

Using Academic Progress Monitoring for Individualized Instructional Planning

Webinar Transcript

Rebecca Zumeta (presenter): So, the objective for today are for folks on the webinar to understand how progress monitoring fits into our process of intensive intervention known as data-based individualization -- I'll call that DBI. I also hope that folks leave today with an understanding of the difference between using Mastery Measures and what we refer to as General Outcome Measures or GOM measures today. In addition, we will provide you with information about how to access resources for identifying progress monitoring tools, and we will provide you with information about how to use progress monitoring data to describe present levels of performance and set goals and determine when changes are needed.

Before we move any further today in our session, I'd like you to answer the following poll question, which is, in which of the following areas do you currently use progress monitoring data? And that could be reading, writing, math, you can check all that apply or N/A; if you're someone who doesn't work in schools or doesn't work with students directly, you can go ahead and put N/A. Well, let's give it another few moments here while the folks are responding.

All right. So, it looks like about 65 percent of the people on the webinar today do some kind of progress monitoring in reading, about 39 percent do use some progress monitoring in writing or written language, and about 56 percent are using it in the area of math. So, this follows pretty closely what we observe when we visit sites that are implementing tiered interventions, either RTI or multi-tiered systems of support. And it looks like about a third of you that are on the call today don't work directly with students, so that means that you're likely people who work for state departments or work in district offices and so forth, who may not have direct contact with students, and so, that explains probably most of the folks that are on today that responded N/A, or of course, there could be people that are also in the information-gathering phases here who are on to learn more about progress monitoring.

So, I noted about today's presentation is that we are assuming in this session that you have some working knowledge of progress monitoring assessment. And so, while those of you who may be brand new to progress monitoring may find some of this information useful today, some of it may move a little bit more quickly than you were expecting. So, if you are brand new to progress monitoring, I would recommend that you view a couple of the resources from the National Center on Response to Intervention. One is a series of slides that compromises of training module on progress monitoring and another one is a set of recorded podcasts related explaining progress monitoring. So, for those people who are new to the concept would probably benefit from taking some time to view those resources.

So, the reason we are talking about progress monitoring today as part of the National Center on Intensive Intervention is that we feel very strongly that progress monitoring is a fundamental component of implementing intensive intervention, and our approach, which we refer to as DBI or data-based individualization. And the reason is that DBI is a systemic

approach for using data -- valid and reliable data, importantly -- to drive your instructional decision-making. So, to help you as a teacher or a school psychologist or a member of an intervention team decide when and how you're going to provide more intensive intervention. And this really grew out of the work that was originally done at the University of Minnesota around experimental or clinical teaching, for those of you who may be familiar with those terms, and then has subsequently been expanded on by the research of others, including Lynn and Doug Fuchs, and several of their colleagues at Vanderbilt University.

It's important to keep in mind that when you're applying and learning about DBI, that it is not a single intervention or single program that you just didn't know about, that if you applied, it would fix all things very quickly or -- and I shouldn't have said it that way, but that will work for all students at a certain point in time, but really, the idea is that it's a way of thinking about how do we customize and tailor instruction for students who may not have responded to our standard approaches that seem to be successful or work for most kids. So, how do we take instruction that is not showing us the benefit that we would like to have for children and use the data we're collecting to come up with some good hypothesis or good ideas about how we can modify that instruction so that it's more beneficial for the students who maybe are more difficult to reach?

So, with that in mind, we really think of DBI as an ongoing process that comprises both intervention and instruction and data collection to evaluate that intervention. And so, if you look at this graphic, this is the DBI process -- and the way we describe this is that it's a teacher or a team would start with a secondary or tier-two intervention program and then delivering it with some kind of greater intensity for a student once they've identified that it doesn't work. So, at this point maybe, that you're using a smaller group or you're providing more intervention sessions in a week. So, you're doing something that makes it more and more intense, provides students with more of the content.

From that point, you would monitor progress and determine if the student has responded. If the student has not responded, they would then move in to the next phase of the process where you would identify your diagnostic assessment, where some of the skill deficits may lie, and then from there, you might come up with a hypothesis about how to further adapt the intervention and make it different in terms of how you deliver instruction. And from there, when you start making that change, then you would again implement progress monitoring to evaluate whether or not the change you made is having the desired the effect -- are you moving the student along where you'd like to see them go?

And so, we see progress monitoring being very relevant for DBI both with respect to the initial intensification of the tier two or secondary platform, and then, as you continue to make and customize or adapt the program and make it more individualized for the student. So, these areas are kind of where in the process we see that progress monitoring piece being so important for informing high-quality data-based individualization.

So, why implement progress monitoring the way we're going to describe it today? First, that the standardized method of formative assessment that tells us how well kids are responding to instruction. And so, by that I mean it's not an informal or highly variable way of evaluating students. It's standardized meaning it's done consistently when you follow the standard procedures, you know that the scores that you get are indicative of where the student falls in comparison to a desired benchmark or in comparison to their peers because you can be confident that those measures, the assessment is being delivered consistently or in a standard way across recipients.

So, that's very important and that's very different from teacher-developed measures or individually developed measures where an individual teacher may be able to evaluate how students responded to the lesson they delivered that day, but it may not tell you more broadly how well does the student understand all approaches to single-digit addition, for example, or how well does the student in one teacher's third-grade class perform compared to the student in another third-grade class. So, we want to make sure that measures are standardized when we're making decisions about whether or not the program is having the effect that we want.

It also is important because it allows teachers and intervention teams to determine what a rate of improvement should look like over time. It allows you to compare how well different kinds of intervention or instruction are working; especially when we're looking at individual students, this will be particularly important because these data can help drive decisions about the kind of instruction that a student may require in order to progress and access general ed. It's also important for students who are not demonstrating adequate progress, so that you have again data that show that the student requires something different in order to progress toward those standards. And then, it also helps you as a teacher decide when do I need to make a change, when is what I'm doing not working.

So, I see a question here which is, can you please clarify the term "secondary intervention," and that's a great question. Secondary intervention, as I noted earlier, is another way of thinking about a tier-two program, that's maybe what you call it in your school or some kind of standardized remediation program. So, this tends to be a program that you can use fairly easily off the shelf that's been tested or evaluated and shown to work better than business-as-usual program particularly for students who are at risk. So, for example, it means that in general, that the program has been rigorously evaluated and shown to work better than an informal tutoring program, or to work better than no tutoring at all for a student who's been shown to be at risk.

