

What Does it Really Take? Frequently Asked Questions About Implementing Intensive Intervention

Webinar Transcript

Amy Peterson: Alright. Good afternoon everyone. I am Amy Peterson here from the National Center on Intensive Interventions (NCII) and I am going to be introducing the webinar today and our panelists that are going to be answering some of the frequently asked questions that we have received over the years around implementing intensive interventions.

So this webinar is entitled “What Does it Really Take? Frequently Asked Questions About Implementing Intensive Intervention.” And we’re going to draw on some experience and some questions that we’ve received over the course of our training and technical assistance with folks.

[Slide 2 – Introductions]: As well as questions that were submitted for the webinar today. So I am excited to introduce our three panelists today. We are drawing from expertise of Chris Lemons, Chris Riley-Tillman and Teri Marx. All who have worked with the center for the past five years.

[Slide 3 – Webinar Format/Structure]: To really work with schools and districts. Can you go back a slide Nick?

[Slide 2 – Introductions]: Around intensive intervention implementation. So, Doctor Chris Lemons is a Senior Advisor for the Center. He is an Assistant Professor in the Department of Special Education at Vanderbilt University. Doctor Chris Riley-Tillman is a Trainer for the Center as well as having supported us in a range of different presentation supports around behavior especially on supporting behavioral interventions. He comes to us as a Professor for the University of Missouri in the College of Education.

And then, Teri Marx is a Researcher here at the American Institutes for Research. And she’s a Technical Assistance Liaison for Rhode Island. Which is one the states that we’ve been working with on the Center. All three of them have lots of experience as I’ve mentioned and you’ll notice that up here we have two Chris’ so, just for your information to distinguish between the two of them we’ll use their last names.

So, I’ll be calling out for Lemons or Riley-Tillman just to be aware of who’s talking when. So that you’ll get a little bit of a sense on that. So Nick, you can go to the next slide.

[Slide 3 – Webinar Format/Structure]: So as I mentioned. One of the things that we’re focused on today with the presentation is answering the questions that have come in from the field around this work. So, we’re really talking about implementing intensive interventions and talking about the questions that you have when you’re talking; when you think about that topic.

Throughout the presentation we'll have opportunities for additional questions that come in and we'll be addressing those as well. One of the things that we want to point out regarding questions is to make sure that we keep them broad so that they're responsive to a number of different folks. We don't want a question about a specific student that you're working with because it won't be something that everyone else can really see across the board. So, really think about kind of questions that will hit home across broader topics. And really focus again on intensive intervention or supporting those students that are struggling to respond academically or behaviorally.

[Slide 4 – Questions Box]: You'll see on your dashboard as a part of the webinar that there's a questions box or what we call a question pod. And Nick you can go to the next slide. And you can see a picture of that here. So go ahead throughout the webinar if you have any questions or challenges. Just type in those questions. If you have any technical issues you can also type those in as well. So, any technical issues please use that question pod in order to answer; in order to submit those.

But, we want to hear your questions and frequently asked questions throughout this webinar today. So if there's something that people haven't talked about yet that you really want to dig in on. Make sure that you put those in the question pod. Alright Nick, the next slide.

[Slide 5 - Frequently Asked Questions]: Okay, another one.

[Slide 6 – Intensive Intervention: FAQs]: So the slides today have been separated into chunks. The questions that we've received on the front end. So, we'll talk a little bit about the descriptions, practicality and scheduling. As well as aligning academic and behavioral interventions. And then some data used and student planning. Again, feel free to ask your questions about any topic at any point. But just so that you know, some of the questions that we've received already is how we're going to go through those.

[Slide 7 – Intensive Intervention: Description, Practicality and Scheduling]: The next slide. The one after that.

[Slide 8 – What is intensive intervention?]: So, just to start off we'll start talking a little bit; just to ground us. In thinking about what is intensive intervention and you know what really makes intensive intervention different. And so I'm going to turn it over to Teri to start us off.

Teri Marx: Okay, thanks everybody and thank you Amy for that great introduction. I know that Chris Lemons and Chris Riley-Tillman and I are very excited to be presenting about intensive intervention and answering some of your frequently asked questions today. So, I'm going to talk a little bit about the National Center on Intensive Intervention approach to intensive intervention or delivery for students with severe learning and behavioral difficulties.

So we use a model that's called data-based individualization which is shown in the graphic on this particular slide. This is also an interactive feature on our website. So if you are on our website intensive intervention dot org you can click on this graphic and it will take you to specific resources that follow the data-based individualization process. The process is driven by data and it is characterized by increased intensity. Either smaller group time or expanded smaller

groups or expanded time for students. As well as individualization of academic instruction and or behavioral supports.

So we think about adapting and modifying interventions for students that; that is done through a data-based process. So we start with a standardized kind of Tier Two secondary intervention platform that's implemented with fidelity. As we're progress monitoring we will determine whether or not the student is responsive to that program. And if they are not responsive we want to dig a little deeper through a diagnostic or functional assessment and find out exactly how to adapt that intervention. Either through a qualitative approach which might be explicit instruction or more systematic instruction. Or a more quantitative approach such as the ones that we talked about for smaller groups or expanded time.

As we make those adaptations to that Tier Two platform we want to continue to progress monitor and determine whether or not the student is responsive or not. And if they're not responsive then we need to dig deeper through it again and go through that diagnostic assessment step as well. I'm going to now turn it over to Chris Lemons to talk a little bit more about this process and how it relates to implementation in a school setting.

Chris Lemons: Okay, thanks Teri. So this is Chris Lemons here and I thank you all very much for being here today. And I do hope that people are thinking of questions along the way. I mean I do know that Riley-Tillman, Teri and I are really excited about getting some questions from you and hoping to make this a little more interactive. So to go further on from what Teri said.

So basically I think that schools who are considering implementing intensive intervention should consider that this is a process that does take a substantial amount of time. And that includes additional personnel and personnel with expertise. So, in a minute we're going to get to a question that asks how this fits into the Tier Two, the Tier Three special ed. process. And so, what I think schools that are planning on implementing intensive intervention should be considering is that this is a process that schools can only do with a limited number of students because of the amount of time, personnel and resources that it does take. And we'll get into that a little bit further on one of the next questions. So Riley-Tillman, you can add your piece here.

Chris Riley-Tillman: Yeah, the main thing that I want to focus on when we talk about the DBI process is that it is not specifically about disability categorization. Alright, it's about designing interventions to support students in need. And so we've had some questions across the years about "how does this fit in with identifying eligibility?" Or "how does this fit within whether a child needs intensive services but doesn't have a disability labeling yet?" And pragmatically from this sites; or this center's approach, we're not particularly worried about what a child is labeled as. But rather simply trying to find interventions that are going to meet the child's individual needs regardless of what the label was at the time. Teri

Amy Peterson: So, Nick if you want to flip over to the next slide?

[Slide 9 – Who Needs Intensive Intervention?]: So Lemons, Riley-Tillman and Teri. What are some of the other things that we think about when we think about intensive interventions, who do we think of? Who really needs intensive intervention? And so, Lemons just talked about the

fact that we can't do this with every student that's out there. So who do; how do we figure out who are the students that really need intensive intervention support? Teri

Teri Marx: Alright, so I'll go ahead and get started. So as you can see on the slide. This is kind of who we classified as in need of intensive intervention from the Center's approach and in our mindset. And so, we're thinking about students with disabilities who are not making adequate progress in their current instructional program. So, perhaps they have an IEP goal and they are not reaching that goal. We may want to consider using intensive interventions for those students.

