Purpose
This handbook is intended to be a district-wide framework or guide for the implementation of Multi-Tiered System of Supports. The resource is a ‘living document’ and will be revised and improved upon as we learn more as professionals.

This document was developed by collaborating with several stakeholders knowledge base during the spring of 2015. District leadership also provided feedback and input throughout the development of this handbook. The intent for the handbook will be revised when new knowledge is provided.

Resources
Amplify
Colorado Department of Education
Florida Center for Reading

Vision
Foundation 4 Success
Education 4 Life
Citizens 4 the Future

Mission
The Weld RE-4 School District mission is dedicated to empowering students to accomplish their aspirations in a safe environment through excellence in teaching and comprehensive learning opportunities.
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What is Multi-Tiered System of Supports (MTSS)?

Colorado Multi-Tiered System of Supports (CO-MTSS) is: ...a prevention-based framework of team-driven, data-based problem solving for improving the outcomes of every student through family, school, and community partnering and a layered continuum of evidence-based practices applied at the classroom, school, district, region, and state level.

The framework of MTSS is a “way of doing business” which utilizes high quality evidence-based instruction, intervention, and assessment practices to ensure that every student receives the appropriate level of support to be successful.

A Multi-Tiered System of Supports helps schools and districts to organize resources through alignment of academic standards and behavioral expectations, implemented with fidelity and sustained over time, in order to accelerate the performance of every student to achieve and/or exceed proficiency.
Essential Components of MTSS

The MTSS Essential Components are:
• Team-Driven Shared Leadership
• Data-Based Problem Solving and Decision Making
• Layered Continuum of Supports
• Evidence-Based Practices
• Family, School, and Community Partnering

Team-Driven Shared Leadership
Teaming structures and expectations distribute responsibility and shared decision-making across school, district, and community members (e.g. students, families, generalists, specialists, district administrators, etc.) to organize coordinated systems of training, coaching, resources, implementation, and evaluation for adult activities.

Data-Based Problem Solving and Decision Making
A consistent process is used by stakeholder teams and applied at multiple levels to analyze and evaluate relevant information to plan and implement strategies that support sustainable improved student and system outcomes.

Layered Continuum of Supports
Ensuring that every student receives equitable academic and behavioral support that is culturally responsive, matched to need, and developmentally appropriate, through layers that increase in intensity from universal (every student) to targeted (some students) to intensive (few students).

Evidence-Based Practices
Approaches to instruction, intervention, and assessment that have been proven effective through research indicating improved outcomes for students.

Reference: http://www.cde.state.co.us/mtss/mtssessentialcomponentsdefinitionsjune2016
Colorado Multi-Tiered System of Supports (CO-MTSS)
Response to Intervention (RtI)
and
Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports (PBIS)
Crosswalk

Purpose: The purpose of this document is to provide educators (e.g., leadership teams, administrators, teachers, implementation support personnel) with information regarding the evolution and interrelatedness of Response to Intervention (RtI), Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports (PBIS), and Colorado Multi-Tiered System of Supports (MTSS). The content here reflects current thinking, distinctions between PBIS and RtI, and clarity around alignment of how the frameworks function under the MTSS umbrella in Colorado. As mutually supportive frameworks within an MTSS, RtI and PBIS are essential. This document describes elements of RtI (e.g., legislative expectations and effective practices), and PBIS that are embedded within MTSS.

Format: This document has two sections. Section One provides information on the definitions, features, and components. Section Two provides information about the strategic concepts incorporated in the frameworks. Citations/publication dates are included to clarify adaptations that have been made over time.

Color Coding: The boxes highlighted in yellow represent the historical foundation of RtI and PBIS. The column highlighted in light blue demonstrates how CO-MTSS integrates and builds upon PBIS and RtI to establish a larger system of supports.
### Framework Descriptions

#### Colorado’s Response to Intervention (RtI)
- **Leadership**
- **Problem-Solving**
- **Curriculum & Instruction**
- **Assessment**
- **Positive School Climate**
- **Family & Community Partnering**

#### Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports (PBIS)
- **Administrative Leadership**
- **Team Implementation**
- **Define Concrete Expectations**
- **Teach Behavior Expectations**
- **Acknowledge and Reward Positive Behavior**
- **Monitor and Correct Behavior**
- **Use Data for Decision Making**
- **Family and Community Partnering**

#### Colorado’s Multi-Tiered System of Supports (CO-MTSS)
- **Team Driven Shared Leadership**
- **Data-based Problem Solving and Decision Making**
- **Family, School, and Community Partnering**
- **Layered Continuum of Supports**
- **Evidence-Based Practices**

### Section 1: Definitions, Features, Essential Components

#### A Definition Desciring Its Scope
- RTI is a framework that promotes a well-integrated system connecting general, compensatory, gifted, and special education in providing high quality, standards-based instruction and intervention that is matched to students’ academic, social-emotional, and behavioral needs.
- PBIS (sometimes referred to as: School-Wide Positive Behavior Supports or SWPBS) is a framework or approach for assisting school personnel in adopting and organizing evidence-based behavioral supports and interventions into an integrated continuum that enhances academic and social behavior outcomes for all students.
- MTSS is a prevention-based framework of team-driven, data-based problem solving for improving the outcomes of every student through family, school, and community partnering and a layered continuum of evidence-based practices applied at the classroom, school, district, region, and state level.

#### Key Features

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Colorado’s Six Components of RtI (2009):</th>
<th>CO-MTSS Component: Team-Based Shared Leadership</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Leadership</td>
<td>The Leadership component in the RtI framework refers to the activities of designated leaders, including:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Problem-Solving</td>
<td>- Creating a clear vision and commitment to the RtI process;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Curriculum &amp; Instruction</td>
<td>- Inspiring, facilitating, monitoring growth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Assessment</td>
<td>- Active administrative involvement is emphasized to ensure that the adoption and sustainability of PBIS practices are contextually relevant and applied efficiently:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Positive School Climate</td>
<td>- Team has established a clear mission/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Family &amp; Community Partnering</td>
<td>- Teaming structures and expectations distribute responsibility and shared decision-making across school, district, and community members (e.g., students, families, generalists, specialists, district administrators, etc.) to organize coordinated systems of training, coaching, resources,</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Colorado’s Eight Guiding Principles of PBIS (2002):</th>
<th>The Six Components of RtI and the eight Guiding Principles of PBIS informed the creation of the five Essential Components of CO-MTSS. Braiding the elements of RtI, PBIS, and Implementation Science helped ensure alignment of shared understanding and lessons learned from implementation efforts both locally and nationally.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Administrative Leadership</td>
<td>- Data-based Problem Solving and Decision Making</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Team Implementation</td>
<td>- Family, School, and Community Partnering</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Define Concrete Expectations</td>
<td>- Layered Continuum of Supports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Teach Behavior Expectations</td>
<td>- Evidence-Based Practices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Acknowledge and Reward Positive Behavior</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Monitor and Correct Behavior</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Use Data for Decision Making</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Family and Community Partnering</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Colorado Multi-Tiered System of Supports (CO-MTSS), Response to Intervention (RtI), and Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports (PBIS) Crosswalk