So, oftentimes, the programs that you might see used in your Title 1 program at your school or in a reading specialist's classroom or, in some cases, a special ed teacher's classroom would be an example of a secondary intervention or a tier-two intervention. But most of the time, we recommend that they be some kind of standardized and to some degree fairly scripted and explicit instructional program so that teachers can provide training on it to others relatively easily, and so that the intervention can be provided to students in a way that doesn't take a huge amount of extra time in planning on the one hand, and on the other hand, that the program have enough instruction to teachers within it that you can be fairly confident it can be delivered the way it was designed, and so that you know that when you deliver it that way, you can expect similar impact that you observed when the program was initially studied. So, that's what we mean when we talk about the secondary intervention program, is one that has some basis in research and has shown to work better for students who are at risk and that have some component that makes it fairly easily easy to transport from one teacher to another so that it's fairly easy to provide that training for staff.

And what we've learned is that there are certain students who, despite the high quality -- or, I'm sorry -- despite the overall positive impacts that those programs may have, there still continues to be a core group of students who do not respond to those programs. So, what intensive intervention and DBI really is about is helping teachers to think about, "What do I do next when that standard program that's been shown to work for most kids at risk doesn't work for this particular student?" So, that's where this process really comes in. So, thanks for asking that question.

All right. So, when we think about types of assessments, it's important to frame progress monitoring within the different kinds of assessments that you may see in your school. So, there's summative assessment that's used to evaluate learning that's occurred, so it occurs after learning or after teaching has taken place; so, this is typically like your end-of-year assessments that may be a part of your state assessment program or some kind of end-of-curriculum or end-of-course test that evaluates how much a student has learned over the past year or several years. Diagnostic assessment is used to help teachers identify where skill strengths and weaknesses are to help them determine how to plan instruction in terms of the kinds of skills students may need instruction on and where their strengths and weaknesses lie. And then formative assessment is really used during the context of teaching to help teachers determine whether or not students have learned what has been taught and whether or not they are approached to delivering that instruction that's having the desired impact. And so, we would like you to think about progress monitoring as, again, a standardized way of conducting formative assessment that's helping you plan your instruction and determines if what you're doing is working.

So, this quote that comes from Scriven I find is to be a useful way to help think about the difference between summative and formative assessment is, "When the cook tastes the soup, that's formative; when the guests taste the soup, that's summative." So, the guests taste it and they tell you, "Yes, we liked it," or "No, we didn't." So, that was successful or was unsuccessful. As a cook, I can taste it and I can say, "Something about that is not quite right. I need to do something different to make it taste the way I wanted to." So, it's that within the context of the cooking activity that you're able to make changes to get the outcome that you want at the end.

Another thing I'd like folks to think about also within the context of today's session is the importance of differentiating screening and progress monitoring. And sometimes these two concepts get sort of conflated or intertwined with one another, and it's understandable because they are close cousins. And in many cases, the same measures are even used. So, for example, you might use DIBELS or oral reading fluency assessments to not only screen students three times a year in your school to determine who's at risk, who's not at risk, and so on. But you may also use those same measures on a more regular basis to evaluate students who've been identified as at risk and determine if their progress is sufficient. So, they are very close cousins but it's important to think in terms of you planning your system about universal screening which is intended for all students in your school from progress monitoring, which is really intended for a small percentage of students in your school, typically no more than about 20 percent of the students in your school who've been identified as at risk.

For the purposes of DBI or intensive intervention or even thinking about a smaller percentage of students, we're thinking about this for about five percent of students in the school. So, progress monitoring is really -- it is somewhat an intensive process because it's done on a much more regular basis than screening, and so, we want to make sure that it's only being done in cases where it is needed because it's important that teachers have the time they need to devote to instruction as well as assessment. So, keep that in mind as we're talking today, is that screening is all students done two to three times a year, progress monitoring is for students who've been identified as at risk and it's to help teachers evaluate and plan instructions for this group of students.

So, as we move into our discussion of progress monitoring today, I want you to think carefully about the two common approaches to progress monitoring that we see when we talk to teams about the work they're doing to evaluate student's progress. One is the use of Mastery

Measurement or Mastery Measures, and the other one is what we call General Outcome Measurement.

First, we'll talk about Mastery Measures. So, these are typically assessments that describe mastery of a single skill and typically a single skill within a larger series of instructional objectives. So, in the area of math, this may mean if you're evaluating student progress in addition, that you would start with single-digit addition steps and then you may move to two-digit additions, and then you may move to addition with re-grouping, and then you may move to addition with re-grouping with a zero, and so on and so -- I'm sorry, not re-grouping with a zero, but re-grouping with -- I'm sorry, you may move to addition with three numbers, and then re-grouping across a zero and so on. So, yes, you're layering on complexity into the skill over time, but that the Mastery Measure itself is only measuring the individual skill you're teaching at that point in time. It typically follows a logical rather than research-driven or empirical hierarchy of skills, meaning that, for example, in math, we often teach addition before we teach subtraction, but there is not necessarily a research base that says that that has to be how it's done or that it's the best way to do it, or that all curricula are going to follow the same instructional progression. So, it tends to require you to follow a more lockstep process.

Typically, Mastery Measures also don't allow you to consider whether the students have maintained the skills you taught previously, or whether they're generalizing to new skills that you maybe have not taught yet. And what we've learned over time is that in many cases, Mastery Measures, the number of objectives that have been met demonstrates that a student has demonstrated having mastered doesn't necessarily correlate or predict how well they'll do on an end-of-term assessment or on a state assessment that may be an evaluation of their overall skills in an area, in math, for example. So, Mastery Measurement can be very good at helping you measure and compare narrow skills, but it doesn't always give you a great snapshot of how students are performing overall.

And an example of what this might look like, as I mentioned, was an addition test. And so, what you'll see here is instead of showing a variety of different kinds of math problems that a student may be working on in their second-grade curriculum, instead it just focuses on a single skill. And so, what you're looking for is a student's accuracy at being able to complete a test that assesses a single skill at a time. And typically, when you see this graph, what you'll see is that it will show the number of problems that the student was able to answer correctly within a certain time period. In this example, you're seeing the student make nice progress with his multi-digit addition skills and then, once he masters that multi-digit addition, then he moves into subtraction and he starts all over, again and again, he's making nice progress with subtraction.

But what you can't see here is when he's working on subtraction, you don't know if he's maintaining that addition skill. So, you don't know if now that the addition is no longer the focus on instruction, if you were to present him with addition problems again, would he be able to do that? You also don't know, can he apply what he's learned about addition and subtraction to an untaught skill because it's not being assessed. So, this is one of the limitations of Mastery Measurement in that it requires this kind of very categorical organization of skills.