For students who present with very low academic achievement and or high intensity or high frequency behavior problems. Sometimes students with disabilities but sometimes they may not be students with disabilities. We want to be looking at the achievement as well as the frequency and intensity of those behaviors. And if it's; again we're talking about severe and persistently then we would want to be providing intensive intervention for those students.

The third kind of category of students that we think about in need of intensive intervention from our Center's perspective are students in a tiered intervention system who have not responded to secondary intervention programs delivered with fidelity. So, that's another kind of key piece to this. It's that we're looking at intensive intervention through the data-based individualization process as it may align within an MTSS model or a tiered systems of support framework or a response to intervention framework. And we're going to talk a little bit more about that in a minute.

But, that's really who we're thinking about. But I know that others probably have more to chime in. So, Riley-Tillman I'm going to turn it over to you.

Chris Riley-Tillman: Yeah, what I would like to focus on for a second here is on the social behavior side of who needs intensive intervention. Obviously, one of the neat things about this Center and one of the neat things about this approach is that it doesn't separate out social behavior problems, behavior problems and academic problems. And one of the things that I think that anybody who has worked on this has experienced is that you'll find kids that are exhibiting really extreme social behavior issues and at the core if it they can't do the academic tasks that the need to master.

They can't do the core academic requirements and they're frustrated. And as a result, they're finding methods to essentially get out of a situation by acting very poorly. What we don't though want to get into on the behavior side is trying to do intensive intervention with lots and lots of kids in a school. If you have a class and there are seven or eight kids that are having really large scale behavior problems and there's an academic mismatch. Then the real focus would need to be on the academic side.

On the social behavior side, we're talking about kids that are essentially going to need intensive intervention probably throughout their schooling. It's not going to be something as simple as we're going to do an intervention and then two or three weeks later the problem is solved. Pragmatically, that's not an example of a kid who needs intensive intervention. And so, we want to make sure that schools are bringing this down to a small enough level and adequate enough

number of students that they can plan on doing two to three week transitions on with their interventions. Making sure that the interventions continue to be successful.

On the social behavior side, you find the perfect intervention and then wait three or four weeks and it's not going to be perfect anymore and then you'll have to shift and find another one. And so it's really important that we're talking about kids that essentially have to have this and not ones that can be handled by the easier to maintain interventions like check-in check-out or something like that. Lemons, do you have something to add to this one?

Chris Lemons: Sure, so I think one thing to consider is that the DBI process isn't necessarily part of a referral or identification process. So, what I would like for schools to think about here is when DBI is incorporated into the top tier of the RTI system it can be a part of the process that we refer students to for Special Education services as a student with LD. But, I think it's important to know that this process should be used for all students with disabilities. So, not necessarily as a part of the RTI referral process. So the thing to consider there is that we need to really ensure that students with disabilities in schools are receiving the most intensive services in the school.

So, I think many of you who are listening probably have the experience that if a student makes it through Tier Three as a non-responsive student and whenever they're labeled as a child with a disability they get placed in a less inclusion form of services. So I think that we need to make sure that students with disabilities are receiving intensive interventions. I think that schools can also provide these services to students in general ed. Tier Three when the school has sufficient resources and expertise to do that. And then in addition to that, I think that we need to make sure that students have gone through a high quality standardized Tier Two intervention before schools start individualizing services.

Again, this gets to the point that if schools are trying to individualize for all students in RTI Tiers Two and Three, it's likely more students than they can handle with high quality. And if we receive; if we reserve intensive intervention for a few students it is more likely that the school will be more successful with those students.

Amy Peterson: Great, so we can move onto the next slide.

[Slide 10 – How does intensive intervention fit into RTI/MTSS systems?]: And this is actually something that we were just talking about. And so I just wanted to open it up. If there was any additional comment or feedback between these next couple of points. But thinking about where intensive interventions sort of lies between the RTI and MTSS or PBIS framework. You're just talking about; all of you about where you might be thinking about intensive interventions in that framework. So, I'm not sure if there is anything additional that people want to jump in about or if we wanted to move on?

But, I wanted to open it up if that was something or if anyone had any points to add?

Chris Riley-Tillman: Let me say a couple of things here. I think when we're looking at essentially the two general approaches to intervention. We have standardized protocols that we roll out that we're going to do with a bunch of kids. And so, an example of those would be

something like PALS or Check-in Check-out. These are interventions that we know can be really effective and they can help a lot of different types of kids.

We will also have whole school interventions. I mean PBIS would be a great example of a whole school approach. Both of those methods are really built around the idea that we're going to run something that we know works for a lot of kids. And as a result, we're not necessarily that worried if five percent or ten percent of kids don't respond to that particular intervention. In a difficult school district it could be a lot higher than those percentages.

When we're talking about intensive interventions. And we're talking about Tier Three or whatever we want to label it in an individual school. We're getting to the stage in the process where an evidence-based intervention or an evidence-based approach isn't just finding an intervention that works in a book or works for some kinds in some research study in some place. But rather finding interventions and then customizing them to work for the specific child, the specific teacher, the specific setting that you're dealing with in the individual case.

Sometimes a child might be a little bit different and as a result you might have to customize the intervention. Sometimes, the teacher who is doing the intervention is different. And as a result they're going to want to see it a little bit different to make it work. What that means is essentially when we move into this stage, the outcome data screen is really going to determine whether you have an intensive intervention that works for the child. Not the historic evidence based or the journal publications or the sort of books or whatever sort of the issues that argue that this was an evidence-based intervention when we started with it.

So, the process really shifts at this stage away from trying to find the perfect intervention to trying interventions that make sense based on the function. Based on the academic problem that you see and then trying them out. To see if the academic data or the social behavior data pans out. We just; there are just way too many schools who spend a lot of time coming up with the perfect interventions. They do a lot of training on you know, Check-in Check-out. Or a lot of training the Good Behavior Game or whatever.

And then they try to use that intervention with every kid even when it doesn't make any sense even when the behavior isn't responding appropriately. And that's a very different approach to what we should be doing with intensive intervention. It's really customizing and really letting teachers build on things that are going to work. And then letting the outcome data determine whether they're evidence based for the specific child that we're working with.

Amy Peterson: Great, and some of the other questions that we have coming in is really thinking about the fit of students with disabilities within that framework. And kind of you know, should all students that have an IEP be a part of this intensive intervention program? Where; by kind of the givenness of needing to have that IEP? So in thinking kind of about that relationship with students with disabilities, can you guys speak a little bit to that? Those are kind of some of the questions from the field right now.

Chris Riley-Tillman: Sure, I see a couple of ones that are kind of interesting to me here. Really to me, the IEP here can be relevant or could be irrelevant. I mean I see kinds on IEPs that honestly can be serviced very, very well with a standard intervention protocol and can do very

well with those interventions. You wouldn't need intensive interventions for those kids. Particularly on the behavior side, I see lots of kids who don't have IEPs and have very intensive behavioral needs which aren't being serviced.

And those are the kids who certainly need; who certainly need intensive intervention and appropriate services. So I think it really depends on the specific child that you're looking at. How your district runs IEPs or uses IEPs could really change that. I think another question that is coming in that really interesting to me. It is talking about qualitative versus quantitative data.

When I'm talking about data, I'm talking about both. And particularly, we're talking about kids with intensive needs and particularly on the behavior side. We're going to want to see both quantitative differences, and time on task and reduced disruptive behavior, etcetera. But, we're also going to want to see qualitative differences in how the parents and the teachers and sometimes their peers are seeing the kids and working with the kids. And that if their perception is that the child is better behaved; if the perception is that the child is engaging with other kids more effectively. Then in many ways, that becomes the reality for those kids.

