. So, there's a link on this slide where you can get the report "Implementing Intensive Interventions: Lessons Learned." And that will give you more detail about what I am going to cover on the next slide.

[Slide 31 – Lessons Learned]: So, there are five lessons that we learned from those knowledge development sites that kind of helped us improve our rubric that I'm going to cover next. That we used to evaluate fidelity of DBI. First, we discovered that intensive intervention is really most likely to happen when it's included as part of a multi-Tiered system of support or a RTI model. So, I mentioned previously that this process can be used by a special educator independently of an RTI system. But, we found that it was most successful, most likely to occur; most likely to be supported by administration when it was integrated into an extant system.

We also found that family engagement really supports implementation. Many of the sites said that this was one of the more challenging aspects. But, they also found it to be highly important. So, many of the families needed additional information about how response to intervention, DBI, MTSS and special Ed; how they relate and how students move through those models. And they also need some assistance in understanding data.

So, with number three; we often found that intensive behavior interventions was more challenging because of the limited progress monitoring tools that were available. I would like to note on this, that at the NCII's website; recently an additional tool chart was added for measures. Behavioral measures used to progress monitor that are both valid and reliable. So, if you're looking for those resources; I would encourage you to go to that website.

Number four we found that inconsistent rules for intensifying supports really hindered intervention planning and resource allocation. And one of the components of this part was schools that did not have much clarity about the differences between Tiers Two and Three. And then how students move between tiers two and three. Really made it challenging for that upper tier to be as intense as it needed to be. And then, we also discovered that there were many times hidden inefficiencies that may overtax staff unnecessarily. And so, in this notation we would find sometimes that schools really struggled making sure that the highest qualified staff and special education teachers were the ones working with children and adolescents with the greatest need in intensive intervention.

[Slide 32 – Components / Infrastructure Required for DBI Implementation]: So next, I'm going to quickly highlight the components that we've included in our rubric and interview to evaluate fidelity of DBI. And again, the reason that these five are included is because we see them as being essential to making sure that DBI is a success. And again, you can go back to slide twenty-nine if you would like links to access this rubric. And so now, I'm going to go over each of these features a little more ineptly to describe the components that we included in the rubric.

[Slide 33 – 1. System Features]: So, first of all you can look at; or we looked at system level features to support DBI. So, here we're really looking at resources and organizational structures that are necessary to

support the implementation of DBI. So, we see that leadership is an essential component and so here we want to make sure that leaders are proactively supporting the essential components of the DBI process. For school schedules, we want to make sure that they are aligned to support multi-levels of intervention and high quality instruction based on student need. For resources, we're looking to see that schools are adequately allocating resources. So the funds, programs, time available to support this process.

We are also looking for cultural and linguistic responsiveness. So, here we want some evidence that the school staff can really articulate information and factors that they consider when they are adopting culturally and linguistically appropriate assessments and intervention programs for the students in their schools. As I mentioned previously, communication with parents is seen as being highly important. And so here, we are looking to see if schools have provided a description of the DBI process with the parents. And that the parents are also involved in the decision making process.

The last component of system features is communication with and involvement of all staff. And here we're making sure that there's again, a description of the DBI process shared with school staff. And also that teacher's are working collaboratively with one another. And that this collaboration happens frequently.

[Slide 34 – 2. Data and Decision Making]: The next section of our rubric focuses on data and decision making. So, here we're making sure that data; for the purpose of making decisions within a DBI framework is collected. So, first we want to make sure that there is a clearly articulated process for students who are identified in terms of needing intensive intervention. And that these students are consistently identified based on either persistent non-response in previous tiers of instruction or that there is data to support the need. That the student has persistent in intensive academic and or behavioral needs. Or that the student has a relevant diagnosis of a disability that warrants intensive intervention. We are also looking to make sure that there are; there are strong and consistent evidence that there are monitoring tools in place. So here, we're making sure that there is a sufficient number of alternate forms to monitor that progress. Also, making sure that the tool is sensitive to the student improvement. And making sure that it has sufficient technical adequacy in terms of reliability and validity for the use of monitoring progress.