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CO-MTSS Component: Data-Based Problem Solving and Decision Making</th>
<th>Purpose</th>
<th>Implementation, and evaluation for adult activities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Focus on data collection and analysis is related to student achievement in response to standards-based instruction. Progress monitoring at the individual level is prioritized. Student data is used for Identification of Giftedness, Specific Learning Disability (SLD), Serious Emotional Disability (SED), and Significant Reading Deficiency (SRD).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Problem solving occurs across the tiers (i.e., universal, targeted, and intensive) to ensure students are responding to best first instruction.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interventions are provided based on individual needs regardless of the student’s designation.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Problem Solving Teams respond quickly with evidence-based strategies and interventions that will likely result in efficiency and effectiveness.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consistent process is used by stakeholder teams and applied at multiple levels to analyze and evaluate relevant information to plan and implement strategies that support sustainable improved student and system outcomes.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thoughtful collection and analysis of academic and behavioral data inform instruction, performance, interventions, fidelity, and efficiency of implementation, and the efficient use of resources.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Problem solving culture exists; inclusive and equitable access is embedded throughout the system.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Four-step process (Define, Analyze, Implement, and Evaluate) is applied formally and informally. This asset-based approach is used within all contexts, in all educational settings, and at all levels, including: individual, classroom, school, district, BOCES, and state.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CO-MTSS Component: A Layered Continuum of Supports</td>
<td>CO-MTSS Component: Evidence Based Practices</td>
<td>Co-MTSS Component: Family, School, and Community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tiered interventions are matched to student need. Responses to tiered interventions are used for decision-making, including intensifying or lessening of an intervention. Eligibility and determination decisions are not assumed as a result of receiving interventions. Students not responsive to a research-based intervention may trigger the suspicion of a disability and a referral for a special education evaluation.</td>
<td>Response to intervention utilizes evidence based instruction, interventions, and practices (e.g., differentiation, modified scheduling, targeted skill development) for improved student outcomes.</td>
<td>Family and community partnering is the collaboration of families, schools, and communities as equal partners in improving learner, classroom, school, and district</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A continuum of culturally responsive behavioral supports are emphasized across all tiers, using function-based thinking, in order to reduce the frequency, intensity, and duration of challenging behaviors. • Universal- Primary prevention occurs school-wide and in classroom, non-classroom, and individual systems. • Targeted- Supplemental interventions and supports are provided for some students to benefit from universal instruction. • Intensive- Specialized, individualized systems are provided for students with complex behavioral challenges.</td>
<td>PBIS consists of core elements that exist within a multi-tiered framework. These elements are implemented systemically and with fidelity. Approaches to instruction, intervention, and assessment that have been proven effective through research indicating improved outcomes for students. Evidence Based Practices (EBPs) are layered across a continuum of academic and behavioral domains. EBPs are reviewed and adopted based on the efficacy demonstrated through peer-reviewed research.</td>
<td>Families and communities are essential to the efficacy and success of the PBIS framework through all-staff valuing their involvement and desire to achieve and the collaboration of families, schools, and communities as active partners in improving learner, classroom, school, district, and state outcomes.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Colorado Multi-Tiered System of Supports (CO-MTSS), Response to Intervention (RtI), and Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports (PBIS) Crosswalk

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Partnering</th>
<th>Outcomes. In effective partnering, each stakeholder shares responsibility for learners' success by:</th>
<th>Sustain a positive school climate and culture. Families and communities are informed and actively invited to participate across all elements of PBIS implementation:</th>
<th>The six National Standards for Family-School Partnerships (PTA, 2008) frame the expectations for implementation of high-impact strategies.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• establishing and sustaining trusting relationships;</td>
<td>• Equitable representation on leadership teams to support the PBIS framework;</td>
<td>• Effective Multi-Tiered Partnering consists of comprehensive, strategic, and sustainable structures that benefit every stakeholder. Shared goals are embedded in continuous improvement efforts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• understanding and integrating family and school culture;</td>
<td>• Ongoing partnership with all-staff across all classroom and non-classroom settings; and</td>
<td>• FSCP is equitable and inclusive; ongoing relationships demonstrate value of cultural and linguistic diversity. Informed by the experiences and philosophies of stakeholders, partnering practices are genuine, meaningful, and relevant.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• maintaining reciprocal communication; and</td>
<td>• Clear and consistent communication of school-wide expectations, rules, acknowledgement system, and discipline processes; and</td>
<td>• Dual Capacity-Building (USDE, 2013) is prioritized; policies and adult learning opportunities enhance the capabilities, connections, cognition, and confidence of every stakeholder.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• engaging in collaborative problem-solving, coordinating learning at home, school and in the community; and</td>
<td>• Data-sharing occurs at specified intervals within the imperative of confidentiality.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### SECTION 2: STRATEGIC CONCEPTS

**A Focus on Prevention**

- **RtI** is a responsive and culturally sensitive approach designed to support effective instruction and interventions in order to reduce academic and behavioral challenges.
- Individual identification of students with exceptionalities is a priority.

- School-wide PBIS is a system's approach to establishing the social culture and behavioral supports needed for all children in a school to achieve both social and academic success. Through a school-wide approach, emphasis is placed on prevention. The sustained use of effective practices can prevent problem behaviors, and when problem behaviors occur, reduce the intensity, number, and complexity of incidents.

- A prevention-based framework, consisting of five essential components, supports improved learning outcomes for every student. Each system of supports establishes a learning culture and a positive climate. Prevention also occurs systematically across the tiers. Preventing the emergence and habitation of learning obstacles is paramount. Every stakeholder contributes to the creation and maintenance of an enabling context where learning occurs in each educational setting and at each layer of intensity within the continuum.

**Multi-Dimensional Application**

- Implementation is applied across general, compensatory, and special education program areas.

- Implementation efforts are intentionally focused on developing and sustaining effective and efficient multiple systems (district, school-wide, non-classroom).

- Implementation occurs across multiple levels and settings (e.g., state, BOCES, district, school, classroom, and individual student). Strategic selection methods, sequential progression of

---
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Prioritizing Student Outcomes</th>
<th>classroom, individual student, family and community to support the school community.</th>
<th>The effective implementation of PBIS depends on function-based thinking that allows schools to design both school-wide and individual systems which encourage and support adaptive behavior for all students.</th>
<th>Culturally relevant and equitable access to support is provided to every student to ensure positive academic and behavioral outcomes. A coherent system is developed across each setting to support every student's success.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Intended to be inclusive of a student's academic and behavioral needs. School personnel provide instruction within a nimble system to deliver fluid access to interventions that support individual student success.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Visible in Legislation

- CO statutes, rules, and guidance require Response to Intervention:
  - The Exceptional Children’s Education Act (ECEA) created provisions to identify and support the needs of gifted students and students with disabilities
  - HB 12-1238 READ Act (Reading to Ensure Academic Development Act) to support students identified as having a significant reading deficiency
  - SB 09-90 SACPIE (State Advisory Council for Parent Involvement in Education) to support best practices for family engagement and partnering for student success

- The Individual Students with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) Federal Rules and the Every Student Succeeds Education Act (ESSA) Insure the use of Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports to Improve outcomes for student.

- MTSS is identified throughout the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA, 2016). The Essential Components of MTSS make RtI, PBIS, and MTSS inextricably aligned within the same framework.

---

Reference: http://www.cde.state.co.us/mtss/mtss-rti-pbis-crosswalk
**Historical Perspective**

In 2004, the reauthorization of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA), introduced the Response to Intervention (RtI) model, in an attempt to better identify and serve the diverse educational needs of all students.

Built upon a broad research base, various RtI models with the following common features have been developed:

1. multiple tiers of intervention service delivery,
2. a problem-solving process, and
3. the use of data collection/assessment to inform decisions at each tier of service delivery (National Association of State Directors of Special Education, 2006).

IDEA 2004 also recognized positive behavior support as an evidence based practice and allowable use for funding to provide prevention and intervention for students with disabilities.

In addition, Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA, 2007) recommended the utilization of positive behavior interventions and supports to ensure safe learning environments in schools.

The implementation of RtI was initiated across the state of Colorado in 2006, when a change in legislation occurred in the Exceptional Children’s Education Act (ECEA), regarding eligibility for special education related to the identification of specific learning disabilities.

Previous to that, Colorado began district and school-level implementation of PBIS in 2002.

Over time, as districts and schools became more fluent with the implementation of both RtI and PBIS practices, the similarities of the two frameworks/systems became apparent.

Colorado has adopted the Multi-Tiered System of Supports (MTSS) conceptual framework as a representation of two sustainable systems change frameworks, Response to Intervention (RtI) and Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports (PBIS).

To better-articulate a focus on equitable and efficient learning environments and high-quality instructional practices, usage of the term MTSS has emerged.

