

# DOINGWHATWORKS



## SAMPLE MATERIAL

### RtI Data Analysis Teaming Process Script

Tri-Community Elementary School, Pennsylvania

**Topic:** Response to Intervention in Elementary-Middle Math

**Practice:** Screening and Monitoring

This document contains a description of the data analysis teaming process used by Tri-Community Elementary School within their RtI Framework and guidelines for conducting a team meeting. Also included is the *Data Analysis for Instructional Decision Making: Team Process* script<sup>1</sup> used by Pennsylvania Training and Technical Assistance Network (PaTTAN) staff to train school staff in this process.

The script provides guidance on procedures, typical prompts to promote discussion, and record keeping. It has two parts and addresses interventions at each tier. Part 1 outlines the Initial/Fall Goal Setting and Instructional Planning Session. Part 2 describes Quarterly Benchmark (Follow-up) Meetings. Although the example presented here pertains to reading, the guidelines and script can be easily adapted for mathematics interventions.

---

<sup>1</sup> Pennsylvania Training and Technical Assistance Network (PaTTAN). (2008). *Data analysis team script*. Harrisburg: Pennsylvania Department of Education.

## **The RTI Data Analysis Teaming Process**

Joseph F. Kovalski, Megan Roble, and Michelle Agne, Indiana University of  
Pennsylvania, Indiana, PA

For schools implementing Response-to-Intervention (RTI) approaches, team meetings are a vital part of creating curricular improvements, designing interventions, and deciding which students will benefit from additional tiered instruction.<sup>1</sup> RTI teams should use a problem-solving process to analyze data from school-wide universal screening at the Tier 1 level to assist teachers in planning and implementing instructional strategies that will differentiate on the basis of students' varying skill levels (Kovalski & Pedersen, 2008). The same type of teaming process should also be used for designing instruction and placing students into higher tiers (i.e., Tier 2 and Tier 3). Data analysis teams (DATs) are convened after benchmark screenings to review universal data, select students for tiered interventions, and discuss instructional strategies.

The following guidelines for data analysis teaming are to be used in conjunction with the Data Analysis for Instructional Decision Making: Team Process script to facilitate effective RTI team meetings (Pennsylvania Training and Technical Assistance Network, 2008).<sup>2</sup> The script, which is based on Kovalski and Pedersen's (2008) work on best practices in this area, is an outline of the recommended format for DAT meetings. It lists, in chronological order, the items that should be discussed, typical prompts that encourage discussion and decision making, and suggestions for record keeping at each step. Together, these guidelines and the script address in detail how to plan and conduct these meetings, including suggestions for team membership, the types of data to review, methods for analyzing student data, and how to plan interventions for students identified as needing additional support.

The script is organized into several sections. Part I is the script for the initial fall meeting, in which initial goals are set and the team plans for instruction. First, the script lists activities that should be planned and reviewed before the meetings. Then it outlines the procedures for reviewing benchmark data and planning for improved Tier 1 instruction for the entire grade level. Next, it lists procedures for considering students for Tier 2 using progress-monitoring data, followed by instructions for repeating the process for Tier 3. After Tier 3 procedures, it lists interim steps to be taken between meetings. Part II follows the same format, but for subsequent meetings (quarterly benchmark meetings). The general procedures and prompts are the same for the initial meeting and follow-up meetings, but some differences do necessitate a variant script.

Another document that should be used for DAT meetings is the Screening and Information Recording Form (SIRF; Kovalski & Pedersen, 2008). Teams should use the SIRF or a similar document to record current student performance, goals, strategies discussed, strategies chosen, students considered for tiered services, and decisions made regarding student placement. The script lists in more detail everything that should

be documented for purposes of record keeping, regardless of what document is used. It is useful for the facilitator to choose a “scribe” for the meeting to ensure that all appropriate information is recorded. [An updated version of the SIRF is available here](#) (PaTTAN, 2008).

