School Based Leadership Team
Year Two, Day Four

Problem Solving & Response to Intervention

A collaborative project between the Florida Department of Education and the University of South Florida
Survey
Perception of RtI Skills

Please complete this survey while you are settling in, prior to the beginning of our session.

Your project ID is:
• Last 4 digits of SS#
• Last 2 digits of year of birth
In this Day of training, school teams were provided with greater amounts of “working time” or technical assistance in the last couple hours of the day rather than a “skill assessment”. This was due in part to many variables. For example, teams seemed “ready” to go beyond PS basics and explore applying the PS model to building level planning and focus on implementation status. Also, many teams communicated in trainings that the complexity of the information covered in Years 1 and 2 combined required more time to practice and learn how to apply the concepts in their school. Some teams also indicated a need to just be able to discuss the information and make connections with their school specifically. The end of the day’s session allowed teams an opportunity to meet/discuss/plan for integrating PS/RtI more comprehensively than just developing procedures for staff to follow. In Year 3, the ends of each session days were structured to provide on-site technical assistance and support for helping teams develop school PS/RtI Implementation Plans – something that in Year 3 became a greater focus for schools in the context of the SIP process.

This being the last Day of Year 2, there is great emphasis in this module to allow teams to reflect and identify what was most salient, useful, and important for them to continue to keep track of and learn about. As with all activities conducted with the pilot school trainings, data played a central and key role in providing structure to teams as they look to plan for next school year.

Teams were provided with implementation data in this session and asked to reflect and plan for observed strengths and school needs with regards to scaling up implementation of PS/RtI with a high degree of fidelity. An important question to consider: How much implementation of PS/RtI model is needed in order to achieve satisfactory school outcomes? Without knowing that upfront, it was critical to keep track of school implementation status and its relationship to the outcomes the school was getting.

Final thought: How is your district evaluating for the (a) effectiveness of training on PS/RtI, (b) in relation to a range of implementation levels schools are experiencing, combined with (c) knowledge of resources available/needed for supporting district-wide implementation of PS/RtI K-12?

Some training questions for your training team to consider as you look beyond this module and Year 2 overall:

(1) Can teams not only demonstrate knowledge of PS/RtI across Tiers 1 and 2 to a defined criterion, but also demonstrate application of PS/RtI to building-level planning for (a) scaling up implementation of PS/RtI and (b) supporting data-based decision-making in classrooms?

(2) How much variability is observed across school teams with respect to knowledge/skills/beliefs of PS/RtI? What implications does this information have for your trainers and how can you begin differentiating training sessions based on matched need?

(3) How much time or percentage of time should be given in future sessions to training vs. technical assistance? How can determination of this be data-driven?

(4) How much structure should be provided to teams during planning or TA time in terms of guiding them through application of PS/RtI as framework for school improvement? Compliance and adherence to minimal standards? Very loose and unstructured time for teams to simply “plan and discuss what they want”? Or, semi-structured with guiding “rules” and expectations and format to lead planning and discussion time? How can this determination be data-driven?

(5) In looking ahead into Year 3 content, teams should start to recognize the similarities of using the PS model across tiers. It might be viewed as an empirical question to ask as trainers, “To what extent can teams automatically or with significantly less training and assistance, apply the PS model to Tier 3 cases as a generalization of skills/knowledge learned about PS with Tiers 1 and 2? That is, how much more time can be offered to teams in Year 3 for primarily technical assistance as opposed to direct training of PS model to Tier 3? If your training team pursues this question, how would you determine this?
This slide and the next slides with the same title are all provided specifically in response to (a) data collected on team members knowledge and skills demonstrated to date, and (b) based on identification of critical implementation variables related to PS/RtI. Also, in an effort to help teams see the integration of PS/RtI system-wide in Florida, key education FLDOE policies were referenced to highlight strong support of the implementation variable being identified. Note the connections between each for these Critical Concepts slides.

There are a number of options available for using these slides. We allowed teams to have some time to discuss and share their understanding of these critical concepts rather than just review them down the list. Perhaps ask teams to identify as many critical components of PS/RtI that they can before showing them the slides.
Found it helpful sometimes to emphasize that policies at a national and state level, like laws created by the legal field, tend use very precise and targeted language/words. What similarities or differences in emphasis about different concepts can be found among the referenced rules/policies? Why worded the way they are? We wanted teams to see value in understanding the flexible and adaptable nature of implementing PS/RtI as a framework rather than a program that they have to “comply with” across different steps. All of the polices and rules that schools must comply with are in most ways targeting the same issues and with a focus on the same goal: positive student/school outcomes. We tried to help teams see how a single activity at a school like analyzing data at key times in the year, could satisfy several policy/rule requirements. In Year 3 we continued the importance of integrating a framework and the unique challenges to that process.