Research and lessons learned from schools and districts contributed to the shift to a Multi-Tiered System of Supports as the best description of a continuum of effective academic and behavioral instruction and supports for every student.

This document addresses the transition from RtI and/or PBIS implementation to the development of the CO MTSS framework.
Special Education within MTSS

A Multi-Tiered System of Supports (MTSS) is a systemic, continuous improvement framework in which data-based problem-solving and decision making is practiced across all levels of the educational system for supporting students.

The Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA 2004), supports implementation of a Multi-Tiered System of Supports because it has proven to be effective in accelerating learning for all students, including students with disabilities.

When the MTSS framework is implemented with fidelity, students’ educational needs are more intentionally addressed by designing, developing, and delivering needed, appropriate supports.

How students with disabilities’ needs are addressed should be documented in an Individualized Education Program (IEP).

In Colorado, the Essential Components of an MTSS framework represent the integration of existing evidence-based educational reform initiatives, Response to Intervention (RtI) and Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports (PBIS).

This document explores the connection of special education to each of the MTSS Essential Components.

A Multi-Tiered System of Supports restructures the educational system by creating a culture in which there is a shared responsibility and collaboration between general education and special education for the purpose of ensuring that the educational needs of every student are met.

General and special educators work closely together within collaborative learning groups to create instructional plans that are rigorous and purposeful.

These educators collect and analyze data to plan, organize, and deliver supports that reflect the Colorado Academic Standards and students’ needs.

The special education eligibility and IEP development process becomes informed, valid, and instructionally driven when a team-based problem-solving approach is implemented.

Decisions about the supports and/or services a student needs are based on multiple sources of student-centered data and the student's response to evidence-based instruction and intervention.

This process of problem solving and using data should also be used to make ongoing instructional decisions for students who are continuing to receive special education services, by helping to guide measurable goal-setting and monitoring of progress at home and school.
The goal of problem solving is to intentionally design, develop, and deliver instruction and supports matched to student needs, which may or may not include accessing special education resources.

A well-designed MTSS framework has hierarchical tiers of instruction and supports available to every student within the school.

These tiers are layered so that the first layer of universal supports is supplemented with additional supports that increase in intensity as needed.

Movement within the tiered system of supports is fluid, not static, and is determined through the data-based decision making process.

Tiers represent instruction and supports, not categories or groups of students.

They are not pre-established based on specific programs or environments, disability categories, or related services.

As students respond positively to the instruction and supports, the intensity of the support will be gradually and carefully faded.

Every student has access to universal instruction and supports for both academics and behavior.

The federal law IDEA (2004) mandates that students with disabilities be educated in the Least Restrictive Environment (LRE), specifically that “to the maximum extent appropriate, children with disabilities . . . are educated with children who are not disabled.”

A Multi-Tiered System of Supports (MTSS) presumes the participation of every student, including those with disabilities, in the core curriculum, which includes small and large group instruction.

Effective interventions and supports at the universal tier can reduce the need for supports at subsequent tiers; however, students (including those who are eligible for special education services) may require supports at multiple levels.

Receiving intensive, individualized interventions and supports does not automatically mean that a student will be evaluated for special education eligibility.

Not all students who receive intensive supports are identified as students with disabilities, and not all students identified with a disability need intensive supports in all areas.

Additionally, students do not need to receive intervention in all tiers before consideration for special education services or supports.

The initiation of formal evaluation procedures for a student suspected of having a disability can and should occur at any time that the parent(s)/guardian(s) and/or educator(s) express their suspicion of a disability.
Evidence-based practices are the use of instruction, interventions, and strategies which have been proven effective through scientifically-based research and a comprehensive collection of studies.

These studies demonstrate a strong, positive cause-and-effect relationship between the intervention and improved outcomes for individuals when implemented with fidelity (Colorado MTSS Essential Components, January 2014).

Every student with identified needs at any tier should receive necessary supports through the utilization of evidence-based instruction which is planned and delivered using a viable curriculum that has been developed according to the state standards.

Instruction is differentiated so every student can access the core curriculum.

Sound assessment practices, including universal screenings and progress monitoring should be used throughout the year to make appropriate, informed instructional decisions for every student, including those with disabilities.

General educators share the responsibility for every student in their classrooms.

It is imperative that general and special educators, including related service providers, work collaboratively to align their efforts to accelerate the performance of every student to achieve and/or exceed proficiency.

Universal screening is characterized by the administration (usually three times a year) of quick, low-cost, and repeatable data collection of academic and behavioral skills of every student.

Progress monitoring is a systematic approach to gathering academic and behavioral information using a variety of data collection methods (Colorado MTSS Essential Components, January 2014).

Schools must have a comprehensive assessment system in place utilizing multiple assessment tools and strategies to produce meaningful student data that guides instructional decision making.

Every student’s progress, including those identified with an educational disability, is monitored to ensure that needed supports are provided.

The team makes adjustments and improvements to instruction/intervention when progress monitoring results indicate that the student, or group of students, is progressing beyond expectations, not progressing, or decreasing in rate of progress.

Adjustments and improvements in instruction, in addition to progress towards goals and objectives, are documented within the student’s learning plan.

For students with disabilities, that is the student’s IEP (per IDEA 2004 guidelines).
To develop true collaboration, parents and families must be fundamentally involved in the entire educational experience.

Schools should acknowledge that families are active partners with educators to support children’s learning.

Additionally, partnering with community supports contributes to students’ success and should be strategically tied to specific school and family needs.

Families of each student in the school, along with community resources, are seen as key partners in all aspects of MTSS, but their roles may shift at each level of support.

At the universal level, they can be involved in determining what constitutes high-quality instruction, collaborating on the development of instructional practices, and provide ideas for culturally responsive materials.

Also, families can reinforce classroom behavior and academic expectations, partnering with teachers at the universal level.

At more advanced levels of support, families are active participants in the evaluation of data and in the design, implementation, and monitoring of interventions.

Throughout the tiers, their expertise regarding the individual student is vital as they provide unique information and participate in home-school coordinated learning.

When there is suspicion that a student may have an educational disability, active partnership allows for seamless teaming during the eligibility and IEP process, with a continual emphasis on a continuum of learning supports focused on student success.

A Multi-Tiered System of Supports allows for flexibility, rather than determining a student’s need for supports based on specialized categories and/or funding streams that are pre-determined by federal and state laws.

Connecting MTSS with special education enables teams to blend the resources and expertise of both general and special education personnel to provide a unified system of supports that meets the needs of every student.

Applying MTSS logic to the educational disability identification process and IEP development reinforces the requirements for the use of ongoing progress monitoring, instructional responsiveness, and data-based decision-making towards the specific goal of improving outcomes for every student.

Reference: *Colorado Multi-Tiered System of Supports:* [www.cde.state.co.us/mtss](http://www.cde.state.co.us/mtss)
Why is MTSS so important?

By systematically evaluating and analyzing student progress through ongoing universal screening and progress monitoring, educators are able to more efficiently use their available resources and to improve student performance.

Information yielded by these data sets allows educators to problem-solve less severe educational challenges in the general education environment, and preserve additional resources for students who require more targeted and intensive instruction and intervention in order to achieve educational benchmarks.

This type of structured problems process meets the mandates of both ESEA (2002) and IDEA (2004). MTSS also supports the Colorado educational legislation priorities SB 10-191 (Educator Effectiveness), HB12-1238 (READ Act), SB08-212 (CAP4K), HB11-1254 (Bullying in Schools) and SB13-193 (Parent Engagement in Schools).
Leadership for MTSS

Shared leadership within MTSS exists at both the district and school level. For MTSS implementation to be successful, it is critical to establish leadership teams at each level of the system.

The function of these teams is to ensure effective implementation across all levels of the system, including district, school, classroom, and individual student.

Initially, the team creates a common vision and common language in order to clarify purpose and desired outcomes.

System support needs are determined through a data-based problem solving and decision making process utilizing school-level progress data.