### **Before the Meetings**

RTI teams are often organized into grade-level DATs that include the principal, all teachers from that grade level, the individuals who provide the tiered interventions, the school psychologist, and the individual who manages benchmark and progress-monitoring data (data manager). For larger schools that have more than six teachers per grade level, more than one team per grade should be considered. The principal arranges for meeting logistics, such as scheduling, and often acts as facilitator of the meeting or appoints another team member for that role. At minimum, teams should meet shortly after each universal screening (typically three times per year). They may need to meet more frequently as needed to accommodate changes in student movement or interventions. Prior to meetings, the data should be compiled and sent to all team members ahead of time in a user-friendly format so that all team members can review the data to familiarize themselves with it before the meeting. Data shared with the team can include results of measures such as AIMSweb (Shinn & Garman, 2006), DIBELS (Good & Kaminski, 2005), or 4Sight (Slavin & Madden, 2006), using both raw data and visual displays (e.g., graphs and histograms) of individual and group data.

### **Tier 1 Analysis**

First, the team should review whole-grade performance on the universal screening conducted for that grade level. The team should review what percentage of students is at each performance/risk level: benchmark (low risk), strategic (some risk), and intensive (high risk). Next, the team uses the percentages at each level to set measurable goals to achieve by the next review point. The goals should be stated in terms of the percentage of students making a particular amount of progress toward the identified benchmark.

After reviewing the students’ current performance and setting goals for the next universal screening, the team lists whole-class instructional strategies to consider implementing to improve student performance. Ideas should be recorded in a list that is easily viewed by everyone. The team analyzes and rates the listed strategies according to the extent to which they are evidence based, practical, and available or according to the feasibility of their creation. Finally, the team selects which strategies to implement during the next intervention period.

The team should then discuss the logistics of the strategies, such as how to locate or create necessary materials, teaching each other the strategy by using peer modeling and coaching, or identifying assistance from specialists such as the school psychologist

or Title 1 staff. The team also makes plans for self-monitoring of the strategies. Then, a “to-do list” is created for strategy implementation.

### **Tier 2 Analysis**

The team now identifies which students will be considered for Tier 2 interventions. Students meeting criteria for Tier 2 services are identified based on their risk level for academic difficulties as indicated by benchmark scores. More specifically, students whose performance is in the emerging or strategic range of the data sets are identified. All available data on these students are reviewed, such as universal screening scores and progress-monitoring data. In reviewing each student’s data, all areas of assessment should be considered to determine what kind of learning profile the student has and to ensure that the assessments validate each other. Based on all of this information, the team decides which students need Tier 2 interventions. For each of the identified students, the team sets a measurable goal in terms of specified benchmark scores for the next review point.

The team now focuses on tiered intervention strategies. Based on students’ needs in Tier 2, the team determines which strategies apply. Pennsylvania’s RTI teams use a standard protocol approach to interventions both at Tier 2 and Tier 3 (Fuchs, 2003), selecting from among strategies that are research based, highly scripted, and targeted to particular types of instructional problems. Methods for implementing the strategy are planned by identifying instructional groups and the frequency and duration of the interventions. In addition, a plan for self-monitoring needs to be determined. One good method to determine the fidelity of the interventions is to use an intervention checklist that outlines the correct implementation of the strategy. The team then makes plans for monitoring the progress of students in Tier 2 at least twice a month.

### **Tier 3 Analysis**

Next, the team focuses on identifying students and planning interventions for Tier 3. Students chosen for Tier 3 are typically those performing the lowest on universal screenings (i.e., those whose performance places them in the greatest risk category). Students for Tier 3 are identified by the same process described for Tier 2. Because these students need the most intensive supports, however, planning for specific interventions according to need may be more involved than Tier 2 planning. For instance, a closer look at progress-monitoring data may be necessary to make decisions for students in Tier 3. Students who continue to display deficits in level and rate of improvement after Tier 3 supports may be referred to the special education evaluation process.

## **Interim Steps**

Between meetings, members of the DAT should all take responsibility for monitoring the fidelity of the selected instructional strategies and interventions, monitoring student progress, and fine-tuning the strategies based on classroom performance.