We also look for the same things in progress monitoring for behavior. And then we're also looking to make sure that the procedures of progress monitoring are established. So that there is a progress monitoring plan in place that includes a goal for each individual student, that the plan is reasonable for the student. So, the data is collected with appropriate frequency and is aligned to the students level and that this; the data from this progress monitoring tool is graphed.

For component "E" we're looking at diagnostic assessments. So here, we're making sure that an assessment is in place that is consistently used to identify specific skill deficits or the functional behavior to guide adaptation. And then we monitor fidelity of assessment implementation. So, here we're looking to see that when assessments are administered that they are administered correctly, they are scored correctly and that there is a plan in place to make sure that fidelity of assessment implementation is monitored.

[Slide 35 – 3. Intervention]: The next component of the rubric focuses on the intervention. So, the individualized intervention with a focus on addressing the severe and persistent academic or behavioral needs of these students. So first, we look at the component "A" the intensive intervention. So, we're looking to see that there is evidence that intensive intervention consistently meets and follows criteria for all students in need. That it is designed on an evidence-based platform and that platform is available. That it is reasonably aligned to student needs and it's intensified appropriately.

So again, the instruction provided in an intensive intervention is more intensive than what was provided in the highest tier of the multi-tiered system of support or RTI. For adaptation of intervention, we're making sure that there is strong and consistent evidence that interventions are being adapted based on student need. And that both quantitative and qualitative adaptations are being made as appropriate based on data and the student's response. For fidelity of implementation of intervention, we're making sure that the interventions are delivered as intended. So, appropriate group size, the schedule dosage, the components are in place and we want to make sure that there's a plan that says the fidelity of implementation is being monitored adequately.

For the intervention; interventionist characteristics, we're looking for evidence that the person providing the intervention has been adequately trained, that they have appropriate experience and this component can often help us to determine when additional technical assistance or training is needed. To ensure that the Interventionist has the training needed to deliver the intervention or the DBI process. And the last component on this slide, we're looking at the relationship of intensive intervention of the core instruction. So here, we're looking to see if there's evidence that either the intensive intervention is aligned Core Standards or school wide behavior expectations. Or, that it addresses those primary deficits or pre-requisite skills to learning the Core Standards or participating in the school wide behavior model.

[Slide 36 – 4. DBI Process]: The next aspect focuses on the DBI process itself. So here, we're focusing on the process for both designing and delivering intensive intervention to these students. So, the initial component focuses on the team mechanism. So here, we're looking to see that a team has been formed to make these data based decisions as a part of the DBI process. And we're making sure that the teacher who delivers intensive intervention they are skilled Interventionist and have appropriate support to be able to implement this type of instruction.

We look to see that there is evidence of frequent meetings that the DBI Team is able to meet review data and review adaptations and progress. At these meetings we're looking to see that data is reviewed. So that the adaptations of interventions are driven by student data and that there are really explicit goals for each student. To determine when an adaptation would be need; would be needed. For documentation, we're looking to see strong and consistent evidence that students are receiving DBI have an intervention plan that's written down with a goal or progress monitoring procedures.

And also that teacher's are keeping some form of intervention log as a record to document that the intervention has been delivered as intended. For component "E" we're looking at decision roles. So again, strong evidence that for students participating in intensive intervention. That goals and decision rules are according to adaption are clearly articulated and that they're being implemented accurately.

[Slide 37 – 5. DBI Evaluation]: And the next component that we are looking at is evaluation. And here we're looking to see if the school has a system for collecting and analyzing data to measure fidelity and effectiveness of DBI. So for here, we're looking to see does the school have specific goals set for the school's DBI process? We're looking to see if there is a plan to review DBI implementation. And then to make sure that relevant staff have the time to review the school's DBI plan and that there is a plan for making adaptations to this plan as needed.