The General Outcome Measurement or GOM measurement is a different approach to progress monitoring assessment that tests students in a brief way on their overall competence or overall growth in the annual curriculum. And it incorporates tests of maintenance and generalization or retention and generalization because it includes different kinds of problems in the test.

So, for example, in math, instead of seeing all addition problems on an assessment, you would see a mix of addition problem, subtraction problem, some fraction problems and so on that represent the entire year-long curriculum in math. So, students are instructed to do the problems they know how to do and just skip around, and if they come to a problem they can't do, to go past it and do all the ones they can do first. And then, if they want to, they can go back and try more. And then they typically, as the year goes on, are able to do more and more of the problems and as that occurs, the score goes up and that gives you a sense that they're learning more and more of that annual curriculum. So, it gives you an opportunity to not only check have they learned what you taught this week, but also, do they remember what you taught last month, and can they possibly even try some problems or guess some problems or make an educated effort at some problems that you haven't taught yet, or are there students who are high-performing who are able to do that. And so, that's what's useful about these general outcome measures, that they give you a good snapshot of where the student falls in the overall curriculum.

It also is useful because when you take this -- when you conduct this kind of assessment over time, it not only tells you about how a student performs at one certain point in time, but because you're giving the assessment that can be compared from one day to the next or one week to the next, improvement on these assessments and this graphed information actually can give you information about the student's rate of improvement or rate of growth, which is why we find these so useful for progress monitoring purposes. And then, it also helps you use this -- you can also use this graphed information then to help you determine when you need to make decisions about making instructional changes.

So, for example, in math, as I noted, an assessment that includes computation problems that span the entire curriculum of a grade level will be given to the student and parallel forms of this assessment will be given repeatedly over time, and those assessments, when they're compared to one another over the course of the year can be used to help you determine whether or not the student is learning more and more of the annual curriculum.

So, why is this important? Why do we even care about measuring progress with General Outcome Measures? One of the important reasons is that it can help us make better decisions about instruction. And what we've learned when we look at studies where progress monitoring data had been collected using this kind of measurement tool, what we've learned is that when those data are collected weekly, we actually see really robust improvements in student performance. So, what this graph is showing is that when students are given a progress monitoring assessment about once a week, they make growth that is faster than peers who are not getting those progress monitoring assessments and that that percentile gain is about 24 percentile points compared to students who don't get that regular progress monitoring assessment. So, progress monitoring and the information it gives teachers actually help students learn more, and the belief is that it's because it helps teachers plan and design better instruction that would better meet the needs of students.

And, again, we always highlight the taking of these data about once a week, because if you look at this graph, what you'll notice is when you move up to taking the data from 15 times in 15 weeks, so one time per week, to taking the data 30 times in 15 weeks or two times per week, the growth in student performance doesn't match the extra effort that's required. So, when you go from taking data never to taking data once a week, you go from a zero percentile gain to a 24-and-a-half-point-percentile gain. But when you go from once a week to twice a week, you only go from 24-and-a-half-percentile point to about 29 percentile points. So, it's a modest improvement, but the extra effort required given everything else being asked of teachers may not

be worth the -- it may not be feasible for teachers to do in a sustainable way. So, this is where the recommendation for taking progress monitoring data once a week typically is derived from.

So, in selecting a progress monitoring tool, this is something that I'm just going to go through very quickly given the time we have today, but I did want to spend some time making you aware of some of the options that are out there when determining and identifying a tool to use, especially for those of you who maybe are considering conducting progress monitoring in a different content area, perhaps you've been doing progress monitoring in reading and are thinking about expanding in to math, for example.

Some things to think about when you're selecting or evaluating a tool. First are the skills that are going to be measured. It's very important that they be age- and grade-level appropriate. It's not uncommon when we do visits to sites conducting RTI or conducting intensive intervention that we see that sometimes measures are being overused for populations where they may not be particularly useful. A common example of this is use of oral reading fluency to monitor progress and students in late elementary school and middle school. For students performing at grade level, that is not a particularly valid measure as students get into that late elementary and early middle school grade range, so it may be again useful at that point to consider whether there is another more appropriate measure that may be used at that point or you may consider augmenting that oral reading fluency data with some more questioning of the student about what is it that they've read. And we'll talk about that a little bit more in a minute.

Other things to think about are the cost and training requirements, administration and scoring time. Again, as I noted before, in an ideal world if we had all the time that we needed, we would collect progress monitoring data twice a week because that seems to give us the most - - the strongest outcome in terms of improved student performance. However, collecting it once a week gives us most of that benefit and may be more feasible and sustainable for teachers.

Another thing to think about is the data management required. So, it could be that this tool is very inexpensive but it doesn't come with a way to manage and monitor the data using software. So, it may make the data less useable for schools or for teachers in your school or in your district. So, it may be worth considering whether or not you want to invest a little bit more money into a program that also gives you some kind of a data management system. Alternatively, if budget is a concern but you have somebody who's very savvy at using Excel in your district or school, it may be worthwhile to invest in something that's less expensive and have that staff person devote some time to managing the database in Excel.

The other pieces and probably the most important pieces to consider are the technical rigor of the tool. And the reason I say this is a tool that is not rigorous or technically valid for the purposes you're using it for is a useless tool. So, if you do not have good information that it's predicting what you want it to predict, that it provides you with consistent data or reliable data, then it is a tool that you really can't depend on for making the decisions because you cannot tell if it's giving you the information that you need. So, it's really important to consider reliability; again, that's the consistency of the measure; validity, whether it's testing what you think it should test; and then, also it's the ability to detect change over time. And again, the reason we strongly recommend use of General Outcome Measures is that you can detect change over time when you have those assessments that are evaluating student progress in the overall curriculum over the course of the school year.

And for that reason, we want an assessment that has alternate or parallel forms, and that means that there are several versions of the test that are of equal difficulty that you can give the

assessment repeatedly over the course of the year and compare the scores and get a sense of if the student is improving or not.

Okay. So, the place to go to look for progress monitoring measures is the Intensive Intervention Centers websites. We are at www.intensiveintervention.org, and we have several tools charts, and there is a progress monitoring tools chart that provides you with the information on General Outcome Measures, and then there's also a page on that chart that provides you with information about Mastery Measures. There are a few Mastery Measures that have been evaluated and have technical data attached to them that may be worth considering. You'll notice that the list of General Outcome Measures is much longer because for all the reasons we've talked about, it does lend itself better to this kind of monitoring more effectively.