## **Initial and Follow-up Meetings**

Part I of the script is for the initial fall meeting, and Part II is for subsequent follow-up meetings. Although many items are very similar, there are some important differences to be aware of before using the script at DAT meetings. The most important difference is that the initial meeting will focus mostly on planning, whereas the follow-up meetings involve much more evaluation and fine-tuning of strategies. In follow-up meetings, previous student data are available for comparing performance over time. Previous universal screening data are helpful in determining if there is overall improvement, especially in examining specific skills via item analysis or other methods. Also, there is an increased emphasis on evaluating past decisions at follow-up meetings. In addition to selecting new strategies, the team also discusses how well the strategies they planned at the previous meeting have been working for the students. The team can decide to continue with the existing strategies or to select new ones. Finally, follow-up meetings may include more detailed discussions about tier movement. As the year progresses, students will move between the tiers, in and out of various intervention groups.

## **Conclusion**

Using a systematic team approach to RTI allows teachers and staff to all be involved in planning for every student's academic performance. By sharing responsibility as a team, more educators are accountable for student progress and aware of the diversity of needs among students. The DAT model described by the script is very explicit and detailed for the purposes of keeping teams on task and focused on the data. Although the script may seem rigid, adherence to an established systematic model helps ensure implementation fidelity and, thus, improved outcomes for students.

## **References**

- Fuchs, L. S. (2003). Assessing intervention responsiveness: Conceptual and technical issues. *Learning Disabilities Research & Practice*, 18, 172–186.
- Good, R. H., & Kaminski, R. A. (2005). *Dynamic indicators of basic early literacy skills* (6th ed.). Longmont, CO: Sopris West.
- Kovaleski, J. F., & Marco, C. M.. (2005). *Screening Information Recording Form (SIRF)*. Unpublished manuscript.

Kovaleski, J. F., & Pedersen, J. (2008). Best practices in data analysis teaming. In A. Thomas & J. Grimes (Eds.), *Best practices in school psychology V* (pp. 115–130). Bethesda, MD: National Association of School Psychologists.

National Association of State Directors of Special Education. (2005). *Response to intervention: Policy considerations and implementation*. Alexandria, VA: Author.

Pennsylvania Training and Technical Assistance Network (PaTTAN). (2008). *Data analysis team script*. Harrisburg: Pennsylvania Department of Education.

Shinn, M. R., & Garman, G. (2006). *AIMSweb*. Eden Prairie, MN: Edformation, Inc.

Slavin, M. R., & Madden, N. A. (2006). *4Sight benchmark assessments*. Baltimore: Success for All Foundation.

---

Notes:

1. It should be noted that the following description is based on the three-tier model for RTI used in Pennsylvania. In this model, all three tiers of support occur as part of the general education program. Special education is considered after the student has been provided with three tiers of intervention. As compared with other three-tier models (cf. ,National Association of State Directors of Special Education [NASDSE], 2005), Pennsylvania's Tiers 1 and 2 roughly correspond to NASDSE's Tier 1, with Pennsylvania's Tier 3 corresponding to NASDSE's Tier 2.
2. Contributors to the data analysis script include Joseph F. Kovaleski, Jason Pedersen, Joy Eichelberger, Edward S. Shapiro, Rosemary Nilles, Christina Marco, Caitlin Flinn, Megan Roble, and Michelle Agne.



## ***Data Analysis for Instructional Decision Making: Team Process\****

### **Part I. Initial/Fall Goal Setting and Instructional Planning Session**

#### **Before the data team meeting:**

- Data sets/packets are prepared for meeting in teacher-friendly format with and without student names (e.g., 4Sight Proficiency graph, DIBELS histogram, PVAAS).
- Data are provided to the team (teachers and other school personnel) in advance.
- Session facilitator (permanent) is identified by the principal/designee, and is trained in team facilitation.
- Meeting logistics, including the date/time, place, and an agenda, are arranged by principal or designee.