So, it's going to be really important with intensive interventions particularly on the behavior side. Chris can talk about the academic side. To make sure that we doing just get lost in you know changing percent of time on task or changing a best score or something like that, but really get into an understanding that are these people who are working with these kids feeling like there's successes being made on the back side of the interventions that we're trying.

Chris Lemons: Right and so, this is Chris Lemons. And so I think kind of on the academic side; the question of should all students with disabilities be receiving intensive intervention? And I think it's a really good one. I think a couple of points to go with what Riley-Tillman said. You know, there are some students with disabilities who do quite well either in inclusion with some support or, in some schools I've even seen kids with disabilities; including kids with intellectual disabilities be included in Tier Two services in the area of reading. And they do quite well with that.

I think the important idea here is that for all students with disabilities. Teachers need to be monitoring progress closely so that if a student is not making progress. They can ensure that services are intensified. And so I think that for many of our students with disabilities who are not making progress in those settings. Teachers do need to start that process like DBI to improve those interventions. That's all that I have to say on that one.

Teri Marx: And this is Teri. And I'll just add that we really feel as though students with disabilities should have access to Core instruction, a secondary intervention, supplemental instruction and small group instruction as necessary and as based on student needs and then intensifying from there. So we really don't want to exclude students with disabilities from tiered support delivery models within MTSS, PBIS, or RTI model. But really making sure that all students have access to the tiered support so that we can intensify based on a validated program.

Chris Lemons: Right, and I'll add one more comment. This is Lemons again. So, they; I know a lot of people are wondering about feasibility. And there is; there are a lot of questions about if I am a special ed. teacher and I have a lot of kids who are non-responsive. Do I jump in and do

this process with every single kid? And I think that there are two points on that that I would like to make.

So, one I do think for teachers in general getting started smaller is better. So choosing one or two students and really do this process well. Is more beneficial than trying to do it with all of your students at once and that would make this a more feasible process. The other point; I think that the notion to ensure that all of students have received some high quality standardized protocol or Tier Two type program is also important.

We have several schools here in Nashville that I have been working with. That we went in and provided services for the Tier Three elementary students in reading. And we started the process that was outlined on the earlier DBI slides. And what we saw in these elementary schools is that sixty to seventy-five percent of the students responding incredibly well and did not need any adaptations. So, that's an indication that they didn't receive a high quality standardized Tier Two. And so schools should make sure that those services are in place before they move to individualization.

Chris Riley-Tillman: And I have one thought. Kind of about the general feasibility questions. And we will address some of this. But, I guess I've been around in the field enough. I worked as a school psychologist in the nineteen nineties before going into Academia. And I've; I have been generally concerned about how we've shifted much of our special education and support and dollars away from intensive with the kids with the most significant problems into a pure whole school or Tier Two prevention approach.

And so, I've seen schools where the problem solving team which used to focus its time and energy on you know four or five or six percent of the kids. Moved into a problem solving team that was focused much more on a whole school initiative or what focused on a much more on Tier Two initiatives. And I do think that there is a bit of a catch twenty-two here. I think that there's only such much time to go around. And there's only so much attention that a school can provide.

And if it's using its finite resources on the idea that if we just do great whole school or if we just do great Tier Two then we won't have Tier Three problems. It's two thousand and sixteen and we've heard that for a long time. And the percentage of kids with intensive needs hasn't decreased. And so I think if you're in a school where most of your resources are being focused on class wide interventions or group interventions or whole school models.

The school really has to take a look at that and consider how much time and attention that they need to focus specifically on kids with intense needs. Frankly, much like we did in the eighties and nineties when there was more, fewer and clean focus on kids with intensive disabilities. That's not something that we're going to be able to fix over the phone. But, I think it is an issue which we need to talk about up front.

I sometimes joke that when I was a middle school; school psychologist. And we always heard in middle school that they were focusing all of the district intensity on early elementary. And that if just waited three or four years all of the reading and behavior problems would be gone in middle school. But some of my colleagues I sometimes still joke with them and ask them if all

of those reading and behavior problems are gone yet twenty years later. And we get a good laugh and anybody in middle school or high school knows how that can go.

And so, this stuff takes time. And school districts should be focusing a lot of their resources around kids with legitimate intensive needs.

Chris Lemons: Yeah and Riley-Tillman, I think I would just like to add one thing to that. I think in some schools; I've seen some schools indicate that they're not going to work on Tier Three if you know Tier Two is working in the perfect eighty, fifteen and five structure. And I do think that that is a mistake. But I do think that as schools are working to improve their RTI systems and their special ed. systems. They need to kind of be working on both ends of the triangle so to speak.

I think it would be a mistake for schools not to focus on the kids with the most severe needs and wait until everything is working with everyone else. I think that we need to make sure that those; particularly the students with IEPs are getting the high quality services that they need.

Chris Riley-Tillman: And I mean; what I'm going to say right now. And this is just me, it's not representative of the Center or anybody else. I really think that it's unethical, immoral and illegal to shift special ed funds just to Tier One and Tier Two. And saying out loud that we're going to wait two or three years before we're going to focus on kids with intensive needs. special ed dollars are supposed to go to the kids with the most intensive needs. And that's not a whole school Tier Two approach.

So, not only is it not working. But, at least personally would argue it's quite unethical and illegal to use the funds that way and ignore Tier Three or the kids with the most intensive needs.

Chris Lemons: I agree

Amy Peterson: Great so Nick can we flip over to the next slide?

[Slide 11 – What is the relationship between Tiers I, II, & III? When and how do students move between Tiers?]: Okay

Chris Lemons: And so; go ahead.

Amy Peterson: Go ahead.

Chris Lemons: I was just going to say that we've talked to you about most of the things that are on this slide. There are a couple of things that I would like to highlight. It's that one, I think the question here of when and how the students go between the tiers is really important. And I've worked as a senior advisor with many of the schools under NCII who are implementing intensive intervention. I think this is one of the areas that they struggled with the most. It was trying to figure out clear decision rules as to when to move students across the Tiers.

I think that there can be very strict decision rules based on a number of weeks non-responsive or not meeting an old guide and so I think that is really important. I think the challenge that most schools have is that whenever there are no clear decision rules in place that it just depends on the

team meeting on that day about which students to move from Tier Two to Tier Three. And unfortunately, I think that those systems are not very reliable.

With that being said, I do think that I've seen some clever uses of data by schools. They may not be as rigid as some of the structure that has been provided under the DBI framework. You know, a student who has a certain number of weeks. But, they pull in multiple sources of data. And so I think that those; there are multiple ways of doing it. But, I think that it's important that schools have established procedures of when students move across the Tiers.

In addition to that, I would really caution schools to break apart the meeting where you're talking about instruction provided to the students in Tier Three or special ed; the DBI meeting away from the whole grade level data meeting. And so, what I see is that in several schools that I go to. They have a data meeting for the whole grade where they show everyone's progress monitoring data. Where they do a good job of sorting the kids back and forth between Tier One, Tier Two to Tier Three.

But, it limits the amount of time that can be used to talk about those adaptations in instruction provided to the DBI kids. So, I really think teams need to really ensure that the conversation isn't just about sorting kids into piles based on progress monitoring scores, but it's about instruction being provided to those kids with the most severe needs.

Amy Peterson: Great and so we had some questions come in from the field as well. And I just wanted to spend a little bit of time. Nick you can flip to the next slide if you want.