We also will be coming out with a behavior progress monitoring tools charts very soon, but I believe that it has not been published yet. Is that right?

Laura Magnuson (moderator): It will be out in the summer of 2013.

Rebecca Zumeta (presenter): Coming out this summer? Okay, that's what I thought.

And other things to think about when you're looking at this progress monitoring chart as well is that you can sort for information like information on reading, information on math, and so on, so that you can look for specific tools and it provides you with information about grade levels that the assessments are appropriate for and cost information and where you can go to get more information about ordering the assessment and training and so on. All vendors who submit to the chart have a chance to have their tool reviewed and then it's posted to the chart. Now, there may be tools that you use that are not on this chart, and that doesn't that they're bad or that they're good or --it's not a value judgment. It just means that the vendor did not submit the tool for review. So, you should think of this as kind of a consumer report of tools that were submitted by vendors. If you're interested in more information about this chart, we will be providing a webinar on use of the tools charts later in the spring.

And so, as you notice here, you can also use the tools charts to look at the psychometric or the technical standards. And then, you can also click on the different pages of the chart to get information about it to use for progress monitoring and DBI purposes. And we're just going to keep moving along because of the time.

So, a question that often comes up for us particularly as we're working with students who have very low achievement or who have persistent slow progress is, should we ever assess students off level or at a different grade level than they're currently performing? And it's really important to consider the purpose of the assessment when you're making this decision. And then, we would encourage you to think about screening that happens for all students as something that should always occur at the student's chronological grade level. And the reason for that is that screening is really used to help identify students who may be at risk and also to help the school determine how well are we meeting the needs of the students in third grade and helping them reach third-grade standards or fifth-grade standards, for example.

If you are providing an off-level assessment for screening purposes, that may lull you into a fall sense of security if you are giving a screening assessment to a fourth grader who is reading in a second-grade level and you're giving them a second-grade screening assessment. You may say, "Oh, they're meeting the benchmarks for second grade. Great." But the reality is that age-wise, they're in fourth grade; they are not meeting those benchmarks for fourth grade which is where we want them to be. So, for the purposes of screening, that would not be appropriate. So, we want to make sure that students are all screened at their grade-appropriate level.

However, for progress monitoring purposes for individual planning, we need to assess students at a level that is sensitive to change for where they are currently functioning. So, this means that if a student is in fourth grade and is reading at a second-grade level, that fourth grade assessment is unlikely to detect his improvements in reading on a weekly basis over the course of the year because it's likely that that assessment is too hard, and so we will not pick up changes in his reading skills over the course of the year. So, what we would instead do is provide the assessment at a lower level that matches where he is instructionally so that as he learns more of those second-grade skills, that that assessment picks that up and shows that he is progressing towards the later second-grade skill level that is helping to close the gap between where he is currently functioning at a second-grade level and where we would like him to be which is at that fourth-grade level. If we were to give only a fourth-grade progress monitoring assessment, we would likely continue to see no growth. So, it's very important that for progress monitoring purposes, that we use a measure that is likely to pick up the change as it's occurring.

So, examples of how you might determine whether or not a student should be assessed off level look a little different in reading and math so we're showing you an example in each. Now, every assessment tool that you use will have slightly different directions for this, but this is an example of what you may see, depending on the assessment that you'd use.

So, in math, the common ways of thinking about progress monitoring are assessments of computation skills and assessments of concepts and application skills. And so, what you would do for a student where you had concerns about whether or not the grade level progress monitoring tools is appropriate, you would, instead of assessing them at their current chronological grade level, you would say, "My guess is that he will be functioning at late third-grade level by the end of the year."

Let's say you have a fourth grader and you think fourth grade's going to be too hard, but I think he'll be at a third-grade level at the end of the year. You would take that third-grade level assessment and you give him a version of it on two different days and you look at the score. If his score was less than 10 digits or blanks correct, you would know that even that third-grade level is too hard, you need to move down a lower level to the second-grade level. If he's able to do 15 digits or blanks or more, then you would say, "You know, that third-grade level actually looks like it may be too easy. You need to re-consider giving that appropriate fourth-grade level material." If he's falling in between those two, that gives you a sense that that where you guessed he was would likely be at the end of the year was just about right and that that third-grade level assessment is where you should provide the -- is the measure you should use for progress monitoring purposes.

With respect to reading, it's a similar approach where you'd pick the oral reading fluency passage that you believe the student would be able to read at by the end of the year. If the student is able to read less than 10 words correct per minute, then you would go to an early literacy measure instead. So, if you gave that assessment and you found him reading less than 10 words in a minute, you might go to using Word Identification Fluency or Nonsense Word Fluency, which are some of the common measures you'll see used for early literacy monitoring.

If the student's reading 10 to 50 words correct per minute but his accuracy is low, then you may consider administering passages at the next lower grade level. If the student is reading 10 to 50 correct words but he is above that 90 percent accuracy range, that tells you that that's about the right level to be monitoring him at and that you would continue using that grade level of assessment for the year. If the student's reading more than 50 correct words per minute, you move him to the next higher grade level. So, for example, if you had a student who's a fourth

grader and you guessed that they would be reading at a second-grade level by the end of the year and he read -- when you gave that assessment, he read that second-grade passage at 60 words a minute, you'd move him up to the third-grade passage and try again, and then make a determination about whether the third-grade passage might be appropriate.

Now, how can I confirm or augment data when it's collected? I'm seeing a question here, can you recommend any progress monitoring material for Spanish bilingual students other than IDEL? That is a great question, and given where I am in this session today, I'm going to hold that toward the end, and we will get to that if there is time.

So, the question I see on the slide here is, can I confirm or augment data that are collected? So, this is particularly important as we are starting to think about progress monitoring with older students. Now in some cases, it may be worthwhile to augment this progress with typical progress monitoring tools like the oral reading fluency assessment that I noted earlier isn't always great as students get into late elementary school. And what we've found is that brief interviews can help corroborate the progress monitoring data you've collected and it can help you get new information about what the students learned.