The intent is to help teams see PS/RtI as a “framework” that can be integrated into all activities of the school AND help the school streamline their operations and consolidate all school improvement efforts. Ex. Relationship strengthened between NCLB and IDEA.

Many teams indicated an understanding of PS/RtI as a “framework” and NOT as an “program”. Applying a framework, however, as opposed to a program, can be a bit more challenging to provide training on.
Fidelity/Integrity, which ever word is most appropriate for your school, can perhaps be argued to require a place in every training session as it is one of the most critical components to PS/RtI and yet the least known and developed as a tool in the research literature (as compared to progress monitoring tools, for example). That doesn’t mean there isn’t some agreement in the literature about why fidelity is important and available some ideas for how to measure it. As found in these policy and rule references, there are multiple areas of the school district and school PS/RtI system that fidelity can be applied to. What fidelity measures does your district make explicit as an expectation? Trainers should have a strong understanding of the knowledge and limits of knowledge currently available on this topic. Consider a special series issue on Treatment Integrity in the Journal of School Psychology 2009.

The most common “type” of fidelity that is found in policy and rules in FL are about the degree to which the intervention/instruction provided to a student is delivered to AND received by the student. At Tier 1, the concept of fidelity focuses mainly on adherence to identified best practices and adherence to school scheduled activities/procedures and lessons throughout the year.

Teams know they NEED to measure fidelity. What does your district want to provide teams with respect to how and when to measure for fidelity. Also, beyond monitoring for fidelity of intervention/instruction provided to a student, how does your district want to monitor for the fidelity of using the PS model across ALL 3 Tiers?

### Critical Concepts to Emphasize

#### Importance of Fidelity

Must have evidence that interventions are delivered with fidelity and level of implementation is documented - FSRtIP

90 minutes of “dedicated, uninterrupted” reading instruction - K12RP

Schools assembles team to monitor fidelity of RtI implementation - Diff. Acct. Guide (DAG)

“When provided with well-delivered scientific, research-based general education instruction and interventions of reasonable intensity and duration with evidence of implementation fidelity…” 6A-6.03018 (SLD Rule)
There are many “models” of problem-solving. For example, just consider the many similarities between FCIM and PS. The 4-step PS model that was adopted by the FLDOE was rapidly being included and integrated through revisions of the policies above and in previous/following slides during the time of the Year 2 pilot school trainings. Note that it is mentioned and sometimes described in various places of both general and special education policy/rules.

We wanted teams to connect with the specific model being used in FL and be reminded of some of the potential pitfalls to not using the PS model with fidelity (e.g., not engaging in Problem Analysis before developing an intervention plan; not providing supports to the intervention as part of the intervention plan, not monitoring for integrity, etc.).

At the district level, AND for purposes of training, how will the PS model, as is characterized and defined in the policies and rules of FLDOE, replace or integrate with the current models of service delivery, resource allocation, and/or quality improvement efforts by the district?

You can anticipate some discussion at the district level with respect to integrating PS for decision making towards greater accountability and service effectiveness. Are there any “competing” or otherwise incompatible models/procedures of using data and making decisions in the district that might need to be audited?

How will any changes you make be communicated and trained to school staff district wide?
In 6A-6.0331 (Gen Ed Rule) – PS model is to be used as a framework for communicating with parents and guardians about student performance and response to instruction.

**Critical Concepts to Emphasize**

The Four Problem Solving Steps (cont.)

Must be discussion with parents of: response to intervention, data used, adjustments to interventions, and anticipated future actions - 6A-6.0331 (Gen Ed Intervention Rule)

Repeated measures of academic progress, graphically represented, reflecting response to intervention provided to parents - 6A-6.03018 (SLD Rule)
With this slide, teams can focus on what they would define as “comprehensive” about intervention planning at each Tier. What are the components of the intervention plan that were identified in the trainings?

What are the implications for scheduling, staff planning, professional development, and other categories of daily practice in a school. They can then connect that information with what is asked for in the above policies/rule.