| <b>Tier 1</b>  |  |  |
|--|--|--|
| <b>Procedure</b>   | <b>Typical Prompts</b>   | <b>Record Keeping</b>  |
| <b>During the meeting:</b><br>Team uses district-provided data sets.   | Team is provided with data to be analyzed.   | Data sets in question (e.g., DIBELS histogram, 4Sight Proficiency graph, PVAAS grade level report). Use formats without student names. |
| Team identifies current performance of grade-level cadre (particular to school) on relevant benchmark for grade and time of year. Note if grade level and individual students made substantial growth (at least a year) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• DIBELS or other ORF measure (% at benchmark [low risk], % strategic [some risk], % intensive [high risk])</li> <li>4Sight, % Advanced + Proficient, % Basic, % Below Basic</li> </ul> | Facilitator: “Let’s analyze how our students are doing on ( <i>benchmark skill</i> ).” | Summarize salient data on the Screening and Intervention Record Form (SIRF).   |
| Team sets a measurable goal or goals to achieve by the next review point. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Goal should be stated in terms of % of students making <i>x</i> (give a number) progress toward identified benchmark.</li> <li>• Example: “By ----, -----% of students will attain the benchmark of ----- or above.”</li> <li>• For 4Sight, % of students scoring Advanced or Proficient</li> </ul>                                 | “What goal(s) shall we aim for by our next review point?”                              | Record measurable goal(s) in correct format on SIRF.   |

\* Pennsylvania Training and Technical Assistance Network (PaTTAN). (2008). *Data analysis team script*. Harrisburg: Pennsylvania Department of Education.

|  |  |  |
|--|--|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>4Sight example: “By ----, ----% of students will achieve scores of Proficient or above.”</li> </ul> <p>Teams may generate goal for both ORF and 4Sight Proficiency.</p> <p>For 4Sight, team needs to then review either Item Analysis to identify specific skills that large numbers of students missed OR Subscale Averages, which provide very broad information about group strengths/needs. This will help to identify skills to address.</p> |  |  |
| Team selects instructional strategies that directly address the benchmark and may select strategy to address ORF and target areas from 4Sight.   | “Let’s list some effective strategies that will assist our students to meet our goal(s).”  | Use newsprint to record ideas.                             |
| <p>Team analyzes suggested instructional strategies according to the following filters:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Strategy should be evidence based.</li> <li>Strategy should be practical.</li> <li>Curricular materials should be available to implement strategy or can be readily created.</li> </ul>   | <p>“Let’s rate these ideas.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Which ones have a good research base?</li> <li>Of those, which ones are most practical?</li> <li>What materials do we have available?</li> <li>What materials do we need?”</li> </ul> | Annotate newsprint of ideas.                               |
| Team selects strategies and agrees to implement them during coming intervention period.  | “Based on what we see on the display, what’s our choice for the best strategy(ies)?”   | Write an explicit description of the strategy on the SIRF. |
| <p>Team plans logistics of implementing strategy:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Team assists all teachers in learning strategy (if not already used) using: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>peer modeling and coaching</li> <li>grade-level “chats” regarding implementation</li> <li>assistance by content specialists, school psychologist, etc.)</li> </ul> </li> <li>Team locates or creates instructional materials.</li> </ul>                                 | <p>“As a team, how can we make this really happen for our students?”</p> <p>“What do we have to do to make sure we all use this strategy as planned?”</p> <p>“Who can help us with</p>   | Annotate the SIRF with “to-do’s.”                          |

\* Pennsylvania Training and Technical Assistance Network (PaTTAN). (2008). *Data analysis team script*. Harrisburg: Pennsylvania Department of Education.