So, in the area of math, we would recommend that you consider asking students to talk through the strategies they use to get to their answer. So, again, this is not something we'd suggest you do with every student in your school. This would be something that you would consider doing with a small percentage of students where you're monitoring their progress and perhaps where you're thinking, "You know, this student's progress is pretty flat," or "I'm not quite sure why they're having the difficulties they're having; I need to get more information." So, having students talk through the strategies that they've used to answer their math problems may give you important insights into the kinds of errors they're making and why they're making them, and perhaps the level of math understanding that they have. It may be that they've been memorizing procedures for solving problems, and so they're over-applying a memorized strategy rather than understanding when and how to use that strategy appropriately. So, these kinds of questions may help you as a teacher identify where those instructional misunderstandings are occurring.

In the area of reading, some sample interview questions that Sharon Vaughn has used in some of her research with older students emphasized getting students to retell what they've just read. So, if the oral reading fluency passage was a fiction story, you might ask them to tell you what it was about, what did they just read, what happened, can you tell me more. If the question is about a non-fiction or a text-based inquiry activity, you may ask for specific information or factual information from the story, and then ask them about what the strategy was that we've used to come up with the answer, what sections of the text supported the answer or made them think that the answer they provided was correct. So, it's really getting them to go back to the text and refer to where they got their information from and to demonstrate that they understood what they've read.

And the reason for that is that the limitation for progress monitoring purposes, as students get older, comes in because you don't expect these kids to continue to get to be faster and faster readers indefinitely. There is an effect that occurs as students get into those late elementary years where they're not likely to become faster readers, so the speed at which they're reading isn't telling you whether or not they're understanding material well. So, at this point, adding on these comprehension questions can give you a better indication of if they're understanding and thinking about what they're reading.

So, making instructional decisions for individual students. First, we need to establish a baseline when you're monitoring progress. And it's very important for goal setting because there are a lot of reasons that a student may have low performance at one point in time, and so we want to -- or with one measure -- so we want to have more than one data point so that we're fairly confident that the score that we're starting with is reflective of where the student actually is functioning.

So, we want a stable baseline, and we can get that in two ways. One is to take median or the middle score of the three data points collected in one sitting. So, if the student is being -- if you're working with the student providing oral reading fluency assessment and you give three one-minute reads for the student, you would take the median score to determine the baseline. If you are working with the student over the course of a couple of weeks, you need to work with them and take a one-minute oral reading fluency assessment with them one time per week for over three weeks, then you would take the mean of those three most recent data points. So, if you're doing it one sitting, it's the median; if it's over three sittings, it is the mean for calculating the baseline.

And there are three approaches to setting goals that are commonly used, and many of you may already be familiar with these so I'll move through them fairly quickly especially the first two. The first is benchmarking; the second is national norms for weekly rate of improvement; and the third is an intra-individual framework.

So, the first option is where we use the benchmark from screening assessments to determine where a student should be performing at a particular point in time. So, you would identify the appropriate grade level benchmark and set that -- identify that point, mark it on the graph, and connect that point to the student's baseline. This is the most common goal setting approach and probably the one that you use the most often in your school, particularly if you're monitoring students who are perhaps close to grade level but who are slightly below the benchmark.

So, in this example, if this was our chart for identifying benchmarks and we had a fifth-grade student that we were monitoring in comprehension, we know the benchmark is 30 digits correct. And what we would do is identify where that 30 digits should fall on the graph, we would identify where the student's baseline score falls on the graph and we would just connect those two numbers with a dotted line, and that becomes the goal line. It's fairly straightforward and, again, it's typically the most common approach used.

Now, there are some advantages to using benchmarking. First, it is easy to use when the progress monitoring assessment provides those benchmarks, and it can help you make sure your tracking whether students are making progress toward those grade level expectations. So, it can give you a sense of how far an individual child is away from their peers or away from those grade-level standards.

Now, some considerations or some disadvantages are that the goal may not be feasible for a student who's performing well below grade level. So, for example, if you have a student who starts the year and who has performance that is so low that he would have to make four words a week of growth on his oral reading fluency assessment in order to meet that end-of-year standard, if you set a goal like that that has such a rigorous growth expectation, it's unlikely he's going to reach the goal and it's unlikely that the teacher, even if she's providing effective instruction, is going to know that that instruction is effective because then we've set what we would consider an unrealistic goal. So, it's important to keep in mind not only where do we want them to go but what's a realistic pace for helping him or her to get there.

And that's where the second goal setting approach can become very helpful. On the second goal setting approach, you would use the norms for weekly rate of improvement. So, for example, many progress monitoring tools -- and unfortunately, not all -- but many provide information about what the average rate of growth per week should be for a student at a particular grade level on a progress monitoring assessment. So, for example, -- well, in this example we'll use third-grade passage reading fluency. And so, what we do is we determine the goal by taking that average weekly rate of growth, multiplying it by the number of weeks left in the instructional period and adding it to the student's baseline score.

So, if we were to use an example to illustrate this, let's say we have a fourth grader and we are wanting to set a goal in computation and we know the rate of improvement norms, fourth grader and computation on the assessment being used in this school is 0.7, then that is the rate of improvement we're going to use. The timeframe in this example is that there are 10 weeks left in the instructional period and his baseline score when the data were collected weekly was 10, nine, and 11, okay? So, we take this student's baseline information and we get the information about the goal and the amount of time left in the year and we calculate the goal this way. There was a 0.7 rate of improvement from the chart, there were 10 weeks left in the instructional period, and his mean baseline score was 10, because we collected it over three different points in time, so we used the mean instead of the median. So, if we take 0.7 and we multiply it by 10 weeks and we add that initial score, that baseline score of 10, we end up with seven plus 10, and so the student's goal is 17. Okay?

And what's important here is that we've -- although he might've had low initial performance, we are suggesting here that we think or we want -- our goal for the student, even though his initial performance is low, we want to set an ambitious goal that he or she is going to be making growth at the same rate as his or her peers now that he or she is in a high-quality instructional program that's meeting his needs. So, we think that although that achievement is not where we want it to be, that we can still have the student improving at a rate that's similar to his peers, and that's what that norm for weekly improvement gives you.

Well, some considerations for this is that if the student is behind, just matching that rate of growth won't necessarily close the gap for that student because if all students at that grade level are making the same growth, then that gap will not close. It won't get larger but it won't close. That's one important thing to consider. Some progress monitoring tools will provide you with ambitious growth rates that will allow you to actually think about what you would need to do for a student if you wanted to set a rate of growth that would actually help close that gap.