[Slide 12 – Audience Questions]: To really dig into some of the questions that have come in; I think we've talked about some of them. But, one of the ones that has come in is around parent involvement and parent engagement in this process. They are kind of what would you think; what are some of the strategies or philosophies about kind of engaging parents in this process? And then where do they fit?

Teri Marx: So this is Teri.

Amy Peterson: Teri

Teri Marx: Yeah, I'll talk a little bit about the parent and family role within the DBI process. So, I think it's important for us to articulate to parents that they need to understand that intensive intervention is individualized and so is their involvement. We need to try and kind of help them understand how they can be involved within the process. For students with disabilities, we want to make sure that we're following obviously IDEA mandates for notification of parents as well as involvement of parents within IEP decision-making.

For some of our students requiring intensive intervention who may not have an IEP, I think we should still follow those guidelines as best practice. We want to be engaging parents through the process so that they understand their role. And one of the things that we can help parents understand is that they have a lot of information about their child that we rarely know. Some of the historical you know information. Medical information or contextual information about their child that they can share as a part of the process.

And I think that kind of as a student is moving into that need for intensive intervention. We should begin to have that conversation with parents and families to let them know that there is a concern and to let them know what we're going to do to try to intervene and help their child make that progress. So, it's very much about communication and making sure that we're opening up that line of communication with parents and families. That we're considering how we're scheduling these particular meetings and inviting the parent to share with us you know what is their preferred time, and their preferred means of participating in meetings.

Whether it's in person and if they're not able to participate in person are they able to participate through a phone conference or a virtual format. And then what is the level of involvement and engagement within the process? So making sure that we're clearly communicating those specific expectations that are often time common challenges and barriers up front and allowing the parents to understand the process is very helpful.

The other thing that may be helpful for many schools and districts is to also leverage the parent centers at the state level. You know you can just go ahead and do a Google search for the parent center in your state. And they often times have a lot of information that is parent friendly to talk about MTSS structures and progress monitoring. And while they may not be specific to intensive interventions they do provide a good framework or a good understanding of information that's in a parent friendly kind of manner.

So, I would kind of point to those specific things. And just say that parents and families are really key to the process. And we want to make sure that their involvement and engagement within in the process is positive. And that we're sharing and celebrating successes when; with regard to student progress.

Chris Riley-Tillman: Thanks Teri.

Amy Peterson: Great and just to add on to what Teri was saying, another resource for finding your local parent centers or state level parent center. It is parentcenterhub.org. And that's the center for parent information and resources website. And they have a map that includes all of the parent centers. So you can search and you can find your local parent center if you need to connect with them as well.

Chris Lemons: And I'll just say; this is Lemons. In Rhode Island, some of the schools have done a really nice job of involving parents using technology. So, if you think of all of the communication and social media apps that we have available to us know. For many of the students who were really disengaged with Reading instruction and who weren't really motivated. Connecting to the parents on a frequent basis, and sharing progress monitoring information and success stories through the day you know on social media.

It was a really nice way to both encourage and motivate the students. But, also to get the parents you know really directly connected. So, I think that's another possibility.

Amy Peterson: Thanks Chris. Another question that came in that I think is an interesting one. It is looking at the distinction between students that have low scores and students that are not making progress. And then whether or not there is a clear distinction? And how do we think about kind of those differences when we're talking about intensive intervention?

Chris Lemons: This is Lemons again. So, I think that that the idea; you know that the intensive intervention is for kids with both persistent. Which means kids who are not responsive. But also intensive or pervasively. And so if you have a student that comes in their scores are substantially below grade level. They; I think they can be fast tracked to receiving intensive services.

There are students that we are highly concerned about that you know are so far behind that without some intensive work they're not going to make much progress. Probably for many of the students, if I had some information on interventions that they'd received or have not received. Then I could help you plan. You may want to start those students off with a set number of weeks to see if they start making progress.

But for any student that comes in really low, you're going to make a progress monitoring plan. And if you; you know have the resources to provide them with some intensive intervention immediately and they are highly responsive. You may be able to back those services down a little bit. If you have fewer resources you can set up a monitoring program and get them in a standard protocol or Tier Two. And then whenever you have more data to determine if it's just being low or also not making progress then you can increase the services to the more intensive level of need.

Chris Riley-Tillman: Yeah, one thing that I would like to add and this is again, looking at the behavior side. Where we don't really have scores in the same manner. Something like office discipline, referrals or attendance or something like that. I mean sometimes we have the data. But, it's not as simple as having a low score unless we're talking about something like BASC.

What I would say is; is when we're looking at being very different from the typical kids in that environment. I think that's quite important from a diagnostic area. I think it's also important to some extent in terms of intervention goals. But I also don't think that with kids with intensive needs that we should always get trapped into long term outcome data that compares to some sort of norm group.

If you give a child with autism, they're very likely to; I mean the goal. To me it's typical for the goal to be for their best is going to be one hundred percent typical. If you have a child who is four or five years behind in reading it's quite unlikely that they're just going to catch up. And so, we want to make sure that when we're talking about the intervention documentation or to find out if an intervention is working or not. To make sure that we've got realistic short term and long term goals. So that we can see if the intervention is effective or not.

You don't want to be using goals that are so far off. And so; and in some instances so high in the sky. That essentially we're never going to know if an intervention is working or not because the goal is just too big for anything to ever truly tackle. So when in the intervention, I'm much more interested with the child's individual progress. Over low scores as compared to either some national norm or to a state norm or even to the peers in the classroom.

Amy Peterson: Thanks Chris. Alright Nick, I think we can move on to the next slide.

[Slide 13 – How do we get buy in from teachers, staff, district, administrators, etc.?]: And this question really looks at one of those kind of challenging implementation pieces. So, how do we get buy in from teachers, staff, districts, administrators and others to really support the

implementation of intensive intervention? And what are some things that we can think about as we think about getting; generating buy in this process? Teri do you want to go ahead and start us off?

Teri Marx: Yeah so, I'll go ahead and share a little bit. So, what you see on the slide in front of you is some of the kinds of lessons learned surrounding buy in that we have kind of come up with from our implementation sites across four states. And so some strategies that we've seen be successful to gain teacher buy in and staff buy in to the process. Is for our building leadership team to be involved and really help to set a vision and goal for the data-based individualization process.

And so if we are building this on to kind of existing supports for students. Whether it's problem solving teams that are already in existence or grade level team meetings. We want to make sure that we have a clear vision and goal for that process. And that we understand kind of who we're going to be working with. It's important to really reflect up the data and know exactly what students are requiring intensive intervention and making sure that we're providing that.

Administrators also promote staff buy in by making DBI relevant and shaping the culture and expectations surrounding that process. Again, using data to support our decision-making. And allowing our staff and our faculty at our schools to really be a part and involved in that decision making process. As far as another kind of method that we've seen be successful for buy in is really having the structures and resources allocated to support data-based individualization or that process.

So making sure that we have the necessary assessments, the necessary intervention, our professional development; whether that be training particular staff members in how to administer an assessment or an intervention. As well as time devoted to professional development and training and to deliver assessments and interventions as well. So, it goes to you know build buy in to you know the need to look at our school schedules. And I think one of the pieces that we'll see kind of be successful from kind of that teacher to teacher level. It is really to let the data do the talking. But, I'm going to turn it over to Riley-Tillman who is going to share a little bit more.

Chris Riley-Tillman: One of the other; when we first started looking at the DBI process within NCII. I honestly was a little bit skeptical in that we keep having new models or we keep having new approaches. And so, anybody who was around in the early nineties would have looked at the different consultation approaches. I mean there was the instructional consultation, behavioral consultation and time-join consultation.