|   |  |  |
|---|--|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Team plans for self-monitoring of use of strategy.</li> <li>Time to create/adapt materials</li> <li>Strategies for teaching strategies to novice teachers (e.g., peer coaching, modeling)</li> </ul>   | implementation and how will we know that we are on track?"   |  |
| <b>Tier 2</b>   |  |  |
| <b>Procedure</b>  | <b>Typical Prompts</b>   | <b>Record Keeping</b>  |
| <p>Team identifies which students will be considered for Tier 2 interventions.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Review all available data on these students (e.g., DIBELS/AIMSweb and 4Sight Proficiency lists, or data spreadsheet containing all assessment data).</li> <li>Identify students who are in each section (upper and lower ends) of the “emerging” or “strategic” area of the distribution on the most recent benchmark tests.</li> <li>Check for corroboration across different subtest or assessment measures (e.g., ORF and 4Sight scores).</li> <li>Decide which students need Tier 2 interventions.</li> </ul> | <p>“Which students do we really have to watch this quarter?”</p> <p>“How far behind are these students?”</p> <p>“What has been their slope since the last assessment?”</p> <p>“How do the DIBELS/AIMSweb scores compare with their 4Sight scores?” (for intermediate grades and above)</p> <p>“Which students do we think will get to benchmark without extra supports?”</p> <p>“Which students will need Tier 2 supports this quarter?”</p> | <p>Data sets in question (e.g., DIBELS, 4Sight). Use formats with student names and data from ongoing performance monitoring.</p> <p>Record names on SIRF.</p> |
| <p>Team sets a measurable goal to achieve by the next review point for the each student identified for Tier 2 supports.</p> <p>Goal for each student should be stated in terms of the desired score to be attained by the next benchmark assessment (typically the next benchmark score), or improvement on specific skill related to 4Sight data.</p>  | <p>“What goal(s) shall we aim for by our next review point for this student?”</p>  | <p>Annotate measurable goal(s) in correct format on SIRF.</p>  |
| <p>Team selects the standard protocol strategy that they feel best matches to the student’s identified area of need in Tier 2.</p>  | <p>“Let’s discuss which standard protocol strategy matches this student’s needs best.”</p>   | <p>Record strategy on SIRF.</p>  |
| <p>Team plans logistics of implementing strategy:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Team identifies the instructional group in which the intervention</li> </ul>   | <p>“What standard protocol intervention group shall we use for</p>   | <p>Annotate the SIRF with “to-do’s.”</p>   |

\* Pennsylvania Training and Technical Assistance Network (PaTTAN). (2008). *Data analysis team script*. Harrisburg: Pennsylvania Department of Education.

|   |  |  |
|---|--|--|
| <p>will occur.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Team identifies frequency and duration (amount of time each day) of the intervention.</li> <li>Team plans for self-monitoring of use of strategy.</li> </ul>  | <p>this student?”</p> <p>“When and how often will the intervention be delivered?”</p> <p>“What do we need to do as a team to make this really happen for our students?”</p> <p>“What do we have to do to make sure we all use this strategy as planned?”</p> <p>“How will we know that we are on track?”</p>   | <p>Use standard protocol checklist to determine fidelity of intervention.</p>  |
| <p>Team plans for progress monitoring (at least twice per month). Progress monitoring for skills such as comprehension or vocabulary will need team consideration and may be based on the Standard Protocol Intervention selected.</p>  | <p>“How will we measure their progress?”</p> <p>“Who will conduct this assessment?”</p>  | <p>Annotate SIRF with progress-monitoring plan.</p>  |
| <b>Tier 3</b>   |  |  |
| <p>Team identifies which students will to be considered for Tier 3 interventions</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Review all available data on these students (e.g., DIBELS/AIMSweb and 4Sight) using lists or spreadsheet.</li> <li>Identify students who are in the “deficient” or “at risk” area of the distribution on the most recent benchmark tests.</li> <li>Check for corroboration across different subtest or assessment measures (e.g., ORF and 4Sight scores).</li> <li>Review all available progress-monitoring data for each student’s rate of improvement (slope).</li> <li>Decide which students need Tier 3 interventions.</li> </ul> | <p>“Which students are the most deficient on our lists?”</p> <p>“How far behind are these students?”</p> <p>“What has been their slope since the last assessment?”</p> <p>“How do the DIBELS/AIMSweb scores compare with their 4Sight scores?” (for intermediate grades and above)</p> <p>“Which students will need Tier 3 supports this quarter?”</p> | <p>Data sets in question (e.g., DIBELS, 4Sight). Use formats with student names and data from ongoing performance monitoring.</p> <p>Record names on SIRF.</p> |
| <p>Team sets a measurable goal or goals to achieve by the next review point for the students identified for Tier 3 supports.</p>  | <p>“What goal(s) shall we aim for by our next review point for this</p>  | <p>Annotate measurable goal(s) in correct</p>  |

\* Pennsylvania Training and Technical Assistance Network (PaTTAN). (2008). *Data analysis team script*. Harrisburg: Pennsylvania Department of Education.