[Slide 38 – Rating Scale]: So, for our purposes we developed this rubric using a five anchor; five point system. These points represent various levels of implementation. So, on this slide you can see that one point represents really little or no implementation of that component going all the way up to a five which represents complete and consistent implementation. And we found that the schools; in many schools using this tool was very encouraging because, it provided schools with information that they had some of these components in place. And so I think that again as I mentioned before, this tool can be used as part of an intensive intervention but it also useful for other multi-tiered Systems of support.

And so the school can identify places that they already have some relative strengths. The tool can also help guide schools to develop an action plan or next areas of improvement.

[Slide 39 – DBI Implementation Interview]: And then here is an example of the DBI Implementation Interview. So there is a script and some not taking templates for gathering information that goes; it's directly aligned with the rubric. And there are sample questions for each rubric item. And so, as I mentioned before just remember that these tools are very likely useful for schools doing DBI or other forms of intensive intervention. But, they can also provide guidance for other school improvement efforts. So those are all of my slides.

[Slide 40 – Lessons Learned: Initial use in NCII Intensive Sites – Strategies for improving DBI Implementation]: If you have any questions again you can e-mail me at Chris dot Lemons at Vanderbilt dot edu. Thank you.

Laura Kuchle: Hi, I'm Laura Kuchle and I've been working on both the TA and evaluation for NCII. And now we want to talk about how we've used the DBI implementation interview and rubric to learn more about the DBI implementation at our intensive sites and how we can better support efforts to implement intensive intervention. Last year in twenty fourteen, we used the interviews in seventeen of our schools. We had two facilities; facilitators lead the interview so that we could do reliability checks and try to strengthen the interview and rubric so that the items were more aligned and that all of the anchors were clear.

[Slide 41 – Highest Rated Items]: Looking across the seventeen schools, we found that our highest rated items were related to having trained and experienced interventionists. That was the highest and that just meant that they felt that they had the staff who had the skills and the knowledge to implement intensive intervention. What might be harder for a lot of the schools was the scheduling aspect; having enough of the interventionists available to work with the students who needed them. They also felt strong about having teams to support decision making for DBI with a regular meeting schedule. While on average across all of our schools, this was the second highest rated item. We do think that this is a very strong predictor of success in DBI implementation.

Some schools may have struggled in this area and it made it harder to implement DBI with high quality. Another high rated items was aligning interventions to student need and core expectations. So, that could be grade level academic standards or the age appropriate school wide behavioral expectations. And for students who are really far behind, they might focus on the requisite skills needed to meet those age and grade level standards. They also reported relative strengths in district and school leadership support for DBI.

However, we know that this is a very important factor for implementation. And the schools that do struggle with that have a much harder time to gather the resources, the schedules and the buy in to implement DBI. The next highest rated item's was access to the use of technically rigorous academic progress-monitoring tools that are sensitive to student improvement. We did want to note that within this however, schools tended to have a better grasp of reading progress monitoring than math.

[Slide 42 – Lowest Rated Items]: The lowest rated item was regarding evaluation. While some schools informally reviewed implementation and looked for ways to improve, they rarely set specific goals or had a formal plan to review. Also for schools that may be perhaps just getting started, it could be difficult to prioritize formalizing an evaluation plan when they were still trying to articulate their DBI process or bring together schedules and procedures. On that note just in terms of times of implementation we've been working with these schools for one to two years on average.

So; and we spent that first year still in training. So, most of these schools had not been spending a long time implementing DBI. Overall, we found that our schools were almost a three on average across all of the items. Suggesting partial on inconsistent implementation which is what we expected after relatively little time receiving support in implementing DBI.

The second lowest rated item was behavior progress monitoring. This is in contrast to the relative strength in academic progress monitoring. But, this wasn't a surprise given that there are fewer validated tools available for behavior progress monitoring. Also, most schools have a longer and stronger history of assessments of interventions in academics; particularly in reading.