And then you move forward and you start to develop RTI. And that's turning into MTSS and now there's PBS or PBIS and different versions of that. I think one of the things that I really like about the DBI process that the NCII promotes is that it's really that it is a core strategy that can be used at multiple levels. And they can be used flexibly with what districts already have.

And so what I would really like for people to think about is if you're an individual teacher and you're in a school that doesn't do much. One special education teacher can utilize this process with one student. Or if you have a team that's quite successful at some level. Let's say you've

got a really well developed team that focuses on academics really well. The DBI process does a great job at giving you information on how to focus on the behavior side concurrently because you really can't separate those two. You can't act like behavior and academics are separate things within children.

And so this approach to me can fit well within any individual school. Regardless of what type of model that they have adapted or adopted. You don't have to start from scratch. And if you're a single person and you're not in a school that doing a lot of this stuff you can certainly do it on your own with your own special ed. students within your own classroom with one or two targeted students. And so you know, with most things I think starting small and then not throwing out the stuff that you're doing great already are the keys.

I've just seen too many times where a school has had really great problem solving teams and then we threw it away and did whole school teams. Or you know they had a fantastic academic approach and threw it away and added in a standard protocol or something like that. And it frustrates the school, it frustrates the parents and the kids. And I think this approach is just much more flexible and would work at any level of need. And it would allow people to start where they're ready to start.

That's all I have to say about this one. Chris, did you have anything to add?

Chris Lemons: Yeah, this is Lemons. And so I perfectly agree with Riley-Tillman. And so I think what's really important is that if you're a special ed. teach and you're listening to this and you feel like you know, I don't really have a lot of buy in. I'm not really connected to the RTI system so I guess I should do this. I think that's the exact wrong approach.

The idea here is as a special ed teacher this is your opportunity to follow a process to improve outcomes for one or two of your students. And collect that data and show that you've implemented this process and that you were successful. And so, I think the idea here is that you can use your successes with one or two of your students to get broader buy in at your school. And so you know, if you find this process to work really well with a couple of students and you're highly successful then maybe you can start doing it with more students or you can get more support.

So I think; let's see. It was March and April of twenty fourteen and there was a special issue of teaching exceptional children. That's the March April twenty fourteen, volume forty-six number four special issue of teaching exceptional children. It has several examples of how an individual teacher might implement this in an area of either reading, math or behavior. And so I encourage you to get that resource.

If you are a special ed. teacher thinking how am I even going to get started with one or two students? I think that will give you a little more guidance.

Chris Riley-Tillman: And one more thought. When I was working; this is actually when I was back in Grad school. I was actually lucky enough to be in the Syracuse City School District. And Jim Wright had a model there called the SBIT Model. One of the things that they did incredibly well was to start with a small group of teachers who were really dedicated to building problem solving teams for kids with intensive problems.

And then as the team became fluent, they would rotate off people. Which doesn't seem to make a lot of sense right? Once they get good you get them off. But, they would rotate on high status teachers who they thought that they could convert. And essentially, they would use that team as a training site.

And it's really hard to not support this approach once you've got a team of people and you're actually working with that team to help kids. It was the only approach that I've ever seen; that kind of stepping through. That was able to honestly transition a district to doing consistent problem solving across a variety of schools. It's something which Jim Wright talks about in his intervention central site; it is his particular team approach.

But when Chris was talking about starting small and using successes. And taking you know one teacher or staff member who has high status. And really you know helping to champion that. It made me think. That's the approach to building and it has to start with somebody. Either a small group or one individual person.

Amy Peterson: Great, thanks so much. Let's flip on to the next section.

[Slide 14 – Intensive Intervention: Academic and Behavioral Integration]: And in this section, we're just going to start talking a little bit about some strategies for implementing intensive intervention or really adapting interventions. As well as that connection between academics and behavior. And Chris Riley-Tillman just mentioned that as well. That kind of interlinking piece of academics and behavior. And how hard it is or impossible it is really for these students to separate those two out.

So, Nick one more slide please?

[Slide 15 – Can I do academic and behavioral interventions at the same time?]: So when we're thinking about this. And I think that we've talked a little bit about this already. But, how can we do academic and behavioral interventions at the same time? What does that look like? And are we able to do that within this approach?

Teri Marx: Sure, so I'll go ahead and get started. And I think a lot of time schools struggle with this question. Because it's which came first the chicken or the egg? Or which came first the behavior or the academic deficit? So, it is really thinking about them in a concurrent manner and thinking about the integration of academics and behavior.

So if you look at the top of the graphic where you see the skill deficit. One of the things that we speak to in our training series is really looking for the instructional match. Is what we're doing in the academics at their level? Are they; is the student actually able to engage with that content and make progress in that content? Or is there an academic skill deficit that is then causing them to maybe engage in some escape and avoidance behaviors?

And if that's the case they may have removal from task which is going to then create additional skill deficits. And so, we want to be looking at instructional match as if fits in with this. And one of the other things that we'll talk about with regard to academic and behavioral interventions. Is since they often co-occur we are likely to provide interventions for both. So if a student does have an academic skill deficit, we may incorporate a self-management strategy.

Which you know can come from the behavior realm to help them think through you know steps to help them engage with that content or to kind of decrease the likelihood of that avoidance behavior.

Adding in some antecedent modifications. And there are some specific resources available on our website under the implementation tab that will help with that. But you know thinking about some of those behavioral strategies that we can incorporate into an academic data-based individualization plan. As a way to intensify individual supports for a child.

For students with a primary academic need, we may adapt that by adding in some visuals or graphics. And even teaching a child positive self-talk. Especially if they have learned helplessness sort of behaviors. And so, I think it's important to understand the integration between academics and behavior and recognize that they often do co-occur. And I think we're; I'm going to pass it over to Riley-Tillman who is going to add a little bit more to this discussion.

Chris Riley-Tillman: I think you might have answered that question a little bit too well. I don't have a tremendous amount to add here. What I would; I think I would like to just step back a bit. And this; the NCII has some really nice materials. And one of the attractive elements of the materials is that they are written so that the social behavior side and the academic side are using similar language.

And one of the things that I see in schools as more of a behavior specialist is that while a lot of people in the schools are comfortable working with kids with significant academic needs. They're not necessarily highly effective but they're comfortable. I mean, most math teachers are comfortable with teaching math and teaching reading. You find a lot of people that when you get a kid with behavior problems they really want to abolish the child. The really want to immediately go to that there's something really damaged about the child.

And so, I sit in a lot of problem solving team meetings with really great people and they do complex academic work and then all of a sudden we'll hit behavior. And it's almost like the kid is a daemon or possessed or it's got to be something biologically wrong with the child or something like that. And I think that by combining behavior and academics on the same team and constantly talking about the two interplaying with each other. And so, a kid who has attention difficulties is going to end up having reading difficulties.

And those reading difficulties are going to lead to frustration. Which you know are going to lead to more attention difficulties and they're going to go back and forth with each other. It's never going to be just one or the other. You start to normalize behavior problems and treat them much like we treat academic problems. It's not that the child is damaged in some way and as a result has to have some special therapy or medication or something. Which unfortunately, in almost all cases doesn't exist.

But they have a skill deficit in social behavior much like a kid has an academic skill deficit. Or, they have the social behavior and they know what to do but they're not fluent with it. It hasn't been automatized because they haven't practiced it much. And maybe that's because they don't practice it much at home or maybe it's because they don't practice it much at school. But the

way that we would work with that is just like we would work with kids that accuracy or fluency issues with academic problems.