|   |   |   |
|---|---|---|
| Goal for each student should be stated in terms of the desired score to be attained by the next benchmark assessment as well as the expected rate of improvement (slope), or improvement on specific skill related to 4Sight or other assessment data.  | student?"   | format on SIRF.   |
| Team selects the standard protocol strategy that they feel best matches to the student's identified area of need in Tier 3.   | "Let's discuss which standard protocol strategy matches this student's needs best."   | Record strategy on SIRF.  |
| Team plans logistics of implementing strategy: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Team identifies the instructional group in which the intervention will occur.</li> <li>• Team identifies frequency and duration (amount of time each day) of the intervention.</li> <li>• Team plans for self-monitoring of use of strategy.</li> </ul> | "What standard protocol intervention group shall we use for this student?"<br>"When and how often will the intervention be delivered?"<br>"What do we need to do as a team to make this really happen for our students?"<br>"What do we have to do to make sure we all use this strategy as planned?"<br>"How will we know that we are on track?" | Annotate the SIRF with "to-do's."<br><br>Use standard protocol checklist to determine fidelity of intervention. |
| Team plans for progress monitoring (at least once per week). Progress monitoring for skills such as comprehension or vocabulary will need team consideration and may be based on the Standard Protocol Intervention selected.   | "How will we measure their progress?"<br>"Who will conduct this assessment?"  | Annotate SIRF with progress-monitoring plan.  |
| Team sets next meeting date.  | "When shall we meet again to review our progress?"  | Annotate next date on SIRF.   |

### Interim Steps (between meetings):

- Monitor fidelity of intervention.
- Monitor student's progress (CBM).
- Change (fine-tune) strategy (may or may not require team meeting—teachers are encouraged to continue to adjust instructional "practice" based on classroom performance and observation).

\* Pennsylvania Training and Technical Assistance Network (PaTTAN). (2008). *Data analysis team script*. Harrisburg: Pennsylvania Department of Education.

## Part II. Quarterly Benchmark (Follow-up) Meetings

### Before the meeting:

- Team accesses students' new progress-monitoring data.
- Data are provided to the team (teachers and other school personnel) in advance. Data sets include DIBELS, 4Sight Benchmark, Diagnostic and Classroom information.
- Session facilitator is identified by the principal/designee, and is trained in team facilitation.
- Meeting logistics, including the date/time, place, and an agenda, are arranged by principal or designee.

| Tier 1   |   |  |
|--|---|--|
| Procedure  | Typical Prompt  | Record Keeping   |
| Team compares new data to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Present grade-level goal</li> <li>• Appropriate ORF benchmark for grade and time of year               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ % at risk</li> <li>○ % some risk</li> <li>○ % low risk</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Proficiency levels for 4Sight, with additional information from Item Analysis or Subtest Averages</li> </ul> | “Let’s analyze how are our students doing on ( <i>benchmark skill</i> )?”                       | Summarize salient data on SIRD.                            |
| Team evaluates effectiveness of strategies used: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Gains were clearly linked to strategies for all students.</li> <li>• Strategies worked for some students and not others.</li> <li>• Strategies worked poorly.</li> <li>• Strategies were not implemented with fidelity (as planned).</li> </ul>  | “How did our strategies work this past quarter?”  | Record successful and unsuccessful strategies.             |
| Team sets a measurable goal or goals to achieve by the next review point. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Goal should be stated in terms of % of students making <i>x</i> progress (give a number) toward identified benchmark or % of students scoring Proficient or above on 4Sight.</li> </ul>   | “What goal(s) shall we aim for by our next review point?”                                       | Annotate measurable goal(s) in correct format on SIRD.     |
| Team decides on continuation of existing strategies or selects new ones. If new strategies are designed, analyze with filters: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Strategy should be evidence based.</li> </ul>  | “Based on where our students are now, shall we keep our existing strategy or plan for another?” | Write an explicit description of the strategy on the SIRD. |

\* Pennsylvania Training and Technical Assistance Network (PaTTAN). (2008). *Data analysis team script*. Harrisburg: Pennsylvania Department of Education.