Leadership teams engage in on-going review and evaluation of progress data to determine how to best allocate funding and available resources, including evidence-based professional development for educators.
Creating a Problem-Solving Culture

The success of an MTSS framework is dependent upon effective use of data and information to make decisions for student progress and success.

In order for districts and schools to embrace and function as a problem-solving culture, a shift in thinking must take place.

The shift is the recognition that student achievement comes from a collective responsibility of all stakeholders to ensure an appropriate fit of curriculum, instruction, and environment that enables student learning.

Effective leadership facilitates the building of systems and atmosphere to support and encourage educators to problem solve at all levels and more efficiently meet student needs.

A Shift in Thinking

What about the interaction of the curriculum, instruction, learners, and learning environment should be altered so that the student(s) will learn?

STOP!!!

This shift alters everything else!

Adapted from Tachau and Elliott materials (citing Ken Howell)
Effective implementation of an MTSS framework takes time.

In order to reach the stage of full implementation, leaders should expect the process to take 2-4 years.

The Office of Learning Supports at CDE provides support to district and school-level leadership teams demonstrating readiness for implementation of MTSS.

Readiness activities include:
1. Form a district-level leadership team.
2. Conduct a district systems needs assessment to answer the following critical questions:
   Where are we now?
   Where do we want to be?
   What are our strengths?
   Where are our gaps?
3. Determine readiness for change within the district or school.
4. Assess and determine the feasibility of establishing an MTSS organizational framework.
5. Identify priorities for change (no more than 3-4) and create an action plan.
### MTSS Systems Team Meeting Agenda

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Data-Based Problem Solving Meeting</th>
<th>Systems Level Development Meeting</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>REVIEW</strong></td>
<td><strong>REVIEW</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Ensure that essential roles are covered for meeting functioning</td>
<td>1. Ensure that essential roles are covered for meeting functioning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Review notes from previous meeting</td>
<td>2. Review notes from previous meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Evaluate system support/intervention plans from previous meetings</td>
<td>3. Follow up from previous meeting: progress toward objectives, discussion decisions, and actions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Review data summary from previous month and other relevant data discussions and decisions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>OBJECTIVES</strong></td>
<td><strong>OBJECTIVES</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Follow the 4-step problem solving process</td>
<td>1. Identify the problem and goal:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- What is the problem?</td>
<td>- Defining desired outcomes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Why is it occurring?</td>
<td>- Brainstorming resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- What are we going to do about it?</td>
<td>- Identifying potential barriers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Is it working?</td>
<td>- Brainstorming strategies to eliminate barriers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Utilize the Instructional Considerations as guiding questions if the team gets stuck in the process</td>
<td>- Developing action plans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Utilize monthly data summary and other data routinely collected to maintain focus on predictable system obstacles and other emerging needs</td>
<td>- Specifying follow-up plans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NEXT STEPS</strong></td>
<td><strong>NEXT STEPS</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Assign tasks to team members and determine how progress toward completion of tasks will be evaluated</td>
<td>1. Assign tasks to team members and determine how progress toward completion of tasks will be evaluated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Determine the details of the task, who is responsible, and timeline for completion</td>
<td>2. Determine the details of the task, who is responsible, and timeline for completion</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Layered Continuum of Supports

- Every student receives *Universal* supports
- Some students also receive *Targeted* supports
- Few students also receive *Intensive* supports
**What is the problem?**

**Step 1—Define the Problem**

**PURPOSE:** To define the problem as the measurable difference between the desired outcome and the actual behavior or performance.

**GUIDING QUESTIONS:**
- What is the desired outcome?
- What is the actual performance?
- What is the difference between the two?
- If there is more than one problem determine which is the highest priority.
- Is the problem school-wide, grade level, whole class, small group, or individual?

**OUTCOME CONSIDERATIONS**
Academics, Social Behavior, Adults and Students
Hexagon Tool

http://implementation.fpg.unc.edu/resources/hexagon-tool-exploring-context
**What are we going to do about it?**
Step 3—Plan Implementation

**PURPOSE:** To select and implement a system support or an intervention that is focused on what to teach, how best to teach it, and how to monitor progress.

*What is the simplest thing that can be done that has the greatest impact?*

**GUIDING COMPONENTS:**
- System supports or interventions must be based upon data and knowledge gained through the steps of problem definition and problem analysis.
- System supports or intervention plan development includes selection of an evidence-based practice, determination of who will be responsible, alignment of resources, how fidelity of implementation will be measured, how progress will be monitored, and specific decision points criteria met.
- Progress monitoring involves collecting, graphing and using data frequently.
- Progress monitoring requires plan development including **who**, **what**, **when**, and **how** frequently data are collected and reviewed.

---

**Layered Continuum of Supports**

- **Intensive**
- **Targeted**
- **Universal**

**Label supports...not students**

Adapted from OSEP TA Center on PBIS
Is it working?
Step 4—Evaluate Response to Intervention

PURPOSE: To determine the effectiveness of implemented system supports or interventions and make appropriate educational decisions.

GUIDING QUESTIONS:
- Was the system support or intervention successful?
- Does the plan require more time and monitoring or modification?
- Was the system support or intervention implemented with fidelity?
- Was the outcome met according to set criteria?
- Do we have the resources to sustain these supports?
- Do we need to go back to previous steps?
- Celebrate progress!

Responses to Data

Consider fidelity & outcomes together:

- Done without fidelity and no growth: restart/enter with implementation as it was planned; consider barriers to implementing [Ask: How can we reduce, eliminate, navigate barriers?]
- Done without fidelity and growth: change the plan/document to reflect “what is done and working” = assess variables; “what variations are occurring that are resulting in gains”
- Done with fidelity and no/low growth: re-enter problem solving &/or change intervention (consider changes in intensity level)
- Done with fidelity and growth: continue support and/or plan to “fade” or “graduate” (celebrate progress/exit)
Reflective Practice- How are we doing?

Practice Profiles for each MTSS component (6)

A Practice Profile is utilized to support the adoption and implementation of an innovation; in this case, the innovation referred to is the implementation of each of the essential components of MTSS. A Practice Profile is an instrument used to operationalize the features of a practice, program, and/or system.

Practice Profile (1): Team Driven Shared Leadership

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Leadership Team Composition</th>
<th>Ideal “Gold Standard”</th>
<th>Acceptable Variations</th>
<th>Unacceptable Variations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Leadership Team Purpose</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Leadership team is a cadre of committed people with decision-making authority; the team is formed to plan, coordinate, and implement activities to support MTSS sustainability. A formal and predictable process is used by this team including regular meeting times, defined roles and responsibilities, team norms, clear expectations, decision rules, and intentional measurement of their own teaming effectiveness and practices. Membership represents the diversity of all stakeholders inclusive of multiple settings (special education, general education, district/school, families, etc.). The team’s implementation plan is aligned with district/school policy, and a communication plan is used to disseminate information consistently to stakeholders. Knowledge and skills are defined for MTSS system-wide implementation: (A) practices and systems; (B) organizational change; (C) assessment-based action planning; (D) coordination and coaching/facilitation and training; and (E) regular program evaluation.

The purpose of this method is to build capacity in order to establish hospitable environments that effectively align systems, policies, and implementation infrastructure across all levels (state, district, school, community, classroom, students, families). A plan is established to develop and deliver adult learning experiences related to MTSS practices. A consistent process is used to determine which evidence-based practices will be trained and by whom. Leadership provides policy that prioritizes ongoing professional development and technical assistance, including coaching supports. A formal process exists for considering adoption or adaptation of new supports, systems, practices, or data collections.

A team exists, but roles, responsibilities, and vision are unclear. Team meetings vary on time and day but do occur with sufficient attendance and participation. Team membership does not represent all programs, populations and the diversity of the district/school community. Team is building understanding of MTSS and aligning to needs across the district/school. Leadership annually aligns unified improvement planning and key priorities within an MTSS framework. Funding sources and budget allocations are determined. Team effectiveness is measured by anecdotal data only.