We give them lots of practice with feedback. And lots of practice with feedback. When it's time to take those skills and generalize them out, we promote that generalization. Much like transfer reading fluency or reading comprehension. And so, I think that combining these two is the philosophical imperative. If you do not do that essentially the behavior side is always going to be seen as something not that we just don't focus on but as something that we're really uncomfortable with.

One of my colleagues, Erica Lembke at the University of Missouri. She and I; we've worked a lot together on behavior issues. And we sometime joke that I'll get sent into a school and they'll have major behavior problems. And after about five or six minutes I'm like wow, we need to get Erica in here because none of the kids can read the material. Or, she'll have a case where it's supposed to be an academic problem and then I'll get dragged in.

And you know it's; when you have both of those services available it's amazing how it can go back and forth and be a much more effective approach. So, Lemons do you have anything else that you want to add?

Chris Lemons: Before I add mine, Riley-Tillman could you just remind people of the article that you all have with Laura Kuchle? About is combining academic and behavior the next big idea?

Chris Riley-Tillman: Yeah, honestly you're going to have to give me a minute to get up and figure out where it is.

Chris Lemons: And maybe we could just put that in the chat box later. Because I think that's a really good article that kind of highlights the issue. That combining academics and behavior is really critical for you know many of the students who make it to Tier Two or Tier Three or who aren't in special ed. because of their co-occurring behavior and academic deficit issues. And I will also give a shout out to your colleague Erica Lembke. She has some really good advice in terms of schools that she has recently worked with.

She has recently worked with some schools that have considered breaking a part their DBI teams. To make sure; they were thinking a little about making it a little bit more efficient. We're going to problem solve on academic or behavior. But, just like Riley-Tillman said; for many of those students when you did a little deeper in either academics or behavior there are also challenges on the other side. And so, keeping those teams together I think is actually the more efficient process that will help better meet the needs of these students. Amy?

Amy Peterson: Great, let's move one to the next question then.

[Slide 16 - I have tried several behavioral interventions. Why do you think they haven't been successful?]: So, I think in this one we're really thinking about the problem where you've said I've tried several behavior interventions. Why do I think they haven't been successful? What do I do then? Where am I stuck? Riley-Tillman do you want to go ahead and tackle this one first?

Chris Riley-Tillman: Yeah I think this is really a function of the way that we think about evidenced based intervention. And some of the kind of unfortunate assumptions that we started to make out of this. And a lot of what I'm going to talk about next comes from both the National Center for Intensive Interventions and also the EBI Network. Which is this site that I run with Erica Lembke and a whole other host of colleagues. Many of whom are associated with the NCII. So, if you want more information on what I'm going to talk about next. That would be a great place to go.

But when we look at intervention across the Tiers as I alluded to before. In Tier One and Tier Two we are going out and we're selecting fantastic evidence-based interventions that map the population that we're looking at. And so, we'll do something like a PALS system or an example of Check-in Check-out or non-contingent reinforcement. Something good that can work with a lot of people. The idea with those at Tier One and Tier Two is that we have great curriculum school programs like PBIS. And if we've got great Tier Two strategies then we're going to decrease the number of kids that get to Tier Three. Where the traditional evidence-based protocols aren't working.

Once we get to Tier Three the way that we think about evidence-based interventions has to shift. And it has to shift away from if it's in a journal or if it's on the EBI Network or the NCII or What Works Clearinghouse or wherever you go to get your evidence based interventions. If it's in those sites, that doesn't mean that it's an evidence-based intervention for a specific child. And so, when somebody says that I have been doing a whole bunch of evidence-based interventions and their not working.

Sometimes that means what do I do next in terms of finding an intervention? And often and unfortunately it means that this kid is too difficult, we've got to do something more intensive. Like put him in some program. What we really should be saying is that we haven't found an evidence-based intervention for that child. And the first step to me would be asking the question of what the function is of the social behavior or the academic problem. Where; why does the behavior problem make sense?

So, if I use behavior as an example. Some of our most significant kids are externalizing children who are trying to escape from a particular situation. And if a kid is pushed far enough and has engrained the skill enough. They will do really, really exorbitant and extreme behaviors just to get out of; often times just academic tasks. And in those instances, we know what the function is. The function is that they do not want to do whatever the task demand was before the explosion.

And so the intervention for them is always going to be an antecedent modification. And it might need to be quite intense. We might need to be shifting it on a two by; on a two week, you know two by two type nature. But my point is that when we get to these kids with intensive needs, the question should never be that we can't find an intervention. It is that the previous intervention didn't work. So how are we going to utilize our framework to find something that works for the child?

Regardless if they're in special ed, regardless of wherever they are. At the end of the day we have to find something that works for those kids. So on the DBI network, I probably focus on;

or my colleagues and I primarily focus on a function based approach. And that's asking "what is the problem behavior?" And then how do we find evidence based interventions that tend; that are built for that.

So if we get a kid that has extreme attention seeking behavior then stuff like Check-In Check-Out or Non-Contingent Reinforcement can be great. If we get a kid that has escape behavior. Those two things aren't going to work and so we're going to have to use the antecedent modification. So when we get to the point of kids at this level, we've got to really carefully select for the function and then make sure that we can customize the intervention for the teacher or the child etcetera.

I would also like to point out; you know pragmatically when we talk about kids with intensive needs we should plan on essentially to do intervention management for most of these kids forever throughout most of their entire schooling. And so, if you give me a kid that's got major, major social behavior difficulties. I suspect that even in a setting that's really working. You're going to be altering an intervention every two to three weeks across their entire schooling. It's not just going to get fixed in many instances.

And so teams have to be prepped with that in mind. That this is going to be an ongoing process. We have to be scheduling meetings two weeks out constantly. We don't want to get into a model where we're going to burn a lot of energy in the first three weeks and fix this problem. And then three or four weeks later it's not fixed and we're out of energy. And so a lot of this is the focus and having the approach.

Well the model that NCII approaches this with and the model that the EBI network approaches this with are ones that I am very comfortable with. There are other models. I would just suggest that your school should have an approach and should keep that approach consistently. You can't just be picking interventions and not tracking them and think that eventually it's going to work. Even if the interventions have a substantial evidence base.

I could on and on about this one. But, I think that there are some other questions out there that might be useful to hit.

Amy Peterson: Thanks Chris. So one of the questions that has come into the chat box was around; and I think we might have touched on it a little bit. But I'm wondering if anybody wants to expand upon it? But, balancing skill instruction, remediating deficits versus in support of access to the general education curriculum. How do you kind of balance those two? Access to the general education curriculum but also filling in those skill deficits and remediating deficits in that sense?

Chris Lemons: So, this is Lemons. I think that there are a few important things to think about here. I mean I think in the age of common core you know we do have a lot of focus on having student with disabilities access the; you know general ed curriculum. And you know meet the high expectations of common core. But, I think it is important to remember just how big of a discrepancy many of our students have with common core expectations. And I think this gets back to Riley-Tillman's point earlier.

That for many of our students who are Tier Three students or some of our students with disabilities meeting grade level expectations isn't the appropriate goal for that student. It's making at least a year if not more progress within an academic year. And so, I think it's; this is one of the reasons I think the IEP Team is so important in this process. It is because the IEP Team is setting the goals for that student.

And the IEP Team with some information you know about the student's progress over the last year. The interventions that have been tried and then goals that the child, the family and the teachers are making for that student. They can really help decide what the focus should be. And I think the idea here is that for some students; you know if you have a fifth grade student who's reading at a kindergarten or first grade level. No amount of inclusion, UDL type support is going to address those basic skills.