|  |  |   |
|--|--|---|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Strategy should be practical.</li> <li>• Curricular materials are available to implement strategy or can be readily created.</li> </ul> <p>Note: Strategies may need to change because instructional targets have advanced.</p>   |  |   |
| <p>Team plans logistics of implementing strategy:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Team assists all teachers in learning strategy (if not already used) using:             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ peer modeling and coaching</li> <li>○ grade-level “chats” regarding implementation</li> <li>○ assistance by specialists (Title I, literature leader, school psychologist)</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Team locates or creates instructional materials.</li> <li>• Team plans for self-monitoring of use of strategy.</li> </ul> | <p>“What do we have to do to make sure we all use this strategy as planned?”</p> <p>“Who can help us with implementation?”</p> <p>“How will we know that we are on track?”</p>   |   |
| <b>Tier 2</b>  |  |   |
| <b>Procedure</b>   | <b>Typical Prompts</b>   | <b>Record Keeping</b>   |
| <p>Team reviews progress of students who have received Tier 2 interventions.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Review all scores (e.g., DIBELS/AIMSweb and 4Sight) for each student using lists or data spreadsheet.</li> <li>• Check for corroboration across different subtest or assessment measures (e.g., ORF and 4Sight scores).</li> </ul>   | <p>“How did our students do in Tier 2 this quarter?”</p> <p>“How far behind are these students?”</p> <p>“What has been their slope since the last assessment?”</p> <p>“How do the DIBELS/AIMSweb scores compare with their 4Sight scores?” (for intermediate grades and above)</p> | <p>Data sets in question (e.g., DIBELS, 4Sight Proficiency lists). Use formats with student names and data from ongoing performance monitoring.</p> |
| <p>Team evaluates effectiveness of strategies used, to determine if:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Gains are clearly linked to strategies for each student</li> <li>• Strategies worked for some students and not others</li> <li>• Strategies worked poorly</li> <li>• Strategies were not implemented as planned</li> </ul>   | <p>“How did our strategies work this past quarter?”</p> <p>“Did we implement the plan with fidelity?”</p>  | <p>Progress monitoring data on each student.</p> <p>Completed level-of-implementation protocols.</p>  |

\* Pennsylvania Training and Technical Assistance Network (PaTTAN). (2008). *Data analysis team script*. Harrisburg: Pennsylvania Department of Education.

|  |  |  |
|--|--|--|
| <p>Team decides which students need:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Continued Tier 2 interventions</li> <li>Tier 3 interventions</li> <li>To discontinue Tier 2 interventions</li> </ul>   | <p>“Which students have hit or are near benchmark and will be OK without Tier 2 supports?”</p> <p>“Which students are making some gains, but will continue to need Tier 2 supports this quarter?”</p> <p>“Which students are falling further behind and need a more intensive intervention (Tier 3)?”</p>  | <p>Record names on SIRF.</p>   |
| <p>Team sets a measurable goal or goals to achieve by the next review point for the students identified for Tier 2 or 3 supports.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Goal for each student should be stated in terms of the desired score to be attained by the next benchmark assessment, (typically the next benchmark score), or improvement on specific skill related to 4Sight or other assessment data.</li> </ul> | <p>“What goal(s) shall we aim for by our next review point for this student?”</p>  | <p>Annotate measurable goal(s) in correct format on SIRF.</p>  |
| <p>Team selects the standard protocol strategy that they feel best matches to the student’s identified area of need in Tier 3.</p>   | <p>“Let’s discuss which standard protocol strategy matches this student’s needs best.”</p>   | <p>Record strategy on SIRF.</p>  |
| <p>Team plans logistics of implementing strategy:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Team identifies the instructional group in which the intervention will occur.</li> <li>Team identifies frequency and duration (amount of time each day) of the intervention.</li> <li>Team plans for self-monitoring of use of strategy.</li> </ul>   | <p>“What standard protocol intervention group shall we use for this student?”</p> <p>“When and how often will the intervention be delivered?”</p> <p>“What do we need to do as a team to make this really happen for our students?”</p> <p>“What do we have to do to make sure we all use this strategy as planned?”</p> <p>“How will we know that we are on track?”</p> | <p>Annotate the SIRF with “to-do’s.”</p> <p>Use standard protocol checklist to determine fidelity of intervention.</p> |

\* Pennsylvania Training and Technical Assistance Network (PaTTAN). (2008). *Data analysis team script*. Harrisburg: Pennsylvania Department of Education.