It was helpful sometimes to encourage teams to consider their infrastructure for supporting a series of comprehensive interventions for large and small groups, and individuals throughout the school year across several content learning areas and across several grade levels of curriculum/standards.
This slide and the next one are specifically selected to highlight the critical importance of having the right constellation of beliefs and practices to support successful implementation AND use of PS/RtI. On this slide, you can ask teams to think about training their own staff at their schools, and ask them to demonstrate how they would use this slide in training.

What would they want to emphasize to their staff? How would the team want to ensure and measure staff acceptance of this message: Are all students and staff are participating in PS/RtI year-round the school? If not, what actions should be taken to improve implementation status?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Critical Concepts to Emphasize</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PS/RtI = ALL STUDENTS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PS/RtI = ALL STUDENTS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PS/RtI = ALL STUDENTS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PS/RtI = ALL STUDENTS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PS/RtI = ALL STUDENTS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There is no “RtI Process” that is initiated for struggling students. Every student in every tier is impacted in a PS/RtI system.
In addition to the previous slide, this one emphasizes that the Tiers represent educational services and supports, that are selected and matched to student needs (A+B), in order to ensure that ALL students reach their goals (=C).

A simple way to describe this slide from left to right like a math equation: “We will use information about the precise needs of the diverse students at our school (A) in order to match each student with the appropriate instruction and intensity (B), in order to help every student reach their goals/highest student outcomes (C).

You could ask teams to reflect on what it might look like and involve for a student to be receiving intensive Tier 3 and/or 2 services at a school for multiple years while continuing to reach grade level expectations. Some student needs those supports to “maintain” their grade-level performance over time.

Overall, our aim was to ensure that teams see that the goal of using PS/RtI is 100% of students will reach grade level expectations by using services/accessing instruction at different levels of intensity matched to their need based on performance data over time.

If beneficial to teams at this stage of their training, you can use this slide to help teams to see beyond the 80, 15, 5% labels for each Tier and instead recognize what percentage they need to strive for in determining effectiveness of each Tier in the context of what resources they have available and what student needs exist specifically at their school. Some schools, because of relatively lower educational needs among the students, might aim for much greater than 80% of population reaching benchmark at Tier 1 in order to be able to make use of the relatively lower resources they are given by their district for providing supplemental supports. Some schools might aim for less than 80% in early years of implementation as their Tier 1 success is already much lower than that, and their school requires simultaneous use of Tiers 1 and 2 for high numbers of students while improvements to Tier 1 are made over consecutive years.
Beliefs Survey

Your project ID is:
• Last 4 digits of SS#
• Last 2 digits of year of birth
In this section of the session school teams were handed graphs of their implementation data using the

**SAPSI** — Self-Assessment of Problem-Solving Implementation — teams assess their own implementation status through team discussion and consensus using a series of questions grouped by the systems-change model of "consensus", "infrastructure" and "implementation". Infrastructure section focuses heavily on establishing three tiers of services and also on the critical steps and sub-steps for effective Problem-Solving. The infrastructure section also emphasizes the development of a comprehensive data management system.

**Critical Components Checklist**, records/documents are evaluated and rated using a checklist of the degree to which what was documented reflects the steps of the Problem-solving model. Checklists were completed by the coaches.

**Observations** were conducted during Problem-Solving team meetings and rated using a checklist on the degree to which the meeting reflected use of the PS model. Observations were conducted by the coaches.

Both CCCs and Observations give an approximate measure of the level of fidelity in using the PS model in the school. Teams can compare that information to the section on implementing the PS model using their SAPSI. Are the leadership teams' perceptions of the use of the PS model consistent with what is being exemplified in documentation and observations? If not, why? Implications? Etc...

SAPSI is more comprehensive and specifically can help with identifying consensus and infrastructure needs at a school in drive implementation efforts forward. (b) CCCs and Observations can be used together to make connections between quality/quantity of problem solving that is actually occurring in the school and the quality/quantity of documenting PS activities and decision-making.

If your district is NOT utilizing one or more of these tools, what is your district’s plan for helping school teams identify their implementation successes and needs in a way that is evidenced-based and used for school planning and scaling up for using PS/RtI school-wide? What “road map” are school teams offered to keep track of their implementation efforts?