Different Teams exist for each initiative with a communication plan established to ensure alignment of systems, policies, and infrastructure across all levels (state, district, school/community, classroom, students/families). Processes that are known by contributing team members exist for making decisions, but the processes vary and are developing consistency for improved efficiency and effectiveness.

Focus is only on infrastructure across one level of application, e.g., the district, schools, and/or classroom without regard for alignment to community and families. Professional development activities occur without a plan to ensure sustainability or implementation.

Teaming Structures

Intentionally-align teaming infrastructure to integrate a continuum of supports for MTSS implementation over time; build on existing strengths as well as anticipating and responding to the multiple challenges faced by the “scale-up” effort.

Provide opportunities to integrate academic, behavioral, and family, school, and community partnering domains.

Teams develop a evaluation process for assessing student academic and behavioral outcomes across tiers and settings.

Teams engage in thoughtful analysis of collected data to inform systemic adjustments, intervention practices, fidelity of implementation, and the efficient use of resources.

Ensures collaborative learning groups and working groups have reflective discussions to improve practices, instruction, task distribution, and collective responsibility.

A well-articulated communication plan is embedded in all stages of implementation, balancing method of delivery with message content.

There is alignment of cascading teams across all settings.

Databases exist to gather information on student outcomes but not fidelity of implementation.

Separate Tier 1 teams exist for intentional academic and behavior alignment, and a formal communication plan for such efforts exists.

Analysis of some data sets occurs without full integration considerations of outcomes, practices, fidelity, and resource allocation.

Vertical alignment between District and School Teams is not considered. No consideration is made for the necessity of changing communication modes and frequency to obtain different outcomes.

Efficient use of resources is not considered. Responsiveness to data is not evident. Summative data alone is utilized; no narrative data is used.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ideal “Gold Standard”</th>
<th>Acceptable Variation</th>
<th>Unacceptable Variation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Team Members</strong></td>
<td>The team consists of representatives from multiple settings including school, home, and the community. Staff member representation includes (but is not limited to) administration, teachers, and specialists in the area of academics and behavior.</td>
<td>Representatives include school and home only without representation from the community.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Teaming Practices</strong></td>
<td>A formal and predictable process is used by a group of people to build and implement solutions; the process includes defined roles and responsibilities, team norms, clear expectations, decision rules, and intentional measurement of their own teaming effectiveness and practices.</td>
<td>A formal process is used by a group of people to build and implement solutions. Expectations for meeting team norms are inconsistently applied or are unclear. Teaming effectiveness is measured by anecdotal data only.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Problem Solving Steps</strong></td>
<td>The problem solving process includes the following steps: problem identification (defining with a precise problem statement), problem analysis (clarifying root cause), plan implementation (composing and delivering a well-articulated plan that is matched to need), and plan evaluation (using fidelity and outcome data to determine decisions about supports and interventions).</td>
<td>All stakeholders are developing proficiency and fluency in the problem solving process. A problem solving culture is desired and is a known aspiration for members of the system.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Problem Solving Applications</strong></td>
<td>Decision-making begins with known information about alterable variables to inform the process. The process is applied uniformly to academic and behavioral domains. A systematic application of these steps occurs at all levels of the MTSS framework (Tier I, II, and III). The process persists and is used to support decisions for every student.</td>
<td>The problem solving process exists, but application is limited and not yet developed across the continuum of supports (MTSS Framework). The process is used for academics and behavior; consistency in applications is pursued.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Data Use</strong></td>
<td>Data collection is deliberate and ongoing with frequency matched to intensity. Progress monitoring and outcome data are linked. Thoughtful analysis of collected data informs the quality of instruction, student performance, intervention practices, fidelity of implementation, and the efficient use of resources.</td>
<td>Progress monitoring and outcome data is isolated to individual student data and not yet applied to system level implementation decisions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Data Use</strong></td>
<td>Frequency of data collection, review, and analysis does not match intensity of intervention. Data is not aligned with individual, group, or system-wide intervention plans. Items within measures are not discrete enough to inform decision making. Data are collected, but not analyzed. Decisions are made without use of sensitive measures that reveal change over time.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Practice Profile (3): Layered Continuum of Supports

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ideal “Gold Standard”</th>
<th>Acceptable Variation</th>
<th>Unacceptable Variation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hierarchy: Hierarchical tiers of instruction and supports are accessible for every student within the school and facilitate improvement and growth from any initial student performance level (i.e., struggling or excelling).</td>
<td>Advanced (Targeted and Intensive) tiers are implemented synonymously without clear definition between them.</td>
<td>Selected students or student groups are the only ones with access to additional supports. Performance levels are not known. Tiers do not exist; all supports are treated the same.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tier 1: High-quality prevention-based Universal (Tier 1) supports (e.g., school-wide expectations and standards-aligned academic instruction) are accessible to every student, are effective, and meet the needs of most students.</td>
<td>School-wide expectations are taught. Standards-aligned instruction is the basis for classroom practices.</td>
<td>Selected students or student groups do not have access to Tier 1. Most students’ needs are not met in Tier 1. Evaluation of systems is not conducted to measure effectiveness.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tier 2: Intentional, effective Targeted (Tier 2) interventions and supports are available and accessed when data indicates supplement to Universal (Tier 1) is needed, as an additional layer. Tier 2 is not a replacement or duplication of Tier 1; Tier 2 reduces the need for Intensive supports. Monitoring of fidelity occurs and is evaluated.</td>
<td>Targeted supports are building on Universal instruction; effectiveness measures are in place.</td>
<td>Targeted supports are used to supplant not supplement Universal supports. Tier 2 is a pathway to Tier 3, perpetuating &amp;/or extending challenge, not mitigating barriers to success or progress.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tier 3: Intentional, effective Intensive (Tier 3) interventions and supports are available and accessed when data indicates individualized or small group instruction is needed as a supplemental added layer beyond Universal and Targeted supports. Monitoring of fidelity occurs and is evaluated.</td>
<td>Intensive supports are responsive and data-based; effectiveness measures are in place.</td>
<td>Intensive supports are in place as a response to failure. Tier 2 interventions and supports are not provided prior to Tier 3. Tier 3 is definitive replacement curriculum and a final destination.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intensity: Layered supports (tiers) increase in intensity, matching layer (tier) to need, as identified through a well-articulated and commonly-known Data-Based Problem Solving and Decision Making Process.</td>
<td>Data-Based Problem Solving and Decision Making processes are in refinement to ensure accurate alignment between need and support.</td>
<td>Decision-making is not articulated according to a Data-Based Problem Solving and Decision Making Process. Needs are not known. Supports do not intensify according to tiers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transition: Layers of support (tiers) are fluid and flexible throughout the Continuum, with defined decision rules for exit and entry criteria established for additional supports.</td>
<td>Advanced tiers are temporal; well-articulated decision rules are known by certain stakeholders.</td>
<td>Tiers have firm dividing lines. Accessing advanced tiered supports is punitive and reactive. No decision rules exist. Receiving Targeted or Intensive supports is a permanent condition. Students are labeled, not supported.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stakeholders: Effective multi-tiered supports are applied and monitored across the Continuum for every stakeholder (i.e., students, staff, families) with ongoing communication.</td>
<td>Multi-tiered supports exist for stakeholders across the Continuum but are not formalized according to MTSS logic.</td>
<td>Supports for families only exist at the Universal layer (Tier 1), with one-way directional communication from school to home. MTSS logic is not applied to supports for stakeholders.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domains: Needs are identified and supports are available across the Continuum for academic and behavioral domains, with recognition of the impact between domains.</td>
<td>Needs are identified and supports are available for academic and behavioral domains.</td>
<td>A Continuum of supports is only in place for academics or behavior. Academic interventions are treated as 1:1 solutions and behavior supports are only referenced school-wide.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Practice Profile (4): Evidence-Based Practices