And then, as I noted before, sometimes you may have a tool where the rate of improvement norms are not provided by the vendor, and in those cases, you may consider using local norms if your district has been able to calculate them, or a more rudimentary way to do this would be to estimate the rate of improvement by dividing the number of weeks left in the instructional period by the difference in benchmarks from fall to winter, for example. So, if the growth rate in the difference in benchmarks from fall to winter is 20 points different and there're 10 weeks of instruction that occur in that time period, then the rate of improvement would need to be an average of about two points or two words per week. So, that would be an example of kind of a crude way or a rudimentary way you could do that if there isn't better information provided. Again, when possible, you always want to use the best information provided.

So, I know we are running a little bit long today, so I'm probably going to bypass the example that I was hoping to provide today, and we will find a way to make that available in a later recording.

Considered option for setting goals is what we call the intra-individual framework, and this is where we calculate the student's own rate of improvement and use that information to set an ambitious goal for him or her over time. So, in this example, we take the student's rate of improvement and we multiply it by 1.5 and multiply it by the number of weeks left in the school year, and then we add that number to the student's baseline score. So, if we know the student's current rate of improvement is not sufficient to close the achievement gap and we want to increase growth by at least 50 percent over what he has been performing in the past, then 1.5 allows us to do that. So, if we just multiply growth by one, that means his growth rate would stay the same. So, by multiplying by 1.5, we're saying we know his rate of improvement is not where we want it to be and we want to see that improve by at least 50 percent, so 1.5 lets us do that.

And then, as the student progresses, if the teacher determines that they are beating that goal and they're instruction is effective, the teacher could certainly raise the goal and make that goal even higher if she determines that he's outperforming the goal that's been set. But what's important is that you never want to lower the goal.

So, in this example, we'll use the eight most recent scores over seven instructional weeks; so, for example here, we're going to use eight, seven, nine, nine, eight, 11, 10, 11, and 12. So, those are eight scores that were collected over seven weeks, we're going to assume that there's 10 weeks left in the instructional period and we're going to use that information to calculate a goal. So, in this example, we're going to use the third median scores, so the median of the three most recent data points and the median of the first three data points, and we're going to subtract the median of the first three data points which is eight from the median of the last three data points which is 11, and we're going to get 3, and we're going to divide that by the number of weeks of data that were collected. So, the data were collected over seven weeks, so we have a difference of three divided by seven, so the student's rate of improvement is about 0.43 words per week.

We'll take that information and we'll add it to the student's baseline score and we're going to use the three most recent scores that were collected which is the 10, 11, and 12. And because they were collected over three weeks, we're going to take the mean, so that baseline score is 11, so we're going to take the rate of improvement 0.43, multiply it by 1.5 which is the target growth rate, and -- I'm sorry, the target growth factor -- and then we're going to multiply that by the 10 weeks left in the school year, and then we're going to add that to the baseline. So, that gives us 6.45 plus 11, and the ending goal is 17.45. So, we would round that to the nearest whole number, so 17 or 18 would be the goal.

So, when we -- and I do know that we are getting here towards four o'clock, and I am going to keep going just for a few minutes after four o'clock. If those of you who need to leave the webinar now would like to come back later, there will be a recorded version of this archived on our website so that you can listen to the last set of it; but for those of you who are here and who'd like to stay on, I will continue to move forward with the next several slides and then stay online and I'll answer any questions for you. I apologize that we got a little bit of a late start today, and some of this information takes a little more time to get through than I had planned today, so we will just hang out here for a few extra minutes. And, again, those of you who can stick around, you are more than welcome; and if you can't, we hope you can view the webinar that's archived at a later time.

So, using progress monitoring data, the right present levels of performance allows you to take information that may already be being used in your school as part of your RTI system to

also set concrete and measurable goals for students as part of either their IEP or for individualized planning for students who have these more intensive needs. What's useful about using these data for present levels of performance is that it's using concrete and measurable skills to describe the student's competence in the general curriculum. So, these scores really give you good information, not only about how well can they add or how well can they subtract, but how well are they able to do third-grade computation or how well are they able to read third-grade texts. So, it's not giving you narrow information; it's giving you broad information about overall competence in the domain.

It also gives your staff a way to use a valid and reliable assessment tool that's, again, already in place in many general ed settings for special ed planning. And then, it also has important outcome focus, because it really is oriented toward what do we want the student to be able to do at the end of the school year or at the end of the IEP period, and it is less oriented toward how are we going to provide the instruction or where is it going to occur or which teacher is going to provide it, and it's really about the outcome. So, it's, what do we want the child to be able to do, not how are we going to provide the instruction. This allows us to be very flexible about how provide the instruction, and so that we can adjust our instruction to meet the needs of the child to get them where it is that we want them to go.

So, in this example, I have Andrew who's a second grader with a learning disability and eligibility in basic reading. Now, his progress monitoring occurred at the beginning of the year, and they determined that in the second grade passage reading fluency or oral reading fluency assessment, he was scoring less than 10 words a minute. So, his team decided that that second-grade assessment was really not appropriate and that they would do an off-level assessment. So, they were going to go down to the first-grade Word Identification Fluency assessment. They collected these data weekly and they had eight data points for Andrew. And if you want to follow along at this point, we have this handout that you can download and follow along and you can do the goal setting for Andrew along with me. We're going to walk through benchmarking, rate of improvement, and intra-individual framework, and we're going to assume that there is 30 weeks left in the year. I'm not going to spend as much time on benchmark and rate of improvement because those are the two that people tend to be the most familiar with, so we'll go through those relatively quickly, but I will take a few seconds here on pause for those of you that want to download that handout.

Okay. While I'm waiting for people to download these measures, the question is, how often are the norms updated for ROI? So, that's a great question. ROI or rate of improvement norms are actually provided by the assessment, the vendor. So, they will vary based on the vendor that you use, but typically vendors are collecting these data on an ongoing basis and adjust them, I can only say periodically, there isn't typically a standard for how often they are updated, but typically your technical manual will provide the information about when the most recent update of the rate of improvement information occurred.

So, with that in mind, let's move in to the goal-setting options. We have the first one which is if we were to use benchmarks for Andrew, let's think about whether or not we would use the first- or second-grade benchmark. Again, we decided we were going to be collecting the Word Identification Fluency data, because the second-grade assessment appeared to be too difficult for him. So, because we're collecting data at that level, we're also going to use that benchmark, we're going to use the first-grade Word Identification Fluency benchmark for Andrew. So, his goal would be very straightforward for this first option. It would be that by the end of the year, our goal for Andrew is that he's reading 60 words per minute.