[Slide 43 – Lowest Rated Items Continued...]: Another low rated item was fidelity for both assessments and for interventions. However, this doesn't necessarily mean that procedures, processes or interventions were not being implemented with fidelity. In most cases, the schools didn't really know. They didn't have any systematic way to monitor fidelity. Decision rules were also a relatively low area often because the decision rules were not clearly articulate; or at least not in all areas.

And again, many schools had a stronger process for using Reading screening and progress monitoring data to move students between the tiers. Also, sometimes the rules were not applied consistently across grades, teams or areas. Lastly, overall implementation was a relatively low score. Again, this sometimes had to do with documentation. Also, it could be inconsistently applied; the procedures, the process across areas. Again though, it would be hard to have a high overall implementation score if other key pieces are missing.

[Slide 44 – Essential Elements of DBI Implementation]: Looking at these patterns in strengths and weaknesses, the TA Team met with coaches and the people who had run the DBI implementation interviews to identify the essential elements that we felt contributed to strong DBI implementation. These were staff commitment, student plans, student meetings, valid, reliable data and the inclusion of students with disabilities.

[Slide 45 – Staff Commitment]: The first is staff commitment. And while many schools report being strong in this area, we did more anecdotally find that schools that didn't have; for example strong principal support. They had a really hard time implementing DBI well. It's most important for schools to have the commitment and support of their principal, intervention staff and special educators. Where we might have some flexibility within strong implementation of DBI are the specific intervention staff who work with students in different areas.

[Slide 46 – Student Plans]: The next area that's really key for us is the student plan. In the students; or in the schools that we're working with, we were less concerned about where they started making student intervention plans. In terms of do they want to just start with a few students to get their process strong in a certain content area or perhaps a grade level where they have strong Interventionists or decision making teams? But what was really important was that the intervention plans were developed based on accurate and timely student data. That the goals were based on valid, reliable assessment tools and that there was a timeline for executing and revising the intervention plan.

They need to have you know specific steps from the plan as to who was going to do what and when. And this comes back to some of what we've been talking about regarding the importance of documentation. Sometimes, teams would meet and come up with good ideas but, they weren't clearly documenting how they were adapting and individualizing an intervention. Which made it harder to assess fidelity and overall quality of implementation but, it also left them without a good record for future teams to consider when they're problem solving for an individual student.

[Slide 47 – Student Meetings]: And all of that is based on student meetings. It may not matter as much how often or when they meet or even which team members come as long as the core people are involved. What does really matter is that data drives the meetings. They have regular meeting times. And that the meetings are structured to be as efficient as possible.

And this is something that in our sites we have really seen a lot of variability on. And I want to pause here to give Chris Riley-Tillman our behavior trainer in Missouri a chance to talk about some of the patterns he's seen in our schools.

Chris Riley-Tillman: Thanks Laura, the; one of the best things that we've seen when working with our schools. And I'd like to remind folks that these are schools which had from all initial signs; had rather advanced intervention systems in place. And so, we're talking about schools that had typically had a history with RTI and had a history with PBIS. They also had rather high ratings on the PBIS side and we had selected those schools because we wanted to really be able to get down and focus on working with children who have intense needs and hoping that the overall school system would be in place. What we found was that most of these schools had meetings. And so, there were student meetings in place. But these meetings were often not focused on individual students but rather had been diverted to focus on something else. So for example, school wide data or a school wide behavioral plan or something of that nature. Those teams were not set up to deal with individual student needs and working with; with specific intense needs students.

Second of all, most of the teams that we started working with we found they had relatively little trainings specifically working specifically with kids with intense needs. And they were scheduled and were meeting in a manner that was much more conducive to large scale school wide decisions. So for example, meeting on a monthly basis rather than dealing with intensive interventions with individual children. Where you're going to much more likely be meeting on a weekly or at least twice a month basis. And so, this was really something that was rather fascinating to us.