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Selection</th>
<th>Ideal “Gold Standard”</th>
<th>Acceptable Variation</th>
<th>Unacceptable Variation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Selection</td>
<td>Selection of practices is intentional, prevention-based, and matched to need across the Layered Continuum and applied at various levels (e.g., system, classroom, student). When selecting practices, all of the following are formally considered to determine if applicable for the context: need, fit, resources, evidence, readiness, and capacity.</td>
<td>Selection of practices is intentional, and needs assessment data is used; prevention is considered. Application across levels and Tiers is in development. When selecting practices, the following are considered generally without formal documentation: need, fit, resources, evidence, readiness, and capacity.</td>
<td>Selection of practices is misaligned to a prevention focus; selection of practices is only needs-dependent for individual student applications. When selecting practices, considerations are imbalanced, inconsistent, and characterized by variable traits.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Identification of critical features | For each effective practice adopted, every stakeholder involved knows: core features, who participates, how delivery occurs, expected outcomes, supporting research, and fidelity and impact measures. | For adopted practices, a small number of stakeholders know: core features, who participates, how delivery occurs, expected outcomes, supporting research, and fidelity and impact measures. | Practices are adopted without communication or clarity about core features and expected outcomes. |

| Outcomes-based | Results of the instructional, intervention, and assessment practices are measurable and show a direct relationship to improved student outcomes in the identified area of need. | Results of instructional, intervention, and assessment practices are measurable and may indicate a relationship to improved student outcomes. | Measurable results are acquired, but links to outcomes are unclear or not evident. |

| Evidence-based | Practices are evidence-based for all instruction, intervention, and assessment across academic and behavioral domains. Generalizable, peer-reviewed research supports the effectiveness of the practices adopted. | Practices are evidence-based for instruction, intervention, and assessment in select identified areas of the Continuum for academic or behavioral supports. Research, in a broad sense, is used, understood, and documented for the adopted promising or research-supported practices. | Practices are evidence-based for only academic or behavioral supports throughout the Continuum. Evidence and research are weak or unclear for support of practices adopted. |

| Instructional Practices | Instructional practices are: Standards-aligned, culturally-relevant, developmentally-appropriate, and ensure engagement, inclusion, and differentiation strategies are embedded in academic and behavioral learning experiences. | Instructional practices are: Standards-aligned, culturally-relevant, developmentally-appropriate. Instructional plans attempt to strategize to support academics and behavior. | Instructional practices reference the Colorado Academic Standards or school-wide expectations but are not intentional in planning for the learning of every student. |

<p>| Intervention Practices | Intervention practices are: Responsive, goal-oriented, skill-focused, temporal, scaffolded, and monitored; academic and behavioral interventions are equitably accessible throughout the system. | Intervention practices are: Goal-oriented, skill-focused, and monitored; interventions for academics and behavior have some flexibility for adjustment. | Intervention practices have undefined or unclear goals, with little reference to skill development; it is a placement not a support. |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Practice Profile (5): Family, School, and Community Partnering</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ideal “Gold Standard”</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Welcoming All Families</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Communicating Effectively</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Supporting Student Success</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Speaking Up for Every Child</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sharing Power</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Collaborating with Community</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dual Capacity - Building</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
DATA CONVERSATIONS with Benchmark and Progress Monitoring

Why do we Benchmark?
*Adapted from Amplify and other resources*

Benchmark assessments are short tests administered throughout the school year that give teachers immediate feedback on how students are meeting academic standards. Standardized administration and scoring help maintain validity, reliability, and fairness. Regular use of benchmark assessments is seen by many as a tool to measure student growth and design curriculum to meet individual learning needs.


Typically, on the school-wide level, benchmark testing couples student performance with extensive reporting systems in order to break down test results by the same student categories required under the federal No Child Left Behind Act (i.e. race, income, disability, and English proficiency) in addition to providing individual progress reports at the district, school, classroom, and student levels.


After Benchmark:
In data teams-

1. Review data. Begin with the 4 steps to data analysis and dialogue (Predict, Explore, Explain, Take Action)

   What are our instructional strengths (for instance 80% of students in grade or class are at or near proficiency...for example at least 40th percentile on Aimsweb) and weaknesses (a weakness may be defined by performance consistently below the 25th percentile READ ACT LIKELY...significant weakness should be considered consistent low performance below the 12th percentile)?

2. Look for trends/observations.

   Conversely if student performance is trending flat or downward, efforts to stop this effect must be be identified and implemented immediately. This in effect becomes the monitoring process for the intervention(s) and processes themself.

3. Look at current plan/resources.

   Where should instructional resources be focused? Create a “system” of focused interventions directed at the specific components of reading (phonological awareness, phonics, decoding, fluency, vocabulary, comprehension) or the 3 specific components of math (number sense, fluency, problem solving) using human resources in the most effective and efficient manner. This should include reduction in redundancy of effort. Instructional resources should be examined in the following hierarchy: tier 1-what’s happening in the general classroom and what differences in instruction can/should occur, tier 2-inside and/or outside direct instruction focused on formally or informally diagnostically identified need “goodness of fit” from instruction to need, tier 3-further focused small group direct instruction designed to “catch up” skills. ALL INTERVENTION SHOULD REFLECT THE FOLLOWING PARADIGM. “An intervention is targeted, prescriptive instruction aimed to remediate a specific skill.” 2014-2015 Colorado Department of Education Accommodations Manual.

ALL INTERVENTIONS MUST BE RESEARCH BASED, IMPLEMENTED WITH FIDELITY AND/OR APPROVED BY THE CDE FOR READ ACT COMPLIANCE. SEE APPROVED LIST HERE: http://www.cde.state.co.us/coloradoliteracy/approvedinterventionsprograms
4. Additional information. Establish standard protocols for student data evaluation, plan, action, follow up, then do it all again. Recommended district standard protocols.

After each benchmark:
- Student > 25th percentile = Monitor progress and classroom performance at least monthly to assure stability
- Student < 25th percentile for 6 or more weeks after initial benchmark student should have PLP created and monitored
- Student < 25th percentile = Team should attempt to determine cause (inability vs misunderstanding). Begin tier one interventions within General Education immediately begin tracking student regularly with at least bi weekly progress monitoring targeted toward lowest measured skill.
- Student < 12th percentile = Team should conduct further diagnostic evaluation to determine specific skill deficit and begin IMMEDIATE targeted intervention with at least bi-weekly progress monitoring in targeted skill development component i.e. fluency.
- Team should review all student data for EVERY CHILD, adjust plans and interventions accordingly.

Individual teachers-
Review data.

What are my student's strengths and weaknesses related to the acquisition of Colorado Content Standards?

2. Look for trends/observations. (Answering for each, how do I know? what data tells me this)
   How have my students progressed in different areas over time?
   How many students are currently at benchmark, strategic, and intensive?
   On what specific skills or standard does the student need support?
   How can the teacher use the response patterns to inform instruction for the student?

3. Look at current plan/resources.
   What are my next steps for my whole class?
   What do I need to re-teach based on the overall lowest skill/standard?
   What are my next steps for individuals in my class?
   What goal will each student be working on?
   What kind of differentiation instruction do I need to provide in my classroom?
     Small group, mini-lessons, 1-1 with classroom teacher, aide, parent volunteer.
   How will I monitor progress?
   When will I meet as a team to follow up?

4. Additional information.
   What additional information will need to be attained to assure the lowest skill is being closed first?
Why do we Progress Monitor?
Researchers have demonstrated that when teachers use student progress monitoring, students learn more, teacher decision making improves, and students become more aware of their own performance. A significant body of research conducted over the past 30 years has shown this method to be a reliable and valid predictor of subsequent performance on a variety of outcome measures, and thus useful for a wide range of instructional decisions (Deno, 2003; Fuchs, Deno, & Mirkin, 1984; Good & Jefferson, 1998).