The next option is the rate of improvement norm. So, again, if we're working with Andrew on first-grade Word Identification Fluency, we would use that goal, that 1.8 words per week, and we'd calculate it the way we described before. We'd take Andrew's three most recent data points and divide by three because they were collected over time, and we will multiply the growth rate of 1.8 by 30 weeks left in the year, that gives us 54. And we would add that 54 to the baseline, and our goal for Andrew would be 68 correct words per minute.

The third option, again, it's the trickiest but it's often one that's particularly useful for students who have persistent slow growth rate or low rates of progress. And what we do here is we would use Andrew's most recent eight scores, because we need to have a sense of his rate of improvement, so we would take that third median, so the median of 13, 15, and 14, and we would take that 14 and we'd subtract it from the first median, the median of nine, eight, and 11, and that would be nine. So, we would take 14 minus nine, and we'd divide it by the seven weeks of time that passed in collecting those scores. So, we'd take 14 minus nine and divide it by seven. That gives us Andrew's rate of improvement which is 0.71. And then we'll take the 30 weeks left in the school year and we'll calculate his baseline. His baseline, again, is the mean of those three most recent data points: 13, 15, and 14. And when you divide that by three, our answer is 14. So then, we do our math, we multiply 0.71 by 1.5, by the 30 weeks left in the year and we add that 14, that baseline score, that he started with. And so, we know that Andrew's goal is to be reading about 46 correct words per minute by the end of the year using this third goal setting option.

But choosing a goal, you'll notice that there are some fairly different scores that emerge from these different options. The first one, the goal was 60 words per minute; the second one, the goal was 68 words a minute; and the third one, the goal was 46 words a minute. So, the first two are somewhat close together but the third goal is a fair amount lower than the other two goal options are. So, some questions as a team that you may ask yourself when deciding which option is most appropriate is, are national norms too ambitious for Andrew, or do we think we can increase his current rate of improvement by more than 1.5 by changing his intervention or by providing something that's more intensive? And the other question we may want to ask is, how does his current rate of improvement compare to the national norms score where a student should be growing at that grade level? And, do we know anything about the history of his reading progress or his reading instruction in previous school years? So, how well do we know Andrew?

So, ideally, as we've talked about before, we want him to achieve grade-level standards. So, if a student has a chance of achieving near grade level, we want to use the benchmarking option because that's where in most cases we want students to end up. Rate of improvement can be appropriate when students -- we think students are able to learn at a typical rate or at a rate that meets that national or local norm, however, this rate of growth may not close the gap. So, it's important to think about whether or not we have a student where we may need to even accelerate that growth rate and set a goal that's even more ambitious. That's a consideration we may need to have.

And then, intra-individual framework, that third option may be useful in cases where achievement is too low to realistically reach the benchmark by the end of the year, or where the students have a history of a very low rate of improvement despite repeated efforts of intervention, or, finally, where the cognitive delays that a student presents with suggests that expecting a typical rate of growth is not appropriate. And again, we believe that these decisions should be made on an individual and case-by-case basis, and that other attempts of intervention and other data should be collected before moving to this option. However, there may be students

with significant and persistent learning problems where this may be what you need to do in order to create a goal that is ambitious but also realistic for the students. But what's also important to keep in mind is that data should be reviewed regularly by the team, and so that if the student is outperforming the school, that it can be raised so that we continue to push that student forward as much as possible.

So, for Andrew, his current rate of improvement based on our calculations is 0.71. The national norm was 1.8. So, his rate of improvement is less than half of the national norm. So, for Andrew, depending on what we know about him and what his team knows about his history and his past performance, they may decide that this is appropriate because his rate of improvement is so significantly different than where the national norms are.

However, we would want to watch this closely so that if we see he's exceeding that goal, that we can quickly raise the goal and move toward a more ambitious option. So, while this may be a place where we start, depending on what we know about Andrew, we want to collect this closely and to raise the goal immediately if we see he's outperforming it.

So, the final step is making good decisions. So, how much data do we need to make a good decision? This is a really common question that we get because, again, people want to do the best things for kids and they want to know quickly if what they're doing is working. So, what we do know about data collection is that the more information you have, the more confident you can be in your decisions.

So, researchers suggested that we typically would want about six to nine data points before making an initial instructional decision about a student. So, if it's early in the year and you haven't collected much data, that you would want those six to nine data points before making a decision, if you make an instructional change and then have data that you've collected after that instructional change, that can be added on to data that were collected before the change, then you have more information about trends that you can use for looking at overall skills and overall progress that may be useful. But at the early part of the year, you want to take about six to nine data points before making any high stakes decisions.

More frequent progress monitoring allows you to make these decisions more quickly. So, six to nine data points taken weekly are going to allow you to make much faster decisions than only taking data every two or three weeks, and that's why we recommend taking data at least weekly for students who are in this intensive intervention.

So, this just looks like something many of you may already be familiar with, the four-point rule. I suggest that once you have six data points, you can look at the four most recent data points and make a pretty good decision about whether or not the instruction is effective. So, I'm going to move immediately to the graph. If the four most recent data points are above the goal line, that tells you that the instruction is working and you can likely raise the goal. If the four most recent data points are below the goal line you need to make an instructional change. You never lower the goal. You never -- and I would also encourage you to not question whether the assessment was a good assessment. If the student's performance is consistently below the goal line, it tells you an instructional change is needed. And that's very important. Oftentimes, I think we want to attribute low achievement, low performance on these assessments to other things, something being wrong with the test and not maybe something else that we maybe need to think about doing instructionally. And that's why we don't make big decisions based on one data point, but if we see consistent patterns of low performance, that tells us something needs to change in our instruction.

And then, the second one is the method where we use the trend line; so, if we have a software program that can calculate a trend line for us, we can compare the trend line to the goal line. So, in this example, you have a goal on the top where the goal line is the dotted line, the trend line is the solid line, and what we see is for the first student, the trend line is steeper than the goal line. This student is on track to meet his or her goal by the end of the year. He's actually on track to exceed it. So, in this example, we would consider raising the goal for the student, because our instruction is successful and we want to continue to move the student forward and see how much growth we can get in that year.

For the student in the lower example, what we see is that the trend line is actually below the goal line. If something doesn't change in the student's instruction, he is not going to reach his goal by the end of the year. So, we know here we need to make an instructional change. We don't lower the goals. We always make an instructional change if the trend line is lower than the goal line.