Not only did the above tools allow our coaches and trainers to provide targeted technical assistance to teams regarding system change model and infrastructure needs, but these tools also allowed for monitoring across schools in terms of variation of implementation status so that appropriately matched amounts of technical assistance could be provided to team.
3= Maintaining
2= Achieved
1= In Progress
0= Not Started

When presenting SAPSI data, we often chose this format. There is no magic to why we chose a column graph. However, we wanted teams to recall systems change knowledge about the length of time it takes to fully implement PS/RtI building-wide and to focus on their school’s TRENDS over time. In this session, the data above shows aggregate pilot school data between Fall 2007 and Winter 2009 with respect to defining Tiers of Service for academic and behavioral targets. Teams could have similar data of their own school and compare with the above (average).
This graph is also from the SAPSI and aggregated across all pilot schools. The data focused on are the use of the PS process at the school. This data from the SAPSI, along with the Critical Component Checklist, and Observation data can be combined to triangulate as accurate as possible the fidelity of using the PS model in a school. NOTE that the critical component checklist and the observation tool come in two “sizes” – Combined Tier 1 and 2; and a Tier 3 form. The SAPSI is a building-wide focus.
For the CCC slides (reading, math, behavior) use the slides germane to your group. Some schools are focusing on reading, some math, some behavior.
For the CCC slides (reading, math, behavior) use the slides germane to your group. Some schools are focusing on reading, some math, some behavior.
For the CCC slides (reading, math, behavior) use the slides germane to your group. Some schools are focusing on reading, some math, some behavior.
This slide shows the observation levels for each of the PS steps for Tier 1&2 meetings. (aggregate).

A question being explored during the pilot project was how much of each of the PS steps was needed in order to produce effective student outcomes? Teams were not asked to already be at 100% for all of these. Rather, teams were encourage to consider their school’s observed use of the PS model in relation to what they as a team thought/felt was occurring in the school among staff and PS teams as found in their SAPSI. Ask them to explore why, if there are any differences in what was observed and what was perceived to be occurring with respect to the fidelity of using the PS model.
Slide prior was for Tier 1 & 2. This slide shows the observation results for a Tier 3 PS meeting (aggregated data).
Project Data

Follow-Up Problem-Solving Team Checklist
Project Level Graph

- Roles Represented: 65%
- Program Evaluation/Response to Intervention: 68%

Percentage of Roles/Components Present
The next several slides on small group planning and problem solving are intended to provide teams with a structured approach to problem-solving that can be easily applied to the school-wide efforts/organizational level. After teams have had a chance to review their school’s implementation data with respect to those consensus and infrastructure components that are most critical to successful implementation of PS/RtI, the Small Group Planning process can allow them to begin identifying priorities and establishing timelines and action plans for reaching current and future implementation goals. In the absence of implementation data for teams to use, how will they know what to work on and what to prioritize? How will they know they are on the right track with respect to correct implementation and maintenance of PS/RtI at their school?

1. Describe the problem or concern as concretely and as specifically as possible. Once the problem has been defined, identify the desired outcome of the problem-solving efforts (what is it that you want to see happen as a result), again using concrete, descriptive terms.

Often, what initially is thought to be a problem, once analyzed, is recognized to be several distinct, although perhaps related problems. Record all problems identified. Although all of them may not be dealt with during a particular session, once recorded, they can be addressed during subsequent sessions. Identify the specific problem that will be addressed first. Then, define the desired outcome that would result from resolution of only that specific problem. It is essential that all members of the problem-solving team have the same understanding of the problem to be addressed and of the desired outcome.
2. Analyze the specific problem chosen in terms of factors that might help in addressing it (resources) and factors that serve as obstacles to achieving the desired outcome.

Using a "brainstorming" process, all members of the group participate in generating a list of resources and obstacles. The use of only concise statements should be encouraged. It is essential that ideas are not discussed, evaluated, or even clarified at this point. The intent is to produce as much information as possible by involving all members of the group in a free flow of ideas. Record only enough about each idea to allow clarification by its originator after brainstorming is completed. This should be recognized as an "idea" stage. At this point, there would have been no decisions made regarding actions to be carried out.
3. Select one (1) obstacle from #2 to address first and identify it in behaviorally descriptive terms – ensure everyone understands it.

Support and expectation to develop School Based PS/RtI plans has not been explicit from project

3. Select one obstacle that is significant in terms of its hindrance to achieving the desired outcome as specified in Step 1.

The obstacle selected should be viewed as only the first obstacle to be addressed, not as the only one. It is best to avoid trying to identify the most important obstacle to reduce concerns relating to ownership associated with who generated specific ideas. However, the obstacle chosen should be one for which there is shared interest across the group. If the group were inexperienced in using structured problem-solving procedures, it also would be desirable to select an obstacle for which the group has a reasonable chance of generating possible solutions. Experiencing success is important in developing group skills and confidence. Other important obstacles can be noted for future attention.
4. **Brainstorm** strategies to reduce or eliminate only the obstacle identified in #3 and record them below. These are only ideas. Do not consider feasibility or implementation at this stage.