Although student progress monitoring (then called curriculum-based measurement) was initially developed to assess the growth in basic skills of special education students, specific research has validated the predictive use of this method in early literacy programs (Good, Simmons, & Kameenui, 2001) and in the identification of general education students at risk for academic failure (Deno, 2003). In addition, some evidence shows the reliability and validity of student progress monitoring procedures in evaluating the progress of English language learners (Baker & Good, 1995).

http://www.ascd.org/publications/educational-leadership/feb05/vol62/num05/How-Student-Progress-Monitoring-Improves-Instruction.aspx

Progress Monitor Case Example for the Classroom:

Student progress monitoring fits well into the routine of the classroom. The probes can be administered quickly, and the results are immediately understandable and easy to communicate. In some classrooms, students graph their own progress and find it motivating to “make the line go up.” The following example shows how a 3rd grade teacher might use student progress monitoring.

During the first week of school, Ms. Cole includes as part of her initial probe of all students in her class an oral passage-reading test. She selects several 3rd grade-level reading passages and has each student read aloud for one minute while she notes any errors. She uses this assessment to identify any students at risk of scoring below grade level in oral reading fluency on the state end-of-year reading test. In reviewing the scores, Ms. Cole sees that six students have low scores, placing them at risk.

Ms. Cole determines each of these student’s current reading rate (correct words per minute) as well as the level that student must attain by the end of the year to demonstrate grade-level reading fluency, and graphs a line indicating the necessary rate of growth. Using different but equivalent-level passages, Ms. Cole then administers a one-minute probe to each student each week, graphs the number of correct words the student reads per minute, and compares that score with the goal line.

After six weeks, Ms. Cole sees that the rate of growth for two students is relatively flat, indicating that the reading instruction she is providing for them is not effectively moving them towards their end-of-year goal. Ms. Cole decides to provide 15 minutes of additional reading instruction focusing on particular reading skills to these students each day, and to monitor their progress twice weekly.

After three more weeks, Ms. Cole sees that the growth rate of one student has improved significantly. She discontinues the extra reading instruction but continues to monitor the progress of that student weekly. The second student still shows relatively flat progress, so Ms. Cole refers the student to the school reading specialist, who provides remedial services and continues to monitor the student’s progress twice weekly.

http://www.ascd.org/publications/educational-leadership/feb05/vol62/num05/How-Student-Progress-Monitoring-Improves-Instruction.aspx
After progress monitoring:

1. Determine whether the students are making adequate progress (above their aim line. Targeted to MINIMUM 40th percentile end of year performance). If a student is scoring near the 10th percentile then off grade level progress monitoring is appropriate.

2. Determine whether instruction needs to be adjusted.

3. Determine progress monitoring schedule.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tier 1</th>
<th>Tier 2</th>
<th>Tier 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Who:</strong> Classroom Teacher</td>
<td><strong>Who:</strong> Classroom Teacher</td>
<td><strong>Who:</strong> Title I or Literacy Teacher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>What:</strong> Strategic Monitoring</td>
<td><strong>What:</strong> Targeted instruction</td>
<td><strong>What:</strong> Strategic Instruction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>When:</strong> Monthly</td>
<td><strong>When:</strong> Bi-monthly</td>
<td><strong>When:</strong> 10-12 days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Where:</strong> Classroom</td>
<td><strong>Where:</strong> Classroom</td>
<td><strong>Where:</strong> During READ ACT services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Why:</strong> To make sure student is making adequate progress towards next benchmark.</td>
<td><strong>Why:</strong> For classroom teacher to see if the targeted direct instruction is closing the skill gap for student(s).</td>
<td><strong>Why:</strong> For interventionist to see if the strategic direct instruction is closing the skill gap for student(s).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Level:</strong> Grade level</td>
<td><strong>Level:</strong> Grade level</td>
<td><strong>Level:</strong> Can progress monitor off grade level if under the 10% at current grade on skill.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tier 1</th>
<th>Tier 2</th>
<th>Tier 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Who:</strong> Title I or Literacy Teacher</td>
<td><strong>Who:</strong> Title I or Literacy Teacher</td>
<td><strong>Who:</strong> Special Education or Title I, Literacy Teacher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>What:</strong> Targeted instruction</td>
<td><strong>What:</strong> Targeted instruction</td>
<td><strong>What:</strong> Intensive Instruction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>When:</strong> Bi-monthly</td>
<td><strong>When:</strong> Bi-monthly</td>
<td><strong>When:</strong> 7-10 days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Where:</strong> During services</td>
<td><strong>Where:</strong> During services</td>
<td><strong>Where:</strong> During READ ACT or Special Education Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Why:</strong> For interventionist to see if the targeted direct instruction is closing the skill gap for student(s).</td>
<td><strong>Why:</strong> For interventionist to see if the targeted direct instruction is closing the skill gap for student(s).</td>
<td><strong>Why:</strong> For interventionist to see if the intensive direct instruction is closing the skill gap for student(s).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Level:</strong> Grade level</td>
<td><strong>Level:</strong> Grade level</td>
<td><strong>Level:</strong> Can progress monitor off grade level if under the 10% at current grade on skill.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*This is not an exhaustive list.

**Formative Assessment** is not a test, not a tool. It is a continuous improvement process. Example of formative assessment is the American Reading Company’s IRLA (Independent Reading Level Assessment).
Differentiated Instruction within a Multi-Tiered System of Supports

Text, Reading, and Resources
Adapted from the ED 589: Differentiated Instruction within a Multi-Tiered System of Supports from CDE


Pathways to Literacy
Adapted from Amplify

*The following resources are not exclusive but resources Weld RE-4 School District (1-all buildings) have:

**Tier 1 Resources for differentiation in the classroom:**
(Whole, small or individual groups)
Florida Center for Reading Research
http://www.fcrr.org/
The Daily 5
At least 90 minutes, daily
The Cafe Book
Basals reteach
6 Minute Fluency Solution *(Fluency)*
6-10 minutes, small group or individual

**Tier 2 and 3 Resources that have been approved intervention programs per CDE READ ACT:**
(Small or individual groups)
Amplify BURST Intervention *(Phonemic Awareness, Phonics, Decoding, Vocabulary, Fluency, and Comprehension)*
30 minutes daily, 6 students
Read Naturally, Inc. *(Paper Pencil version)* *(Vocabulary, Fluency, and Comprehension)*
30 minutes daily, small group
**Read Naturally, Inc.  READ LIVE!**
30 minutes daily, individualized based, small group
**Read Naturally, Inc. GATE .8 and 1.3 (Phonemic Awareness, Phonics, Vocabulary, Decoding, Fluency and Comprehension-Primary Grades)**
30 minutes daily, 5 students
**Lexia Learning Systems CORE 5 (Phonemic Awareness, Phonics, Decoding, Vocabulary, Fluency, and Comprehension)**
20-30 minutes, 3-5 times a week
**Lindamood-Bell Learning SEEING STARS (Phonemic Awareness, Phonics, Decoding, and Vocabulary)**
30-90 minutes daily depending in tier, 5 students
**Lindamood-Bell Learning VISUALIZING and VERBALIZING (Comprehension)**
30 minutes daily, 5 students
**Lindamood-Bell Learning LIPS (Lindamood-Bell Phoneme Sequencing) (Phonemic Awareness and Phonics)**
60 minutes daily, 3 students
**Sounds and Letters (Phonemic Awareness)**
15-30 minutes a day, 5 days, whole or small group