Okay. This is just repeating what I just said. So, in summary, progress monitoring data help us decide whether a student is profiting from the database individualization we're providing, it helps us determine whether a student is responding to the adjustment or the adapted individualized intervention we've provided, so this specific instructional change we've made, and it can help us write these concrete and measurable, present level performance statements and individualized goals by providing us with a valid and reliable tool that gives an indicator of overall competence and a specific domain: in reading or computation or concepts and applications within the math domain.

So, with that, I apologize that we went over a little bit today, but I did want to make sure we go to all of this, and I know several of you have stayed on. So, what I'd like to do is answer any questions that have come up at this point. I'm going to look through the questions that I can get to now, and any that we do not have time for, we will respond to and include on the chat.

So, I'm going to stay on for about five more minutes and answer as many questions as I can, and then, we will again add any others into -- I'm sorry, an FAQ document that we'll include with the recorded webinar.

So, all right. So, I've got a couple of questions. One is for mastery interventions such as corrective reading, "Would you recommend a GOM to test its effectiveness or the data that is collected from the intervention itself?"

Becky [phonetic], this is fantastic question. So, what I would actually recommend is that as you're moving through the program, that you collect the unit test data that you would collect as part of the instruction within the intervention. However, I would also layer onto this the General Outcome Measurement data that you would be collecting on a weekly basis. And the reason for that is has these Mastery Measures within that program can be useful in telling you has the student learned what you just taught, but it doesn't necessarily tell you, is the student generalizing what you taught in that intervention to broader reading skills? So, if you see growth on both the General Outcome Measure and the corrective reading skills assessments, you can be relatively confident the instruction you're providing is working and it's generalizing. Without that General Outcome Measurement, you don't necessarily have that information.

Please share if possible algebra GOMs that are reliable. So, that's a great question. These are measures that are actually in development right now, and there is a woman at Iowa State University whose name is escaping me at the moment, who is doing this -- I'm sorry, Anne Foegen is her name. She is doing this work around algebra measure. She has IES grant and it's actually in some of the later phases, and they are validating this right now, and I believe that they

will be making this available within the next couple of years. If you would like more information on Anne's work, please feel free to send me an e-mail and I'm happy to send you some resources. I think it's very promising and it will add a lot to how we may be able to support students at the secondary level.

When you talk about more frequent progress monitoring producing better results, are those results measured by the progress monitoring measure or on General Outcome Measure or on GOM. So, GOM is a type of progress monitoring measure but that was actually the intervention itself, and then what they looked at was broader achievement measures of the outcome, so not just that they do better on the progress monitoring tool, but also did they do better on achievement measures of reading and achievement measures of math that were not the progress monitoring measures, it's a separate correlated measure but not the same thing.

Okay. Where and how can information about progress monitoring for behavior be found? Thank you for asking this question. That is going to be available on our website, the www.intensiveintervention.org website this summer. We have just finished the first round of review of tools, and we will be making that available very soon. Again, that's just a new area for us, so it's taken a little time to get that pulled together. We will also be posting a training module on using direct behavior rating within the next month or two, and there will be a webinar on direct behavior rating which is a progress monitoring tool for behavior, and that will happen in May. And there are additional resources for progress monitoring and behavior that might be useful for you to look into on the EBI network website at University of Missouri, and then also the Direct Behavior Rating website that I believe you'd have to Google, I do not know the web address off the top off my head. If you e-mail me, I'd be happy to help you put you in touch with those resources and with folks who do provide training on that as well.

The only other question that I saw was about progress monitoring for English language learners and looking for a progress monitoring tool that was not EDEL. And you are right that there are not great additional tools that are published in other languages, however, what you will see when you look on our chart is whether or not measures have been desegregated or validated for different subgroups. And there are some that have looked at ELL students, so that would be one thing to consider.

And then, also, as students are learning English, progress monitoring tools in English can still be good indicators of their progress in learning to read and also in particular in learning to do math in English. So, while it may not be their first language, they still do have some evidence of reliability and validity. And the National Center on Response to Intervention has a module on this specifically related to literacy, intervention, and progress monitoring within an RTI system for ELLs, and I would highly recommend that you look at that module for more specific information. And again, if you e-mail me, I would be more than happy to get that module to you. It's on the RTI Center's website, but I'd also be happy to help you track it down. And, I think, again, that has some great resources.

So, I think, with that I will go ahead and wrap up, unless there are any other questions, I'll hang out here for another minute or so. Again, I apologize for going a little bit long today. I appreciate those of you who stuck around. And if there are any --

Laura Magnuson (moderator): There's a question from Roger, I'll read it.

Rebecca Zumeta (presenter): Okay.

Laura Magnuson (moderator): Can you provide an example with a Mastery Measure for reading?

Rebecca Zumeta (presenter): Great question. So, a Mastery Measure for reading would be something that you may see in a very skill-based instructional program. So, again, often like those tier-two instructional programs that may be of use where you were teaching individual skills at a specific time. So, for example, in phonics for reading, the end of a specific set of lessons may have a short test that tests specifically on the skills that were just taught in the previous handful of lessons, for example, the teacher may have taught how to read certain vowel teams, and then the Mastery Measure tests the child's ability to read those vowel teams. That would be an example of Mastery Measure. That helps you know did this student learn what I just taught in those last lessons, which is great, it's good to know if they did learn that. But what it doesn't tell you is when a student sees those vowel teams in other contexts, can they apply what they learned from that lesson to those other contexts?

Other examples of Mastery Measures that are not uncommon to see in IEP goals that are written are things like a student will read a list of CVC words that start with hard C with 90 percent accuracy by the anniversary of the IEP. So, that's an example of a very discreet set of skills that may also not be particularly authentic. Because how often in your life would you have a list of three-letter words that all start with C that you need to read. And is your ability to read that list of words in that context going to generalize to other setting where you may have to read those words. So, that's the limitation of some of those kinds of assessments. It's not that they can't provide some useful information. It's that they don't give you good information about how well this skill is generalized and how well this student is at maintaining that information after it's no longer the focus of instruction.

All right. I think we've covered all of them. Again, thanks to all of you for sticking around. And with that, we will sign off for the day, and if there are any other questions I can answer, please feel free to e-mail me at the address on the screen. Thank you.

Laura Magnuson (moderator): And just a reminder to everyone, that everything will be archived on our website and to please take our survey. You can find it in the chat box, and we will also e-mail all participants reminders afterwards.

Our next webinar will be in April on progress monitoring in behavior led by Dr. Dan Maggin. So, please see our website for announcements about that. Thank you for joining the webinar, and have a great day.

Rebecca Zumeta (presenter): Thank you all.
[End of transcript]