Use Y2D4 Training to provide structure and support for goal setting.  
Provide time for planning during Y2D4 training  
Consult with principals, coaches, and project liaisons to learn the barriers faced and support needed to develop a School Based PS/RtI Implementation Plan  
Build support into Year 3 PD plan  
Provide examples of plans

---

4. Focusing only on the one obstacle selected in Step 3, brainstorm resources and activities that might be used to reduce or eliminate that specific obstacle. The list of resources identified in Step 2 serves only as a stimulus for the generation of ideas. Again, because a brainstorming process is being used, the intent is to generate and record as many ideas as possible. Specific ideas can be clarified after brainstorming is complete. Remind participants that this is only an idea stage and that no decisions have been made regarding actual action plans.
5. Design a concrete plan of action that reflects accountability for completion (i.e., who, what, when).

If possible, several action plans should be developed to address the same obstacle. In that way, if one plan is not carried out, or does not attain the desired results, the identified obstacle still may be reduced or eliminated through other actions. Each plan should clearly identify who (by name or position) is responsible for carrying out what specific activity (include as much detail as possible) by when. Avoid stating any aspect of a plan in general terms; the greater the detail provided in a plan, the greater the likelihood that it will be carried out as intended and on time. Sometimes, it is desirable to try out an action plan on a limited scale before proceeding with full implementation. If the person identified as being responsible for the action plan is not a member of the group developing the plan, it is necessary to create an action plan that identifies a member of the group who will contact that individual about willingness to take responsibility for the action plan (what), and the date by which contact is to be made (when).

6. Establish a procedure for follow-up and review.

Consider interim reporting dates and procedures to check on the progress of an action plan, rather than waiting until the deadline for its conclusion. This stage also is used to evaluate the effectiveness of action plans and for modifying them or even recycling to an earlier stage in the process.
This and the next two slides provide teams with an example of what can be produced by engaging in a small group planning process. Suggest that your training team replace these slides with content that is relevant for your schools and involves examples of actions that are occurring in your district with respect to PS/RtI. Another option: provide time for teams to view the Small Group Planning Process in action by facilitating one live with audience participation. Along the way, details could be provided about what to ensure and avoid in carrying out these steps with high quality.
**Small Group Planning & Problem Solving**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#2 Who: Beth, Kelly, Brian</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>What action:</strong> Regional Coordinators will deliver Y2D4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>When</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4/7/09</td>
<td>Walton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4/9/09</td>
<td>Polk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4/13/09</td>
<td>Pasco East</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4/14/09</td>
<td>Pinellas A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4/16/09</td>
<td>Monroe South</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4/17/09</td>
<td>Monroe North</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4/21/09</td>
<td>Pinellas B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4/22/09</td>
<td>Clay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4/23/09</td>
<td>Pasco West</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5/4/09</td>
<td>St. Johns</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Plan for Follow-Up:** Clark will email Beth, Kelly, Brian two days prior to each training meeting to assure that each has materials and support necessary for meeting.
Small Group Planning & Problem Solving

7. Plan for evaluation of reduction or elimination of obstacle identified in #3:

   Review permanent products:
   Y2D4 ppt
   Training evaluations
   Action plans created during Y2D4 Small Group Planning time

8. Plan for evaluating progress toward achievement of desired outcome specified in #1

   Review SAPSI Item 23 from administration EOY 08/09 and MOY 09/10
   Receive coach input ongoing and at beginning of 09/10 coach meeting
   Review school progress toward development of School Based PS/RTI Plan at beginning of 09/10 coach meeting.
This Slide is a place holder for teams to use during the last couple hours of the day as their planning time. Having consumed their implementation data and considered all information they have about what is working and not with respect to PS/RtI at their school, what do the school teams want to focus on for future planning into the next school year?

NOTE: we chose to collect a copy of their plans in order to identify goals that the teams were selecting and the plans that they were developing to reach those goals as a way to monitor for our training effectiveness. There was NO skill assessment used in this day of training. As Year 3 approaches, our focus for teams began to address how they were going to “institutionalize” their actions towards full and successful implementation of PS/RtI school-wide. The focus therefore increased from a series of action plans to a comprehensive school improvement plan.
Training Evaluation

No project ID necessary