And without those basic skills being addressed. There's no way that the student is going to access the common core curriculum. And so I think in some ways, we've gotten a little bit out of hand with what we think accommodations can do. And so, if the IEP Team you know really thinks about the student and what would be beneficial meaningful progress for that student. Often devoting a much larger focus on improving basic skills. Will benefit the student more than trying to support access to the general ed. curriculum.

Chris Riley-Tillman: Yeah, I want to follow up on this. Because, I think a lot of times the behavior folks really see the out. You know, the ramifications of this; this perception, the separation on every kid has got to be at grade level and every kid has to be on grade level. And you know, this starts very early and it ends up being really damaging for kids. It as if; as they fall behind and as that gap in some instances becomes bigger and bigger and bigger.

[Slide 17 – Audience Questions]: And there are going to be examples of where kids aren't going to catch up. But, by continuously presenting them with grade level material. What you are essentially doing is continuously punishing those children. You are providing them with academic task demands that they are going to have fifty percent or sixty percent or eighty percent success rates. But, that means that they're failing fifty percent of the time or twenty percent of the time in situations. And that's a recipe for the building of behaviors.

Eventually, a kid who is being asked to do academic task demands that they cannot do will start to misbehave in a manner to get removed from the classroom or removed from the environment. So that they don't have to be embarrassed in front of the peers. And we end up with kids; you know eventually what they end up doing is dropping out. You know that is the ultimate escape behavior. And so, I get really frustrated on the constant separation that everybody has got to be at grade level.

That's done a tremendous amount of damage to individual students who aren't ready for that material. It doesn't help them academically. It damages them literally in the long run and it's something that we need to get away from. We need to focus more on the individual student's current levels and current needs. And kids should be working within an accuracy band which is going to; which can allow for a consistent stream of reinforcement and not a consistent stream of punishment.

Frankly, if many of us failed consistently on a daily basis at ten percent of the time or fifty percent of the time with our given task we would all quit. Yet, we put kids through that situation constantly. And they are confused or get frustrated and in some instances throw a desk. Which honestly is a natural response to be given that amount of punishment to a child. Particularly in open social settings.

So, I think that this is a great question that one of the participants asked. And it's one that we really need to aggressively focus on.

Amy Peterson: Great, thank you both. So, as we switch into kind of the last sections of questions for today. One of the other questions that had come into the chat was around data and growth and thinking about growth. We also had some questions; and Nick, you can flip down a couple of slides.

[Slide 18 – Intensive Intervention: Data Use and Student Planning]: About how?

[Slide 19 – How much data do we need before adapting an intervention? How long should I do intensive intervention?]: Do we know how much data we need before adapting an intervention and how long do we do intensive intervention? And then what kind of growth patterns are we expecting to see within these data patterns when we're collecting progress monitoring data over a period of time for these students? Particularly for students that are pretty far behind. So I guess; I think Chris Riley-Tillman is up first on this one.

Chris Riley-Tillman: Yeah, this is behavioral outcome data or progress monitoring data is really my specialty area. And I think it's a great question. You know how much data do we need? And how long do we need it to do an intervention? And in this area it is a little bit different on the social behavior side than the academic side.

On the social behavior side; you know one question is how long do we need to do an intervention? If an intervention is not a; isn't working within a week or so. It's not going to work on the social behavior side. Unless it's a skills training program and then really that's an academic intervention focus rather than a social behavior. Kids don't age into a reinforcement intervention.

They don't age into; you know, if they're not responding to check-in check-out after three or four days and it's being done appropriately. Then it's just not reinforcing for them. And it's not going to work. So you know one question is how long does an intervention need to be run? On the academic side it's going to be longer because those are learned behaviors. And Chris Lemons can focus on that.

The second question is how much data do I need before adapting the intervention? And that's; that's honestly a really complicated question. And there are a couple of technical answers that I can give. But if anybody gives a simple answer to this, they're not; they're not being honest or they're really not being accurate. You essentially need enough data so that you're comfortable that you can make a statement about how the child's social behavior is during that period of time.

What you should be using is an evidence-based assessment where research has been done. To say how much data you need before you make a generalizable statement. What we use at the

NCII are things like systematic direct observation, direct behavior ratings where the research has been done. And for those sources of data you often need somewhere around seven to ten data points.

Now, with DBR or SDO data you can get multiple data points each day. So you could do one week of data collection and have seven to ten data points. But that is indeed a technical question within the actual progress monitoring data that tells you how many samples of the behavior that you need before you are able to make a generalizable statement about the outcome data.

The second thing that you need to look at is the way that the data is dancing. If the data is incredibly consistent and you are more comfortable after a limited amount of data that you've nailed it. And so if a kid is calling out between twenty to twenty-five times over three, four, five or six data points then you're comfortable. But, if it's vacillating from zero to forty then you're going to end up needing more and more data. So, really the variability of the data is going to help you understand can you make; you know a comfortable statement.

I think the NCII has some really nice resources on how you use data. This is one area that unfortunately many Technical Centers have not focused on as much. We've talked about evidence based intervention. We've talked somewhat about evidence-based assessment although not as much as I think some of the progress monitoring community would like.

But, we very rarely talk about evidence-based analysis. And that's what we're talking about here. How do you use the data to make a statement? And so, I like some of the stuff that the NCII has and I hope that we can continue to develop resources here. There are a number of books out there which get into some of these; some of these questions. I think the Gilford practitioners series has some nice books on it. Chris, what do you think about the behavior; the academic side?

Chris Lemons: So I think that in academics I mean that there are a variety of things to say here. So I think first of all in terms of thinking about what is an expected growth rate for students with disabilities or our most non; our least responsive students in Tier Three. I think that we need; you know additional research to really figure that out. Which doesn't really help practitioners very much at this point and time. And so, what I would say is that I think there are a few important things.

So, first of all there are many different ways to set goals using progress monitoring. So backing up that, to choose measures I recommend that people go to NCII's Tools Chart to see a variety of different progress monitoring tools that are available. And those are highlighted by grade level, subject level. And so, there are a bunch of important resources there. So, I think those are useful to look at.

But in terms of setting goals, I think that there are a variety of ways to do it. I'll talk about three of those briefly. I think it is less important about how you're setting goals and more important that you're actually setting goals. The schools that I've visited for NCII that have had the most success, one of the most common characteristics of those schools is that goals are set for students and data is graphed. And the team reflects on that data and uses it as a source to adapt instruction.

And so, there's a lot of research evidence that shows that teaching teams who set goals and graph them; their students have better academic outcomes than teachers who do not do that. It's the only variables that differ between the two. So, it's highly important that goals are set. NCII is going to be releasing on their website a really clever excel spreadsheet that Devin Kearns from the University of Connecticut helped create. And then people at NCII; Teri I think you were one of them kind of refine and polish it.

But, it basically allows teachers to enter data for students on progress monitoring measures. And then they see three different aim lines or goals pop up on the little graph. So basically you can either set the goal for the end of year benchmark. So often when I do research or interventions with kids with intellectual disability. If they are functioning below a certain grade level on a progress monitoring tool; I will select the relevant grade level end of year benchmark to monitor their progress on.

It's substantially below their grade level but, that much growth would be meaningful for that student. You can also set weekly progress. So, many of the progress monitoring tools like AIMSweb or DIBELS come with data that shows "what is the average growth rates that students have made per week." And so you can just say, I would be satisfied if my student made the average growth on this measure. And you can multiply that average weekly growth by the number of weeks left until you want them to attain your goal.