I did not expect when we went into this project that simply having groups of people meeting in a consistent behavior; or consistent basis focusing on intensive academic and social behavior was going to be something that we were going to have to train and put in place as a pre-requisite. But, we found that even in schools that had a really nice history these student meeting's weren't really existing and the meetings that were existing were not focused on working with the children with the most intensive needs. Rather, they had been diverted to something else. Back to Laura.

Laura Kuchle: Thank you Chris.

Chris Riley-Tillman: Sure

[Slide 48 – Progress Monitoring]: Laura Kuchle: The next element that we talked about was progress monitoring. It is just so important to have valid, reliable progress monitoring data to inform the decisions that these teams make so that they know when a plan does need to be adjusted. Beyond just collecting the data and using the appropriate tool, is graphing the data. I think we all know that a lot of schools have data overload and just collecting data doesn't mean it's going to be useful. It needs to be presented in a way that really helps them see whether or not a child is progressing enough under the current intervention.

And it also needs to be collected regularly and frequently enough to make a timely decision. Before, we mentioned the importance of the progress monitoring tool being sensitive to change for that student. And that is really important for decision making. This can be particularly; a clear example is, for academics. When a student is far below grade level we need to make sure that we're monitoring them at their instructional level so that we can see changes in the short term and can make appropriate changes in an intervention.

Where we can be more flexible is the choice of tool. As long as it is sensitive to change, valid and reliable for that area; that is fine with us. Also, we can be flexible with the use of progress monitoring data at lower tiers of support. While we often hope that that progress monitoring data is collected for example at Tier two or secondary intervention levels helping us identify students who need DBI. We also don't want schools who don't have that in place to feel like they can't use progress monitoring data to make decisions for the students who have the most intensive needs. And that does bring us to our last point.

[Slide 49 – Students With Disabilities]: On Students with Disabilities and Chris was alluding to that as well. That sometimes, students with disabilities may be excluded from the more GENED or general problem solving team process. And we've seen some schools where actually that Tier three or intensive intervention based on problem solving and being driven by data. Resulted in more intensive services than what students were receiving in special education. And we want to make sure that our students with disabilities have access to the most intense; most appropriate intervention for all of their areas.

Where we are more flexible is in who delivers those interventions for those students. That is going to depend on school and district policy and context. And also, the extent to which students who do not have IEPs for example, are included in those interventions groups. Or, if the process is a little different as long as the students have access to what they need based on data. And, I'm going to turn it back over to Chris now to talk about how we've used those lessons learned to develop a lot of our resources.

[Slide 50 – NCII & NCSI Resources to Support Implementation]: And I did want to say that as we've been expanding to new schools we've been using a lot of these lessons learned to introduce the schools this. And we now go over these essential elements with schools before we bring them onboard and start training so that they really know if they're going to be able to commit to working through this process with us. Chris

Chris Riley-Tillman: Thank you very much Laura. So, I'm going to wrap up the webinar today; at least the content portion before we get into some of the final questions with an overview of the NCII and the NCSI resources to help support implementation.

[Slide 51 – Addressing Common Barriers to Implementation]: We've just gone over the section where we just talked about common barriers to implementation. And that's things like system level considerations, identifying intervention and assessments tools and consistent procedures and documentation. What's really neat about the NCII is that there have been tools developed in each one of these areas. Which can help schools really; regardless of where they are in their journey towards having effective supports for children with intensive needs. And it is wherever they are in each one of these categories and so, we're going to go through each one of these pieces and look at where the tools exist.

[Slide 52 – Getting Ready to Implement Intensive Intervention: Infrastructure for DBI]: Let's start off with some kind of getting down to basics and looking at basic structures for working with kids with intensive needs. The NCII has a nice module on looking at the infrastructure for data-bases individualization which we had talked about earlier on. Which talks about the infrastructure need; infrastructure needed for implementation. This is going to have a nice overview of the background. It's going to really orient schools for what are the basic things that need to be in place for this to happen successfully.

