

# DOINGWHATWORKS



SAMPLE MATERIAL

## Core Program Review Tool

Tri-Community Elementary School, Pennsylvania

**Topic:** Response to Intervention in Primary Grade Reading

**Practice:** Progress Monitoring and Differentiation

A strong standards-aligned core program is critical within the Pennsylvania RtI Framework. Tri-Community Elementary School uses the *Core Program Review Tool* to evaluate and select research-based core programs, as well as evaluate present programs. Developed by the Pennsylvania Training and Technical Assistance Network, the tool addresses key characteristics of effective instructional practices and emphasizes the need to ensure high-quality, standards-based core instruction for all students as a baseline to RtI implementation. Review areas include the standards-aligned core program, research-based core program, differentiated core instruction, effective instructional practices, and fidelity of delivery.

# Core Program Review

Directions: Prior to rating each component, indicate the evidence you see for it by discussing and giving a **Yes** or **No** to each evidence item. Then discuss and rate the component as 1, 2, or 3 per the following scale.

## 3-Evidence of full implementation fidelity:

Evidence indicates that all relevant details/look-fors for this indicator are in place as described. Timelines, frequencies, staff involvement, student behaviors, curricular and intervention parameters are documented and supported with evidence, with only minor variations. Evidence suggests the indicator has been institutionalized throughout the school.

## 2-partial implementation fidelity:

Evidence indicates that **some** of the relevant details/look-fors for this indicator are in place as described. Timelines, frequencies, staff involvement, student behaviors, curricular and intervention parameters are as described in most situations, with only minor variations. Evidence indicates that the school is implementing this indicator with fidelity, but has details yet to address in this indicator.

## 1 = lacks evidence of implementation fidelity:

Evidence indicates that **none or few** of the relevant explanations/look-fors are present for the indicator. Systems and or activities are not in place or fall outside the criteria of the PA RtI Framework. Timelines, frequencies, staff involvement, student behaviors, curricular and intervention parameters are not in place. Evidence indicates that the school is not on course to implement this indicator with fidelity.

1. Is our core curriculum standards-aligned?	1	2	3
We see:			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence of an annual planning process that reviews PSSA Proficiency, PVAAS and local data analyzing proficiency on standards and eligible content within and across grade levels. Are there curricular holes for all or any subgroup? PSSA (PSSA Data Interaction, GROW Network) PVAAS Other Assessments (DIBELS, 4Sight, Discipline Referrals, Drop out Rate, etc.)</li> </ul>	Y	N	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence of periodic curriculum mapping in reading and math.</li> </ul>	Y	N	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence anchors and eligible content are addressed in teacher lesson planning.</li> </ul>	Y	N	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence teachers understand the flow of the curriculum and standards within and across grade levels.</li> </ul>	Y	N	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence of effective use of 4Sight, DIBELS, AIMSweb or other benchmark systems</li> </ul>	Y	N	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Grade level planning sessions that set grade-wide goals to achieve benchmark targets in reading, math and/or behavior.</li> </ul>	Y	N	

2. Is our core program research-based?	1	2	3
We see:			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence of consideration of research-based issues in the material selection process. (See reading, math, behavior 'Big Ideas, etc.)</li> </ul>	Y	N	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence supplemental programs were selected and implemented to fill gaps in the core programs selected.</li> </ul>	Y	N	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence of professional development around the critical research features of reading and math content.</li> </ul>	Y	N	

<b>3. Is our core instruction differentiated to meet the needs of all learners?</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>
We see:			
• Evidence the staff has received training in differentiated instruction and co-teaching.	Y	N	
• Evidence the teachers have received the student data they need to plan for differentiated instruction	Y	N	
• Evidence the schedule provides for planning time to facilitate differentiated instruction?	Y	N	
• Evidence the schedule provides for 'all hands on deck' resources during reading and math instruction.( All staff is available to support core instruction)	Y	N	

<b>4. Is our core program delivered using effective instructional practices?</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>
We see:			
• Evidence of professional development in research-based effective instructional practices.	Y	N	
• Evidence that implementation of effective instructional practices are monitored and supported by administration and/or peer processes.	Y	N	

<b>5. Are all aspects of our core instruction delivered with fidelity?</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>
We see:			
• Evidence of adequate uninterrupted instruction time. (Reading-90 minutes, Math-60 minutes)	Y	N	
• Evidence of the use of publisher developed fidelity of implementation checklists.			
• Evidence of the use of generic effective instruction checklists ( <a href="http://www.pattan.net">www.pattan.net</a> ).	Y	N	
• Evidence of principal's observation of teacher performance through classroom visits and observations conducted during the instructional period for the targeted content/ subject area on a regular basis.	Y	N	
• Evidence of the use of integrity checklists of instruction completed by teachers as self-check measures.	Y	N	
• Evidence of the use of checklists of integrity of instruction completed among teachers as peer-check measures.	Y	N	
• Evidence of the implementation of checklists by content specialists or curriculum supervisors working with classroom teachers.	Y	N	

### RtI Core Program Review Summary

	Implementation Score	Priority Score
1. Standards-aligned Core Program.....	_____	_____
2. Research-based Core Program.....	_____	_____
3. Differentiated Core Instruction.....	_____	_____
4. Effective Instructional Practices.....	_____	_____
5. Core Fidelity.....	_____	_____

After determining team's priorities, use one of the available Action Plan instruments to detail next steps for needed improvement in core program and instruction.