|  |   |  |
|--|---|--|
| Team plans for progress monitoring: Tier 3-weekly.<br>Progress monitoring for skills such as comprehension or vocabulary will need team consideration and may be based on the Standard Protocol Intervention selected.   | “How will we measure their progress?”<br>“Who will conduct this assessment?”  | Annotate SIRF with progress monitoring plan.   |
| <b>Tier 3 Analysis</b>   |   |  |
| <b>Procedure</b>   | <b>Typical Prompts</b>  | <b>Record Keeping</b>  |
| Team reviews progress of students who have received Tier 3 interventions. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Review all scores (e.g., DIBELS/AIMSweb and 4Sight) for each student using lists or spreadsheet.</li> <li>Check for corroboration across different subtest or assessment measures (e.g., ORF and 4Sight scores).</li> </ul> | “How did our students do in Tier 3 this quarter?”<br>“How far behind are these students?”<br>“What has been their slope since the last assessment?”<br>“How do the DIBELS/AIMSweb scores compare with their 4Sight scores?” (for intermediate grades and above)                                 | Data sets in question (e.g., DIBELS, 4Sight). Use formats with student names and data from ongoing performance monitoring. |
| Team evaluates effectiveness of strategies used, to determine if: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Gains are clearly linked to strategies for each student</li> <li>Strategies worked for some students and not others</li> <li>Strategies worked poorly</li> <li>Strategies were not implemented as planned.</li> </ul>               | “How did our strategies work this past quarter?”<br><br>“Did we implement the plan with fidelity?”  | Progress monitoring data on each student.<br><br>Completed level-of-implementation protocols.                              |
| Team decides which students need: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Continued Tier 3 interventions</li> <li>To discontinue Tier 3 interventions and return to only Tier 2 supports</li> <li>To be referred for an evaluation for special education eligibility</li> </ul>   | “Which students have made good progress and will be OK without Tier 3 supports?”<br>“Which students are making some gains, but will continue to need Tier 3 supports this quarter?”<br>“Which students are falling further behind and need to be referred for a multi-disciplinary evaluation?” | Record names on SIRF.  |

\* Pennsylvania Training and Technical Assistance Network (PaTTAN). (2008). *Data analysis team script*. Harrisburg: Pennsylvania Department of Education.

|   |  |  |
|---|--|--|
| <p>Team sets a measurable goal or goals to achieve by the next review point for the students identified for Tier 2 or 3 supports.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Goal for each student should be stated in terms of the desired score to be attained by the next benchmark assessment (typically the next benchmark score), or improvement on specific skill related to 4Sight data.</li> </ul> | <p>“What goal(s) shall we aim for by our next review point for this student?”</p>  | <p>Annotate measurable goal(s) in correct format on SIRF.</p>  |
| <p>Team selects the standard protocol strategy that they feel best matches to the student’s identified area of need in Tier 3.</p>  | <p>“Let’s discuss which standard protocol strategy matches this student’s needs best.”</p>   | <p>Record strategy on SIRF.</p>  |
| <p>Team plans logistics of implementing strategy:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Team identifies the instructional group in which the intervention will occur.</li> <li>Team identifies frequency and duration (amount of time each day) of the intervention.</li> <li>Team plans for self-monitoring of use of strategy.</li> </ul>  | <p>“What standard protocol intervention group shall we use for this student?”</p> <p>“When and how often will the intervention be delivered?”</p> <p>“What do we need to do as a team to make this really happen for our students?”</p> <p>“What do we have to do to make sure we all use this strategy as planned?”</p> <p>“How will we know that we are on track?”</p> | <p>Annotate the SIRF with “to-do’s.”</p> <p>Use standard protocol checklist to determine fidelity of intervention.</p> |
| <p>Team plans for more frequent monitoring (Tier 2-monthly; Tier 3-weekly).</p>   | <p>“How will we measure their progress?”</p> <p>“Who will conduct this assessment?”</p>  | <p>Annotate SIRF with progress monitoring plan.</p>  |

### Interim Steps (between meetings):

- Monitor fidelity of intervention.
- Monitor student’s progress (CBM).
- Change (fine-tune) strategy (may or may not require team meeting—teachers are encouraged to continue to adjust instructional “practice” based on classroom performance and observation).

\* Pennsylvania Training and Technical Assistance Network (PaTTAN). (2008). *Data analysis team script*. Harrisburg: Pennsylvania Department of Education.