While this seems rather rudimentary it's amazing that you can get a bunch of people together to come up with all of the things that you think a school needs. And when you actually go into the schools and work, you find that some of the stuff that you thought doesn't become quite as important. And many of the things that you never thought about become very, very salient issues. So, Laura had just finished her

section talking about how we try to use lessons learned from other demonstrations to inform these particular tools. This is a great example of many of the things that we now perceive as incredibly important were focused on; because of our experience actually utilizing the DBI process in individual schools. And this particular module goes through many of those.

[Slide 53 – Fidelity Resources]: The second major resources for schools to look at are fidelity resources. And this has been talked about a little bit earlier in this particular webinar. One of the things I think that we have to understand about most schools at this point is that they have some sort of model in place. I very rarely go into a school and nothing is in place.

Now, what is in place is usually some sort of hybrid from some other things that you see on a national model. And then also state and local initiatives which have been put in place over the past fifteen to twenty years. They gain a foothold and they start to have their own life in schools. What that means is that at this point, schools are not a blank slate. They're not at a place where we're simply going to role in a new initiative whether it's PBIS or RTI or MTSS or DBI or whatever we want to say. But rather, we're entering structures that are going to have a number of systems some quite effective and some quite logically rather ineffective in dealing with kids that have intensive behavioral problems. One of the things that the fidelity resources does is that it helps you go through and look at all of the different things that you need to run intensive interventions in schools. And it allows you to look at your school and ask "Okay, do I have this piece? Do I have that piece? What are we missing? Where are we strong?"

What this should do, is allow a school to rally customize the types of professional development that they're going to do. How they're going to think about building their structures? So, they're not replacing systems which are quite effective but rather, using those systems and building on them so that they can put in other systems where you can see a real bang for your buck. I think though, one real good example that we see in a lot of instances is that schools; at least the schools that we've worked with. They tend to have more resources, more experience and more successful professional expertise in working on academic intensive needs rather than behavioral intensive needs.

To some extent, when a child start to exhibit major behavioral problems; staff that were very effective when dealing with reading or writing or mathematics start to have some real concerns on if they are appropriate to deal with these individuals who are exhibiting behavioral difficulty. Unfortunately, simply moving the child out of those effective interventions for academics because now, this is a concurrent academic and behavioral problem. Really remove the child from those; those resources that they need. Rather, a school should go in and really focus on increasing the capacity of the staff to work on the behavioral side.

And again, the fidelity resources are structure very well. So that when you go through them, you can see what do you have that's effective? What do you have that a little bit less effective? And then how can you make sure that you get the materials that you need for your school to move forward.

[Slide 54 – Fidelity Resources Continued]: There's the overview of the essential components of RTI in the worksheets. This is going to give you a really nice framework for all of the different pieces that you need for fidelity,

[Slide 55 – Tools Chart]: Once you get past the overall fidelity and start to get into the area of specific materials. I think one the real weaknesses out there in RTI or MTSS systems has been simply as lack of a broad range of tools that can deal with both academic and social behavioral issues for kids that are having difficulties. And then again, anybody in the schools knows that when we start to talk about intensive interventions we stop talking about academic issues and behavioral issues. Kids that have severe

behavioral issues start to have academic difficulties. And kids that have severe academic problems eventually start to have behavioral problems in school.

You just can't go through years of school where you're failing on the academic side and not become frustrated or not become voided at some point in time. And likewise, if you're not focusing or if you're not able to do any of the academic activities it's very difficult to have effective academic progress. A number of years ago, the National Center for RTI started to develop a tools chart. Which; was an overview of academic progress monitoring and academic interventions that would help populate in RTI models out there. So that teachers would have a range of interventions and schools would have a range of progress monitoring alternatives. Which, they understood were reliable, valid and had an evidence base for their particular purpose. At that time, behavior was not included in the model.

And so while that system gave a tremendous amount of resources to schools. And I think a lot of the advancement that we've seen in terms of academic intervention can be tied back to those tools charts. Unfortunately the behavioral side did not get the same treatment. What the NCII has done is pulled a bunch of information from the academic intervention and academic progress monitoring. The logic of how those tools charts are established and build them for behavior progress monitoring and behavioral intervention.