**Additional Resources:**
**Reading A-Z (Phonemic Awareness, Phonics, Vocabulary, Fluency, and Comprehension)**
60-90 minutes daily, small group
**Read Well (Phonemic Awareness, Phonics, Vocabulary, Fluency, and Comprehension)**
**Reading Mastery (Phonemic Awareness, Phonics, Decoding, and Comprehension)**
30-45 minutes, 5 days a week, 6 students
**Triumphs (Phonemic Awareness, Phonics, Vocabulary, Fluency, and Comprehension)**
30-45 minutes, 5 days a week, 6 students
**Treasure Chest (Phonemic Awareness, Phonics, Vocabulary, Fluency, and Comprehension)**
30-45 minutes, days a week, 5 students
**Language! (Phonemic Awareness, Phonics, Vocabulary, Fluency, and Comprehension)**
90 minutes daily, 6-8 students
**Lindamood-Bell Learning TALKIES**
**Early Literacy Skill Builder (Phonics, Vocabulary,Comprehension-Moderate to severe needs & Autism)**
**Edmark (Vocabulary, Decoding and Fluency-Intended for students with developmental disabilities)**
15-20 minutes daily, 1-1
**Soar to Success (Comprehension)**
30-40 minutes daily, small group 5-7
**Word Warm Ups (Phonics and Fluency)**
10 minutes daily
**Jolly Phonics (Phonemic Awareness, Phonics, and Writing)**
**Early Success (Phonics, Fluency, Vocabulary, and Comprehension)**
30 minutes daily, 5-7
Tier 1, 2, and 3 Resources for differentiation in the classroom

Step Up to Writing
Six Trait
Spellography (27 lessons, small group) Intermediate and middle school
Tier 1 Resources for differentiation in the classroom:
Bridges Reteach
Bridges Intervention
Rocket Math (Computation)
5-10 minutes daily, whole group

Tier 2 and 3 Resources interventions:
DreamBox Learning (Comprehensive based on individual needs-computer based)
20-30 minutes daily, online-individual
Lindamood-Bell On Cloud Nine (Number sense, computation, sensory learning)
60 per day, small group

Key Math Diagnostic with Essential Resources lessons (Comprehensive based on individual testing)
30-2 hours for diagnostic testing
30 minutes, 5 days a week, individual lessons
Touch Math (Computation)
20 minutes daily, small group
Aleks (Comprehensive based on individual needs-computer based)
**Purpose**
The PLP was designed as a tracking system for individual students in general education. It’s elements have been taken from the Individual Education Program (IEP) for students with disabilities.

---

**Guidance on how to utilize the PLP tab in I.C.**

**Tier 1** - After benchmark, unit tests, progress monitoring, etc. PLC, data team, grade level team, etc. has worked as a collective team to support for the 4 step data collection reflection and problem solving practice, the classroom teacher will create a working goal and share with the students/parents. Goal is skill based (work on the lowest skill first). This differentiated instruction happens in the classroom.

**Goal writing**

Sample SMART goals for Student Growth

- **Specific** – the goal is focused on a specific area of student need within the content.
- **Measurable** – the goal will be assessed using an appropriate instrument.
- **Appropriate** – the goal is standards-based and directly related to the responsibilities of the teacher.
- **Realistic** – the goal is doable, while rigorous, stretching the outer bounds of what is attainable.
- **Time-bound** – the goal contained to a simple school year/course.

*Note that analysis of pre-assessment data is needed to truly determine if the goal is SMART. *You also want to make sure the goal meets the needs of all students in your classroom.

---

**Writing in any content area**

For the 2011 – 12 school year, 100% of students will make measurable progress in writing. Each student will improve by one performance level in two or more areas of the writing rubric (audience/purpose, idea development, organization & structure).

**Social Studies**

During this school year, 100% of my students will improve in analyzing primary and secondary source documents. Each student will increase his/her ability to analyze documents by at least one level on the rating
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Goal and Assessment</th>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Goal and Assessment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Basic Technical Drawing/Design/CAD</strong></td>
<td>During this school year, 100% of my students will demonstrate measurable progress in basic technical drawing. Each student will improve his or her own performance by at least 50% as evidenced by a performance assessment rubric. At least 85% of my students will score proficient on the end of the year performance assessment according to line quality, neatness, accuracy, and title block.</td>
<td><strong>Math</strong></td>
<td>For the school year, all of my students will demonstrate measurable growth in mathematics. All students will meet typical growth identified by the MAP assessment. At least 80% of my students will meet or exceed “proficient” on the end of the year MAP assessment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Physical Education</strong></td>
<td>During the 2012-2013 school year, each of my sixth-grade students will improve on the Presidential Fitness subtests (curl-ups, shuttle run, endurance run/walk, pull-ups, V-sit reach) by an overall average of 20%.</td>
<td><strong>Literacy Design Collaborative teachers (LDC) (any content area)</strong></td>
<td>For the 2011 – 12 school year, 100% of students will make measurable progress in writing. Each student will improve by one performance level in three or more areas of the LDC argumentation rubric. Furthermore, 80% of the students will score a “3” or better overall.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reading in any content area</strong></td>
<td>For the 2012-2013 school year, 100% of my students will make measurable progress in reading. Each student will improve in fluency, comprehension level, and vocabulary knowledge on the AIMSweb assessment. At least 75% of students will move up one performance level as reported by AIMSweb.</td>
<td><strong>Science</strong></td>
<td>For the current school year, my students will improve their ability to use scientific inquiry processes. Each student will improve by one or more levels on the district science assessment rubric in the areas of developing hypotheses, investigative design, and data analysis.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Art</strong></td>
<td>During the 9-week course, students will improve their understanding of art techniques. Students will improve their performance in the areas of identifying art elements/principles and critical analysis of elements/principles by one or more levels on the district art rubric.</td>
<td><strong>Reading in any content area</strong></td>
<td>During the 2011-2012 school year, students will improve their ability to analyze text critically and use textual based evidence in their writing. Students will improve their performance by one or more levels in both of these areas as evidenced by a district common assessment and rubric. Furthermore, 80% of students will perform at the proficient level overall on the post-assessment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FMD – mid functioning</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
For this school year, all my students will improve their ability to independently shop for basic needs: identify items on a list and locate them in a store, ask for and follow directions from a store clerk, and use money to pay for items. Students will improve their baseline number of items successfully identified, located, and paid for by at least double.

For the course, students will improve ability in two of the common core mathematical practices: 1) make sense of problems and preserving in solving them and 2) construct viable arguments and critique the reasoning of others. All students will increase their own score by 40% as assessed using a common assessment developed by regional MDC teachers.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FMD – low functioning</th>
<th>Primary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>During the school year, all my students will improve their fine motor skills in the areas of dressing, preparing food, and communication, as assessed by a classroom performance assessment of fine motor skills and dexterity. Each student will improve his or her ability by one or more levels on the rubric.</td>
<td>For the 2012-2013 school year, 100% of my primary students will meet their benchmark goal on the DIBELS oral reading fluency assessment. Furthermore, all students’ DIBELS retell score will be at least 25% of the oral fluency score.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The classroom or content teacher will document the student’s goal and change in differentiated instruction in the PLP Contact Log.
Teams will follow up and give progress on the student’s current goal. If the student is not reaching their goal then the team explores ways to change instruction in the classroom by adjusting the instructional plan for that student based on the 5 ways to adjust instruction from the page prior.

Progress monitoring will occur every 2 to 4 weeks.

**Tier 2-** Strategic teaching is expanded in the general classroom or content.

**OR**

Strategic teaching for the classroom student occurs because the students is not being successful of achieving their goal and has drained out way to differentiate instruction in their own classroom. The team collective will look if there is a specific intervention that would assist the student in achieving his/her goal. The team works together to decide what skill is the lowest and plans what differentiation will happen in the classroom. If appropriate the student will also go outside of the general education classroom to have an additional intervention provided. Goal(s) will be decided by the team and a PLP document will be created if the student is receiving ongoing tiered intervention.

Teams will follow up and give progress on the student’s current goal. If the student is not reaching their goal then the team explores ways to change instruction in the classroom by adjusting the instructional plan for that student based on the 5 ways to adjust instruction from the page prior as well as the intervention if appropriate.

New goals can be established.

Progress monitoring will occur every 2 weeks.

**Tier 3-** Intensive teaching includes all elements of Tier 1 and 2. Tier 3 looks at adjusting the frequency, duration or group size. A PLP will be updated or created.

Progress monitoring will occur every 1 to 2 weeks.