The other one that I think is really useful for students like the students that Riley-Tillman mentioned earlier. The students that are really below grade level and are really struggling with making progress is an intra-individual framework. So, the idea here is that whenever you graph the data; you use eight weeks of data to calculate a slope for the student. And then you multiply that slope by one point five. Which means basically what you're saying is my goal is to drastically increase the response that this student has.

And so, I think all three of those are good ways for research; for DBI teams to set goals for students. And then going to the last point. One of the things that Chris said was the notion of how long should an intervention occur before you start doing adaptations? Again, I think that we need additional research in this area. But I personally think that the framework set up in the DBI framework that the idea that we set a goal and then every four weeks that the student's data; data points are below the aim line is a time for making an adaptation.

I think that that is a really user friendly tool for teachers to use. And I've worked with teachers here in Nashville who have used that rigid process. And I think that there is some you know additional research that needs to be done to determine if those; that frequency of adaptation is the best. Or if there are other frameworks that may be better. But I think that for schools currently, it's a very simple way or set of rules to follow.

And that if you remember that making adaptations in DBI. It isn't about throwing everything out of the window and starting over. It's implementing one additional little component that might have an impact. And so, I think if teachers are doing that every four weeks. It's going to that the Team spend more time reflecting on instruction.

And so if you remember what I said earlier. The notion that; I think it's really important these Teams realize that progress monitoring is the tool to help them reflect on instruction. And that the conversation should be more about instruction.

Amy Peterson: Thank you so much Chris. One question that we did have that came in was about the research that was; that you were talking about and referencing when you were talking about teams that graph data getting better outcomes for students. Do you have any suggestions of places to point people about kind of the research behind those?

Chris Lemons: So, I can find the original articles. But, I know that Lynn Fuchs is the; an Author who has done a lot of that work. And

Chris Riley-Tillman: Nick Glass

Chris Lemons: Oh, go ahead.

Chris Riley-Tillman: Nick Glass in the nineteen eighty-six article was to me was one of the best. I mean, it shows that one of the largest single effect sizes; well I mean it started off a line of research that shows that the single largest effect sizes is simply graphing out kids, kids outcome data and then feeding it back to the teacher. And essential, all that does is essential help the teacher keep score. And if it's working then they can keep doing the same thing and if it's not then there is the likelihood that they change their approach.

And simply by changing the approach, you know you increase the chances that you're going to move to something that's more effective. It's a great line of research.

Amy Peterson: Thanks Chris. Alright, we are just about at the end of time. But, we did have one last question here. So I just wanted to flip; Nick to the next slide.

[Slide 20 – How detailed should student plans be (objectives, frequency, duration, roles)?]: And let Teri just talk briefly about thinking about student plans. And one of the things that we talk about a lot with intensive interventions is really about making that plan individualized to the student's needs. Talking about those student's individualized plans. How detailed should student plans be; what do we need to include in them? Or what are some suggestions of things that we need to include about objectives and frequency and duration and roles?

So, we probably won't be able to explore this in the level of depth that we were hoping for. But, just to let Teri briefly talk about this. And I know that we've had a log of great questions come in. And hopefully we've gotten to most of them today. But I know that we're running out of time.

And so, we could probably be here for ages answering questions on this topic. But, Teri why don't you take it away for this last question.

Teri Marx: Great, so one of the things that you'll see on the slide that's in front of you is the link to our website that has specific tools that you can use for your specific DBI meetings. So when we're talking about data based individualization and processes, as Amy mentioned they are very individualized. So, we have developed tools to support teams with through this process.

You'll see on the screen that there are meeting agendas both for an initial DBI meeting for a student as well as for a meeting when we're reviewing progress monitoring data.

And then, there are also forms that kind of walk through some of the specific characteristics of what we should be including into a student plan. One of the things that I will say is that these are not stand alone items. And you can definitely cross walk them with existing forms that you have. So for; when you get to the level of intensification for an individual student you want to be looking at do we have the specifications that are required when we're considering an intensive intervention for a student.

So, it's not that you have to use what's posted on our website. But you can definitely cross walk with your existing tools and see where you can embed some of the content that is suggested for intensive intervention planning for students. Similarly, kind of cross walking with IEP forms and making sure that you're also looking at some of the ways to consider adaptations for students with disabilities who may have an individualized education plan as well.

We've found that in our sites that the agendas for meetings are really helpful for folks. As they kind of outline the process so that were focused more on what's going to happen next. What adaptations do we need to make for an individual student rather than exacerbating and just talking about a problem for an individual child? So, if we can get fluency with our team meetings for an individual student. That allows us to be able to integrate into a plan the roles and responsibilities for folks as we're identifying what adaptations we might need to make to an intervention plan.

As well as some of the specific training needs for the professionals. So, we want to make sure that we're talking about you know; if we're going to make an adaptation. Does the Interventionists actually know how to integrate that adaptation to a standard intervention protocol? And I can't reiterate enough what both Lemons and Riley-Tillman we're talking about with graph data.

And one of the things that I'll also highlight within graph data is that as we're making adaptations, to a plan. It's really important for us to highlight that in our graph. So that we can see when we've made adaptation to really identify was that adaptation successful for the student to demonstrate that progress. The other piece that I'll mention within the student planning and really thinking about supports for students; is the tools that we have available for fidelity.

And so we want to make sure that we are monitoring for fidelity to the plan. And monitoring for fidelity to the intervention as well as the assessment measures that we're using. And so, as we're developing the intervention protocols and I'm going to have our folks chat this out to all of you. But there are specific resources on the website that you can go to.

To check on the fidelity of your intensive intervention plan as well to make sure that you're documenting what you need to be documenting to ensure that the fidelity is monitored within the plan as well. So, those are some of the resources that we have available. And as I mentioned, I think it's been really helpful for our team to have agendas for their meetings and to have specific guidance for what they should be including into intensive intervention plans.

But not reinventing the wheel. If you have forms that you're using within problem solving processes. Just do a cross walk and see if there are additional things that you might need to integrate for students when you move into that intensive intervention and data based individualization process.

Chris Lemons: Teri, I think that was a great summary.

Amy Peterson: Thank you

Chris Lemons: This is Lemons and I would just echo that in the Teaching Exceptional Children issue that I referenced earlier. There are examples of how individual teachers used forms and documented plans. I think the idea is that it is definitely important to do it. But you have to do it in a way that is sustainable for you a integrating it into your own systems like Teri just mentioned is a really great idea.

Amy Peterson: Thanks so much Chris. Well thank you everyone so much for being on this webinar today. I would also like to point out that on that same link for the data tools meeting page. There are some additional handouts and resources that appear under the table for different tools and they include things like tools around clarifying questions, creating hypothesis, intensification strategies and checklist.

So, I think we had some questions earlier on about what are some ways that you can intensify. And what some strategies to finding clues within that process? Something like that might be helpful to look at for you as well. There's a lot of resources and information on the website. We have shared a bunch of those today.

But we would love for you to peruse and explore that even further. But, we will post a version of this webinar on the website. So, if you want to reference back to any of the content that has been addressed in this webinar, it will be up under our webinar's page on the website. We also regularly communicate with folks. If you aren't on our newsletter e-mail list already; we also have a Twitter account and You Tube channel where you can; again, this Webinar will be posted.

So, we would love for you to stay connected with us and ask us additional questions. We would love to explore some challenges and questions from the field throughout this work. So we have an Ask the Experts series up on our website where we have addressed some of these questions already or similar questions. But we are always looking for more questions to ask the experts from the field. And so we would love to have some of those questions come through as well.

So, feel free to send them our way at any point. But again, thank you so much. Thank you to our panelists. We really appreciate all of the answers that you have shared with us throughout this Webinar. So have a wonderful afternoon everyone.