And so now, we're at a point where if a teacher is dealing with a kid with intense needs, they can go to the NCII and they can look to see what interventions on the behavioral side have a particular evidence-base in dealing with a particular type of student. Or, what are the progress monitoring methods which are reliable and valid and also sensitive to change. And can currently; they can look at academic interventions and academic progress monitoring tools that could help that same child.

On any of these, if you click on the intervention itself it's going to pop up and it's going to give you a nice overview of what the intervention is. Where you can get more information? If it's commercial where you can buy it? Likewise, on the assessment side you click on it and it gives you more information. And so, it really a nice one stop resource for people who are looking for evidence-based interventions and evidence-based assessments. For their students that have intensive academic or behavioral issues.

[Slide 56 – Mathematics: Sample Lessons & Activities]: There's also a series of nice sample mathematic lessons or activities. This isn't just for Math but, a number of these adaptation guides on how do you work with kids who have needs on different particular problems.

[Slide 57 – Implementing Behavioral Strategies: Considerations and Sample Resources]: And a nice overview on these behavioral strategies. One of the things that the team started to notice as we were looking at behavior interventions is that many of the historic behavior interventions are not pre-packaged interventions like we see on the academic side. Rather, there are a number of strategies often coming for the applied behavior and analytic literature base. Which are evidence-based approaches when dealing with very specific behavioral issues.

And so examples of these would be things like behavioral contracts or intermittent reinforcement or non-contingent reinforcement. These all have a very interesting evidence-base but, these strategies are unfortunately very rarely used in schools. There simply hasn't been that much projection in schools on these different targeted strategies. And then most importantly, how to use these strategies correctly. So, behavior contracts are a good example. That's not the easiest intervention strategy to use. You have to think about how those are set up and how you're going to instrumentize and proceduralize the process of using behavior contracts with students. And the NCII has some nice resources which gives you some

examples of what those contracts should look like. And then also, some strategies and some considerations and some sample resources on how you would go ahead and use those.

[Slide 58 – Individual Student Meeting Tools]: We also have a series of individual student meeting tools. This is one of the things that I talked about a little bit earlier when Laura was talking. I think lots of places have meetings. They have well-meaning teachers who are getting together to work on something. Back in the mid nineteen nineties, when most of these team meetings were focused on the most intensive kids in schools.

But, with the advent of whole-school intervention strategies and that would be both PBIS and RTI. A lot of that shifted up to the level of focusing on school wide issues. I think there was a lot of logic behind that. We've seen some really tremendous outcomes because of that. But unfortunately many of those individual student meetings; of getting together for twenty minutes to talk specifically about designing intervention strategies for a target child with intense needs. Those have seemed to be lost in schools.

And so, the NCII has set up a series of rather simple individual student meeting tools. These are tools which can be used in a DBI process but also could be used for other problem solving models that are out there. And it really hits on the key issues of how we're going to monitor the progress. What's the function of the particular behavior? What's the evidence-based intervention we're going to look at? And trying to get down to the details in terms of how do we design an intervention, how do we track it and when are we going to come back in a couple of weeks to actually work on; look at the data and continue to work on the particular problem?

[Slide 59 – Learn More About DBI]: The NCII website has a ton of information about DBI. I'd like to focus on this particular slide a little bit because, one of the things that I think the NCII has done incredibly well is design resources that can address a whole range of needs and a whole range of different training modalities. So for example, the DBI training series is an expansive overview of a number of modules with each being about forty-five minutes up to about an hour and a half.

That go in depth into things like what is behavioral progress monitoring and how would you do it? How would you select the behavioral interventions? How do you do the overall DBI process? That training series has really been designed to take a school and build a DBI process within that school.

Those are intensive modules they have a tremendous amount of information. And for schools looking to embrace the DBI approach, I think that's a really nice direction. We also have a series of webinars which are a little bit shorter. This is obviously an example of a Webinar that would deal with a targeted issue. In this case, we're talking about fidelity.

These Webinars have been structured so that they are shorter. They're not quite as long. And they deal with something that's topical rather than training in one of the core foundations of DBI. One thing that we don't have up on this slide are something that we call the "Ask the Expert" videos. These go all the way down to five minute short overviews from an expert in the field talking about a particular tool so for example; direct behavior rating or talking about a particular process.

Like how does DBI and PBIS fit together? These are really nice, short videos when a team has a little bit of time; five minutes. And they can learn something about an interesting and important topic but really doesn't have the time for an intensive training. I sometimes use these as the starting point for problem solving team meetings. We take about five minutes; learn something and then we hop into a case. I find that it takes a team four or five minutes to transition from the school day into talking about targeted children.

And so, those are great tools to help shift what we're thinking about. And get us out of thinking about ourselves from a school based approach or from a teacher approach. And then get into the individual DBI process. Finally, we've got this nice connect to NCII overview. This is a particular website and I've actually got a series of slides following these that I'm going to go through now.

[Slide 60 – Find Out What NCII Has to Offer]: But the connect to the NCII website.

[Slide 61 – Examples of Standards-Aligned Across Tiers]: Is a place where you can put your e-mail.

[Slide 62 – DBI Training Series]: If you put your e-mail in, you can get.

[Slide 63 – Webinar]: A really nice overview.

[Slide 64 – Connect to NCII]: Of what is on the NCII and what's being sent out of the NCII. This is going to come every time there's a new update or every time there's a new webinar. Every time there is something that put that that's interesting you're going to get it. I sometimes joke with the NCII folks and I know that they're updating this a lot because. I have submitted my information and I continue to get updates whenever we've got new and interesting materials up there. I think this is really a nice resource and it will keep you up to date on everything that NCII is doing.

[Slide 65 – Connect to NCSI]: At this point, I'm going to go ahead and transition over to Sarah who's going to get into some of the NCSI resources.

Moderator: And in addition to the resources that we have at The National Center on Intensive Interventions like I talked about earlier. There are resources at The National Center for Systemic Improvement. So, there's a website that's developed now and in addition, there's another website being; currently being developed to talk more specifically about the work that's being done at the state level. And with the sort of improvement plans that are happening in conjunction with NCSI. But, there is a website for the NCSI and you can see it on this website; or on this slide. I'm sorry.

You can download a two page flyer. So if you look at the bottom right hand corner of this slide, there's a two page flyer developed by the folks at WestEd and also by the staff at NCSI. Those are more specifically aligned with SISP planning. Planning around stakeholders, etcetera, etcetera. So you can look, there's a resource bar at the top of the page at the NCSI website. There's also this great resource on there. It's called "Ask the NCSI."

[Slide 66 – Ask the NCSI]: So if you are a state person and I think so many of you on this webinar are. Or if you're not a state person and you have questions specifically about the work that's being done or the technical assistance being done by NCSI. You can go to this page and I've taken a screen shot here so you can see what it looks like. This, "Ask NCSI" and you can see that first bullet tended to support states to obtain information about evidence-based practices, developing their SISP, learn more about practices being done or showing you this current research about what works; there is the link to it. It's that NCSI dot WestEd dot org slash contact.

So you can go to this website, put in your information and there's also a phone number. And then that question will get sent to some staff at NCSI and you can start a conversation about what you're curious about. So, there's some good information around NCSI. And with that review of our resources, I think that wraps up our Webinar today. Thank you all so much for signing in and joining us and thanks for your patients and for listening.

For those of you who's questions we didn't have an opportunity to answer in the chat box, we will be getting a chance to answer those when we wrap up. And we will be posting answers to your questions when the Webinar is posted on our website. So, stay tuned for that. It will happen in the next few weeks probably and we'll get that information out to you when it's posted. So thank you for joining us and have a great day.